THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

PARL. PAPERS
OR REFERENCE ONLY.

616919

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

8 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXCIII.

COMPRISING PERIOD FROM WEDNESDAY, TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF JULY, 1908, TO SATURDAY, FIRST DAY OF AUGUST, 1908.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1908.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_july-22-august-1-1908_193

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1303), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35	41 Geo. III.		1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36	42 Geo. III.		1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol.	1 & 2	44	Geo. III.	1803-4
—	3 to 5	45	—	1805
—	6 & 7	46	—	1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	8 & 9	47	Geo. III.	1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	9 to 11	48	Geo. III.	1807-8
—	12 — 14	49	—	1809
—	15 — 17	50	—	1810
—	18 — 20	51	—	1810-11
—	21 — 23	52	—	1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	24 to 26	53	Geo. III.	1812-13
—	27 & 28	54	—	1813-14
—	29 to 31	55	—	1814-15
—	32 — 34	56	—	1816
—	35 & 36	57	—	1817
—	37 — 38	58	—	1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	39 & 40	59	Geo. III.	1819
—	41	60	—	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	1 to 3	1	Geo. IV.	1820
—	4 & 5	2	—	1821
—	6 — 7	3	—	1822
—	8 — 9	4	—	1823
—	10 — 11	5	—	1824
—	12 — 13	6	—	1825-6
—	14 — 15	7	—	1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	16	7	Geo. IV.	1826
—	17	8	—	1827
—	18 & 19	9	—	1828
—	20 — 21	10	—	1829
—	22 to 25	11	—	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(NINTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	1 to 3	1 Will. IV.	1830-1

(TENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	4 to 8	2 Will. IV.	1832
—	9 — 14	3 —	1831

(ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	15 to 20	4 Will. IV.	1833
—	21 — 25	5 —	1834

(TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	26 to 30	6 Will. IV.	1835
—	31 — 35	7 —	1836
—	36 — 38	8 —	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1 Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2 —	1839
—	51 — 55	3 —	1840
—	56 — 58	4 —	(a) 1841

(FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	59	4 Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5 —	1842
—	66 — 71	6 —	1843
—	72 — 76	7 —	1844
—	77 — 82	8 —	1845
—	83 — 88	9 —	1846
—	89 — 94	10 —	(a) 1847

(FIFTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	95	10 Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11 —	1848
—	102 — 107	12 —	1849
—	108 — 113	13 —	1850
—	114 — 118	14 —	1851
—	119 — 122	15 —	(a) 1852

(SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	123	15 Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16 —	1853
—	130 — 135	17 —	1854
—	136 — 139	18 —	1855
—	140 — 143	19 —	1856
—	144	20 —	(a) 1857

(SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol	145 to 147	20 Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 — 151	21 —	1858
—	152 — 153	22 —	(a) 1859

(EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22 Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 — 160	23 —	1860
—	161 — 164	24 —	1861
—	165 — 168	25 —	1862
—	169 — 172	26 —	1863
—	173 — 176	27 —	1864
—	177 — 180	28 —	1865

(NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29 Victoria	1866
—	185 — 189	30 —	1867
—	190 — 193	31 —	1867-8

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32 Victoria	1868-9
—	199 — 203	33 —	1870
—	204 — 208	34 —	1871
—	209 — 213	35 —	1872
—	214 — 217	36 —	1873

(TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37 Victoria	1874
—	222 — 226	38 —	1875
—	227 — 231	39 —	1876
—	232 — 236	40 —	1877
—	237 — 242	41 —	1878
—	243 — 249	42 —	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43 —	(a) 1880

(TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43 Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 — 265	44 —	1881
—	266 — 273	45 —	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45 —	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46 —	1883
—	284 — 292	47 —	1884
—	293 — 301	48 —	1884-5

(TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49 Victoria	(a) 1886

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49 Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50 —	1887
—	322 — 332	51 —	1888
—	333 — 340	52 —	1889
—	341 — 348	53 —	1890
—	349 — 356	54 —	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(Twenty-Eighth Parliament.)

Vol.	152 to 168	6	Edward VII.	1906
—	169 to 182	7	,, ,,	1907
—	183 to 193	8	,, ,,	1908

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

MR. ASQUITH'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION
APRIL 1908.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
    Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
    Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
    Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.
    War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
    India Office——Rt. Hon. Lord Morley.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna, M.P.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon. Marquess of Ripon.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Winston S. Churchill, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Viscount Wolverhampton.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Herbert Samuel, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Colonel Seely, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Lord Lucas.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——T. McKinnon Wood, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Dr. Macnamara, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——Sir Hudson Kearley, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——C. F. G. Masterman, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——C. E. Hobhouse, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——F. D. Acland, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——
    J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
    Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
    Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
    J. H. Whitley, Esq., M.P.
    J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Admiralty——
    Admiral of the Fleet Sir John Fisher.
    Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury.
    Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. Jackson.
    Rear-Admiral F. S. Inglefield.

Army Council——
    The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
    General Hon. Sir N. G. Lyttelton (Chief of the General Staff).
    General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
    General Sir W. G. Nicholson (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
    Major-General C. F. Haddon (Master-General of the Ordnance).
    The Under Secretary of State for War.
    The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
    Secretary. The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland)——T. W. Russell, Esq., M.P.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir W. S. Robson, M.P.
Solicitor-General——Sir S. T. Evans, M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Paymaster-General——R. K. CAUSTON, Esq., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl BEAUCHAMP.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of ELIBANK, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount ALTHORP.
Vice-Chamberlain——J. M. F. FULLER, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of GRANARD.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of MANCHESTER.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl GRANVILLE.
- Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL.
- Lord ACTON.
- Lord COLEBROOKE.
- Lord SUFFIELD.
- Lord HERSCHELL.
- Lord FARQUHAR.

Judge Advocate-General——T. MILVAIN, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. JOHN SINCLAIR
Lord High Constable——Earl of ERROL.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of BREADALBANE, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of ARGYLL, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord KINNAIRD.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord DUNEDIN.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. THOMAS SHAW, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Solicitor-General——ALEXANDER URE, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir STAIR AGNEW, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. LEACH, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. BIRRELL, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Lord MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord HERSCHELL and WALTER CALLAN, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——The Earl of LIVERPOOL.
Controller——Lord PIRRIE.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice WALKER.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. CEERRY, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——REDMOND BARRY, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord GRENFELL, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, P.C.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq., K.C.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
    Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
    Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
    Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
    W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
    Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell ; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs) ; H. P. St. John, Esq. ; V. M. Biddulph, Esq. ; Hon. E. A. Stonor ; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq. ; C. Headlam, Esq. ; J. B. Hotham, Esq. ; E. C. Vigors, Esq. ; G. D. Luard, Esq. ; and G. Proby, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. Ambrey Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. C. E. Chizlett, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip, W. S. Wright, A. J. Vaughan.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. A. N. Stoll.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir H. F. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Assistant Shorthand Writer——William Gurney Angus, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. Ridge.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. W. Bradshaw.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The Chairman of Ways and Means——Rt. Hon. A. Emmott, M.P.
Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq., C.B.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
    Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
    Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
    Committee Office——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
    Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——C. V. Frere, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq. ; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq. ; H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq. ; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Junior Clerks——W. T. Legge, Esq. ; C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; W. P. Johnston, Esq. ; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour ; R. N. Bailey, Esq. ; G. F. M. Campion, Esq. ; S. de la Poer Beresford, Esq. ; H. S. Green, Esq. ; O. C. Williams Esq. ; V. W. D. Fox, Esq. ; E. F. Wise, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. Edward Gully, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Ernest Moon, Esq., K.C.
Trainbearer——Mr. W. Murrell.
Messenger——Mr. W. Holt.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Principal Clerk——Philip Smith, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——John Poyser, Esq. ; W. K. Sanderson, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——V. Kitto, Esq ; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart ; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin and P. J. Stowell.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. Lincoln ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. Bullock.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. C. Davie, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman, J. Surry, A. Sepple.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. Inglefield and Mr. H. Hambling.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day, Mr. J. Henderson, Mr. G. Wainwright, Mr. J. Guyatt, Mr. R. Turtle.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington, H. G. Emmett, J. L. Philip, W. Findlay, W. Macdonald, W. R. Brimson, A. New.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley ; Assistant——Mr. W Broadbent ; Porters——Messrs. J. Hart and G. Fry.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXCIII.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 22ND JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill.—The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn 1

Margate Corporation Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill.—Committed for To-morrow 1

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners 1

Falkirk and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1

Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway, Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford-on-Avon Junction Railway, and East and West Junction Railway (Amalgamation) Bill [H.L.].—London County Council (Tramways and Improvements Bill) [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments considered and agreed to 2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 5)—BRADFIELD (RURAL ORDER)—Report from the Select Committee; That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the said Order, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 15th instant respecting the commitment of the Bill to a Select Committee in regard to the said Order discharged ... 2

Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, etc.) Order Conformation Bill.—Read 1^{a}; to be printed, and (pursuant to the private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^{a} (The Lord Herschell), and reported from the Committee. [No. 174] 2

July 22.] *Page*

PETITION.

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—Petition against; read, and ordered to lie upon the Table ... 3

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milk Shops (Ireland).—Order of the 3rd February, 1908, and correspondence addressed to local authorities in Ireland with respect to the said Order. Laid before the House and to be printed. [No. 171] ... 3

Inland Revenue.—Fifty first Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Inland Revenue, for the year ended 31st March, 1908 ... 3

Trade Reports, Annual Series.—No. 4071 to No. 4073 ... 3

Colonies Annual.—No. 566. Northern Territories of the Gold Coast. Report for 1907 ... 3

Public Works (Ireland).—Seventy-sixth Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland.

Presented, and ordered to lie upon the Table ... 3

Married Women's Property Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 173] ... 3

NEW BILL.

Lunacy Bill [H.L.].—Presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 172] ... 3

Matrimonial Causes Bill [H.L.] (SECOND READING).—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Earl Russell ... 4

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Russell.*)

The Lord Bishop of Bristol ... 10
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) ... 11

On Question.

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 2; Not-contents, 61.

The Shop Hours Act.

Lord Avebury ... 13

Moved, "For a Return of the Closing Orders which have been confirmed by the Home Office under the Shop Hours Act, and specifying those which have been for the hairdressers' trade; and of those now under consideration."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

The Lord Steward (*Earl Beauchamp*) ... 13
Lord Avebury ... 14

Motion, by leave, withdrawn

Home Defence.

The Earl of Wemyss ... 14
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*Lord Lucas*) ... 18
Lord Newton ... 21
Lord Zouche of Haryngworth ... 24

Page

Viscount Midleton ... 25
Lord Saye and Sele ... 28
Viscount Hardinge ... 28
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) ... 28
Lord Belhaven Stenton ... 31
Lord Haversham ... 32

The Scottish Crofters

The Earl of Camperdown ... 32

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return of the correspondence or other basis upon which the Congested Districts Board of Scotland has founded a comparison (see page IX. of the Report) between the position as to payment of rent and annuities due upon loans of annuitants who have purchased from the Board, and of crofters who hold from the proprietor and who have been aided by the Board to acquire their present holdings."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

Lord Herschell ... 38
Lord Balfour of Burleigh ... 40
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) ... 43
The Marquess of Lansdowne ... 45
The Earl of Camperdown ... 46

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Training of Mercantile Marine Officers.

Lord Brassey ... 46
Lord Muskerry ... 49
The Earl of Granard ... 50

Cran Measures Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING]. Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) ... 51

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

Lord Heneage ... 52

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to Order) and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

SHORTAGE OF INFANTRY UNITS.

Viscount Hardinge ... 53
Lord Lucas ... 55

Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill. [SECOND READING.] Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Denman ... 57

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Denman.*)

Earl of Donoughmore ... 57

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Wednesday next.

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill.—[SECOND READING.] Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Viscount Midleton 57

Moved, that the Bill be now read 2ª—(*Viscount Midleton*).

Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Polling Districts (County Council) Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next 58

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 58

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill.—Amendment reported (according to order); a further Amendment made, and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow ... 58

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 22ND JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 59

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—As amended, considered.

Ordered, that Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Deputy-Chairman.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 59

Crystal Palace Company Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time and committed.

Rhymney and Aber Valley Gas and Water Bill [LORDS].—Ordered, that Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill to sit and proceed forthwith."—(*The Deputy Chairman.*) 59

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No, 3) Bill [LORDS]."—Falkirk and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment. 59

Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed. 59

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Friday 59

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow. 59

July 22.] *Page*

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Considered; to be read the third time To-morrow. 60

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [LORDS].—Ordered, that Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on unopposed Bills have leave to sit and proceed forthwith."—(*The Deputy-Chairman.*) 60

Local Government Ireland Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [LORDS]. – Ordered that it be an instruction to the Committee on the Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords], to insert a clause for providing that the district council shall not from the system of sewerage referred to in the order permit any crude sewage to be discharged into the Bay of Dublin, except between the time of high water and five hours after high water, provided that in case of heavy rain or other emergency the storm water may be discharged at any period of the tide.—(*Mr. Nannetti.*) 60

Keighley Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 60

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS —That they have agreed to: Post Office Savings Bank Bill, without Amendment; Padiham Urban District Council Bill; Criccieth Water and Improvement Bill; South-West Suburban Water Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to Amendments: Finchley Urban District Council Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to: Pontypridd Water Bill [Lords]; Aire and Calder Navigation Bill [Lords]; Bognor Gas Light and Coke Company Bill [Lords]: South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, Importation of Plumage Prohibition Bill [Lords].

And also, a Bill, inttiuled, Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc) Bill [Lords].

House of Lords (Manuscripts).—That they communicate Copy of the Manuscripts of the House of Lords, Volume IV. (New Series), as desired by this House in their Message of Yesterday. 60

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [LORDS]. —Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 338.] 61

PETITIONS.

Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 61

Licensing Bill.—7 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 61

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—7 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 61

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4071 to 4073; to lie upon the Table ... ...

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Colonial Report, No. 566 (Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, Annual Report for 1907); to lie upon the Table ...

Public Works (Ireland).—Seventy-sixth Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland; to lie upon the Table ... ...

Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, (Parish Council Elections, 1907).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 247.] ... ...

Trustee Savings Banks.—Return ordered ... ...

Poor Relief (England and Wales).—Copy ordered, "of Statement of the amount expended by Boards of Guardians for Poor Relief" ... ...

Local Taxation Licences, etc., 1907–8.—Return ordered, "of the amount received during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1908, in respect of each administrative county and county borough in England and Wales, for Local Taxation Licence Duties" ... ...

Local Taxation Account, 1907–8.—Return ordered, "showing in respect of the financial year ended the 31st day of March, 1908, the distribution of the moneys paid into the Local Taxation Account" ... ...

London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894, (Accounts under Section 1 (7) of the Act).—Return ordered ... ...

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Reduction in Hours of Spinners of American Cotton ... ...
Pay of Saltcoats Postmen ... ...
The Provincial Homes Investment Company ... ...
Fatal Accidents caused by Motor Omnibuses ... ...
Reduction of British Garrisons Overseas ... ...
Chinese Labourers Repatriated ... ...
East African Protectorate Rules ... ...
African Protectorate—Ordinance ... ...
Recruiting of Native Labour for East Africa, Protectorate ... ...
Government Audit Work ... ...
Compulsory Retirement of Miss Bradley from the Post Office ... ...
Illegal Trawling in Scotch Waters ... ...
Disorderly Seamen on Steamer "Clan" ... ...
Expenditure on Tobacco per head in England and Germany ... ...
Tube Railways—Fire Precautions ... ...
Census of Production Act Returns ... ...
The Imprisoned Suffragists ... ...
Sale of Estate of Sir Arthur Wallace ... ...
Grant for Mrs. Sheehy, of Raheen ... ...

Page

Grant for James Reasdon of Rathkeale 73
Evicted Tenants—Cases of Mrs. O'Shaughnessy and Mrs. Hayes 73
Reinstatement of Mrs. Mary Eagan 73
Case of Daniel Dorgan 74
Territorial Army Quartermaster Sergeants 74

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty China and Earthenware Contracts 74
Naval Officers and Company Directorships... 76
Cadet Examination Papers 76
Woolwich Common 77
Shoeburyness Ranges... 78
Government Purchases and Indian Industries 80
Jasdan and Limbdi States 80
Kankinara Bomb Outrage 80
Trinidad Dock and Engineering Company 81
Dinizulu's Salary 81
Liquor Traffic in Southern Nigeria 82
Federated Malay States—Revenue Statistics 82
Children in Gaming and Opium Dens 83
Suppression of Licensed Gambling in the Malay States 83
Perak and Selangor Gambling Farms 84
Imports of Spirits into Southern Nigeria 85
British Indians in Natal 85
British Indians in Southern Rhodesia 85
British Indians in the Transvaal 86
Dinizulu's Trial 86
Expenditure on Wales 89
Unemployed Grant 89
Stud Tramway System in the Mile End Road 89
Board of Trade Labour Gazette 90
Tenement Dwellings in London and Berlin 90
Fenton (Staffs.) Vaccination Case 91
Inter-Departmental Committee on Compulsory Attendance at School 92
Kenmare Train Service 93
Londonderry Flax Industry 94
Fuge Estate, Templemary, Cork 95
Beardsley Evans Estate, Charleville 95
Irish Evicted Tenants 95
Sligo Cattle-drives 95
Kinvarra Outrage 97
Judge Ross on Terrorism in Westmeath 98
Imprisonment for Contempt of Court 102

July 22.] *Page*

Attack on a Process Server at Kantrick 104
Intimidation in Ireland 105
Irish University Bill 105
Alleged Boycotting in Westmeath 106
Reynell *v.* Toofe 106
Contempt of Courts Bill 107
Mr. Ginnell, M.P. 108
Cork College Governing Body 108
Agitation against Land Grabbing 109
Crime in Roscommon 110
Crime in Westmeath 110
New Irish Universities 111
Irish Land Stock 112
English Land Valuation Bill 112

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Sixth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table to be printed. 112

HOME WORK.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 246.]... ... 112

Sweated Industries Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, from the Select Committee on Home Work

Report to lie on the Table 112

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill [LORDS.]—Read the first time; to be read; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 337.] 112

Prevention of Crime Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee C.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 248.]

Minutes of the proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 248.]

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 336.] 113

Importation of Plumage Prohibition Bill [LORDS.]—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed [Bill 339.] 113

EAST INDIAN REVENUE ACCOUNTS.—Order for Committee read.

The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire. E.) 113

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for Committee on East India Revenue Accounts)."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*

Earl Percy (Kensington, S.) 129
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 141
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen University) 161

Amendment proposed,—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, while it recognises that the reforms now under the consideration of the Government of India are suitable and sufficient in respect of questions with which they deal, is of opinion that the educational system in India stands in urgent need of reform.'—(*Mr. Rees*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Ellis (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) ... 168
Mr Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) ... 171
Mr. MacCaw (Down, W.) ... 183
Sir Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) ... 189
Mr Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) ... 193
Mr. Gwynn, (Galway) ... 197
Sir Henry Kimber (Wandsworth) ... 199
Sir Scott Robertson (Bradford, Central) ... 202
Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.) ... 208
Mr. Buchanan ... 212
Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth) ... 214
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) ... 216

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put and agreed to.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Maclean (Bath) ... 220
Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross) ... 222
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) ... 223
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) ... 224
Mr. Buchanan ... 225
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) ... 226
Mr. Dundas White (Dumbartonshire) ... 227
Mr. Bright (Oldham) ... 227

Main Question put, and agreed to.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, "That it appears from the Accounts presented to Parliament that in 1906–7 the Revenue of India amounted to £73,114,554, the expenditure charged against Revenue to £71,555,179, and the Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue to £8,712,668.—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Resolution to be reported.

Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:

Captain Craig ... 228

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to insert the words 'Subject to the provisions of this Act.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 228
Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 230
Mr. Connor O'Kelly (Mayo, N.) 232

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 26 ; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 211.)

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

New Clause (Saving of rights of the Crown and Government Departments) —(*Mr. T. W. Russell*)—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Moore 233

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress ; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Mr. T. W. Russell 234

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 26 ; Noes, 144. (Division List No 212.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Moore 237

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

Clause read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Walter Long 238
Mr. Birrell 239
Mr. Moore 240

Agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

Bill reported ; as amended, to be considered this day, and to be printed. [Bill 340.]

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—Order for the Second Reading read.

Mr. Birrell 241

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Mr. Walter Long 242

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Agricultural Holdings Bill.—Order for the Second Reading read.

The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) 244

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 245

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.

EAST INDIA LOANS (RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION WORKS.)—Order for Committee thereupon read, and discharged 245

Public Works Loans Bill.—Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir F. Banbury 245
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) ... 248
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 249
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 249
Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.) 251
Mr. Hobhouse 251

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

EAST INDIA LOANS (RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION WORKS AND GENERAL PURPOSES).

Committee to consider of authorising the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise money in the United Kingdom, on the security of the revenues of India, for the construction, extension, and equipment of Railways in India by State agencies or through the agency of companies, and for the construction of Irrigation Works, and also for General Purposes for the Government of India (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease*)... ... 252

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS (REMISSION).

Committee to consider of authorising the remission of certain debts due to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, in pursuance of any Act of the present session, to grant money for the purpose of certain Local Loans out of the Local Loans Fund, and for other purposes relating to Local Loans (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*) 252

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nine minutes after One O'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 23RD JULY, 1908.

SAT FIRST.—The Lord Hampton—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE FURTHER STANDING ORDERS applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings). The same was ordered to lie on the Table 253

July 23.]

Page

London United Tramways Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 253

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 253

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill.—Read 3^{a}, and passed 253

Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill.—Moved, That Standing Order No. 143 be considered and dispensed with in respect of the said Bills, and that the Bills be now read 3^{a}, agreed to: Bills read 3^{a} accordingly, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 253

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to 253

Holderness Water Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 253

Provisional Orders (Procedure) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Monday next... 253

PETITION.

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—Petition against proceeding until the Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law has been issued; read and ordered to lie on the Table 254

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Army Terrtorial Force.—Report, as to the progress made in constituting the medical service of the Territorial Force 254

Shipping Casualties—Shipping Casualties which occurred.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table ... 254

London Corporation.—Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London, for the year 1907 254

Parliamentry Returns.—Treasury Minute, directing that the annual account required by the Uganda Railway Act, 1896, shall be discontinued.
Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 254

Commons Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Standing Committee with a further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Monday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 177] 254

Coroners (Ireland) Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Monday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 178] 255

Companies Consolidation Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Joint Committee on the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.], the Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.], and the Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.], that the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.] ought to be allowed to proceed. The said

Report (with the Proceedings of the Committee) to be printed. [No. 175.] Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out; Bill reported with Amendments and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next and to be printed as amended. [No. 176.] ... 255

Tobacco-Growing (Scotland) Bill.—Report from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3^{a} on Monday next 255

Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies Bill) [H.L.].—Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Monday next. 255

Friendly Societies Bill [SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Denman 255

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Lord Denman.*)

The Earl of Halsbury 257

On Question, Bill read 2^{a} (according to order) and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

Law of Distress Amendment Bill.—Order of the day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Lord Courtney of Penwith 258

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*Lord Courtney of Penwith.*)

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 259

Viscount St. Aldwyn 260

House in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without amendment: Standing Committee negatived. Amendments made. Bill recommitted, and to be printed as amended. [No. 179.]

Telegraph (Construction) Bill.—[SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Granard 261

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

The Chairman of Committees The Earl of Onslow) 262

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 263

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 263

Lord Belper 264

The Earl of Granard 264

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Wild Birds Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Crewe 265

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^{a}.—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

The Duke of Northumberland 267

The Marquess of Lansdowne 269

The Earl of Crewe 272

July 23.] Page

Moved, that the debate be adjourned—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne*).

On Question, Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned *sine die*.

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill.—Bill read 3ª (According to Order).

Lord Clonbrock 272

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 2, to insert the following new Clause: 'A Justice in Ireland shall not be disqualified to act for any purpose under the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906, or the Licensing (Ireland) Acts, 1833 to 1905 or this Act, by reason only of his being interested in a railway company which is a retailer of intoxicating liquor.'"—(*Lord Clonbrock*.)

The Lord Chancellor ... — 273
Lord Clonbrock 273

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

An Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Costs in Criminal Cases Bill [Second Reading].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor 274

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

House of Lords Offices.—Second Report of the Select Committee considered (according to Order), and agreed to.

Irish Land Purchase.

The Earl of Mayo 274
Lord Denman 275

Cran Measures Bill [h.l.].—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to Order), and dispensed with, and Bill read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons ... 275

Ireland—Proclaimed Counties.

Lord Killanin 275

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing the counties and portions of counties proclaimed under the above Act during the last thirty years, with the dates at which the proclamations were made and withdrawn."—(*Lord Killanin*).

Lord Denman 281
The Marquess of Londonderry 284
Lord Macdonnell of Swinford 285
Lord Atkinson 287
Lord Ashbourne 288
The Earl of Mayo 289
The Earl of Crewe 290

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN CATTLE.

The Earl of Onslow 292
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Earl Carrington) 293

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Moved, "That the Lord Balfour be appointed to take the Chair in all Committees of the Whole House next week in the absence of the Chairman of Committees: That the Lord Balfour be appointed to take the Chair in all Committees upon Private Bills next week in the absence of the Chairman of Committees;—(*The Chairman of Committees*)—agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Seven o'clock till To-morrow, Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 23RD JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Ordered, that Standing Orders 220 and 246, relating to Private Bills, be suspended for the remainder of the session.

That, as regards Private Bills to be returned by the House of Lords with Amendments, such Amendments (if unopposed) shall be considered forthwith.

That as regards Private Bills returned, or to be returned, by the House of Lords with Amendments, such Amendments (if opposed) shall be considered at such times as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine.

That, when it is intended to propose any Amendments thereto, a copy of such Amendments shall be deposited at the Private Bill Office, and notice given on the day on which the Bill shall have been returned from the Lords.—(*The Deputy Chairman*) 294

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 295

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS).—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 295

Salmon, Trout, and River Tweed Fisheries Bill.—Ordered, that the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills to examine the Salmon, Trout, and River Tweed Fisheries Bill, with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Sir John Jardine*) 295

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 295

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 295

July 23.] Page

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 295

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 592

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 296

Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to:—Margate Corporation Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to:—Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway, Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford upon-Avon Junction Railway, and East and West Junction Railway (Amalgamation) Bill [Lords]; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [Lords].

And, also a Bill intituled, [Cran Measures Bill [Lords.] 296

PETITIONS.

Children Bill.—Petition from to lie upon the Table 296

Licensing Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table. 2 Petitions for alteration; to lie upon the Table. 6 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 296

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—4 Petions in favour; to lie upon the Table 297

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Parliamentary Returns.—Treasury Minute, directing that the Annual Account required by the Uganda Railway Act, 1896, shall be discontinued; to lie upon the Table 297

Poor Law Relief (Paupers Relieved in a Year and Periods of Relief.—Return presented, relative thereto, to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 250.) 297

Shipping Casualties (1906-07).—Abstract of the Returns of Shipping Casualties to lie upon the Table 297

Paper Laid Upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Chamber of London.—Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London for the year 1907; to be printed. [No. 251.] 297

Page
HOUSE OF LORDS (MANUSCRIPTS), VOLUME IV. (NEW SERIES). Paper to be printed. [No. 249.] 297
ARMY TERRITORIAL FORCE.—Report as to the progress made in constituting the Medical Service of the Territorial Force; to lie upon the Table 297

QUESTION AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Earlier Issue of Education Code 298
Increase of Rents of Tenants at Box, Camelsmaeson 298
Anarchism and Slander in India 299
Military Training for Europeans in India 299
London Street Ambulances 300
Supply of Boots to Prisoners 300
Official Shorthand Writer at Assizes 301
Appointment of Irish-born Customs Preventive Officers 301
Territorial Army—Issue of Wagons and Harness to Supply Columns 302
Athletic Clubs—Facilities for Shooting 302
Working of Patents in Ireland 303
Evicted Tenants—Case of Daniel Derry 303
Restoration of George Cowley of the Beresford Estate 304
Restoration of the Murphy Family 304
Belfast Royal Irish Constabulary 305
Police Transferred from Belfast 305
Withholding of Salary of Teacher of Outquarter National School 306
Irish Teachers' Salaries—Conditions of Increased Grants 306
Transfer of Constable Hugh Martin from Belfast 307
Relief of Distress in Belfast 308
Policeman and the Disturbances at Portadown 308
Disturbances at Portadown 308
Cuiltybo National School 309
Recognition of Colonial Services 310
Railway Employees 311
Foreign Trade of China 311
Cost of Living in Scotch Towns 311
Increased Pay for Irish Rural Letter Carriers 312
Commissions for Private Students at Reyham 312
Line and Trawl Caught Fish 312
Migration of Lewis Cottars 313
Construction of Boat Shelter and Sea Wall at Skigerstu 313
Lemstrom Electrification System and the Cultivation of Wheat 314
Notification of Tuberculosis... 315
London Customs House Accommodation 315
Emigration of British Subjects to Canada and the United States 316
Sunday Hotel Licenses in Scotland 319

July 23.]

Page
Old Age Pensions in Rural Districts ... 319
Irish Development Grant ... 319
Earned Incomes ... 320
Inland Revenue Returns ... 320
Administration of Old Age Pensions Scheme ... 320
Gravesend Topedo Slipway—Arbitration Award ... 322
Cost of British South African Garrison ... 322
Transfer of Officers to the Essex Regiment ... 323
Straffan Stud Farms and Military Manœuvre ... 325

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Portsmouth Gun Wharf Fire ... 325
H.M.S. "Gladiator" ... 326
London Engineer Offices ... 326
Australasian Dissatisfaction with the Suez Canal Dues ... 326
Transvaal Compensation Fund ... 327
Native Labourers' Wages in the Transvaal ... 328
Native Labour Pass Regulations ... 328
Portuguese Native Labourers ... 329
British Government Shares in the Suez Canal Company ... 329
Suez Canal Dues—British Shipowners' Dissatisfaction ... 330
Russian Loans in Great Britain ... 331
Turco-Persian Frontier Negotiations ... 331
Khedivial School of Agriculture at Cairo ... 332
Mortgage Bank in Egypt ... 332
Macedonian Reforms ... 332
Macedonian Bands ... 332
Disorders at Tabriz ... 333
Death Duties ... 334
Supplementary Civil Service Estimates ... 334
Scotland and the Income Tax ... 335
Cost of Old Age Pensions ... 335
Royal Warrant Holders and the Factory Laws ... 336
Truck in the Potteries ... 337
Child Beggars ... 337
Hamstead Colliery Disaster—Rewards for Bravery ... 338
The Imprisoned Suffragists ... 838
The Suffragists ... 339
Fenchurch Street Station Accidents ... 340
Port of London Bill ... 341
Gluenvarane Foreshore ... 341
Labour and the Port of London Authority ... 342
Price of Beef and the Beef Trust ... 343

Page
County Boroughs 343
Vaccination Exemption Certificates 344
Metropolitan Water Board Clerks... 344
Government Hospitality 345
Cattle Disease in Canada 345
Provincial Homes Investment Company 346
Superannuation of Edward Lynam 347
Scottish Fishery Cruisers 347
Departmental Committee on Truck 349
Irish Ranch Grabbers 349
Lough Gara Drainage Board 350
Winn Estate, Glenbeigh, Kerry 351
Kerry Evicted Tenants 351
Assistant Irish National School Teachers' Salaries 352
Stokestown Grazing Land 352
Dease Estate, North Longford 353
Ratheline Evicted Tenants 353
Richardson Estate, Granard 353
Chief Land Commission Assessor 354
Irish County Councils, Compulsory Education 354
Queen's College, Belfast 355
Belfast New University 356
Irish University Degrees 356
Catholic Students in the Royal University 357
De Blaquiere Estate, County Clare 357
Lewis Estate Evicted Tenants, Galway 358
Belfast Workhouses... 359
Castletown Cattle-drive 359
General Taylor's Clonara Estate 360
Grehan Estate, Kildorrery, County Cork 360
Kearney Estate, Ardfert, Kerry 361
Donegal Assize, Grand Jury 362
Irish Local Government Auditors 362
Labourers (Ireland) Act Agreement 363
Irish Teachers and the Education Grant 363
Tulrahan Farm, Mayo 364
Derrycassan Evicted Tenant 364
Australian Commonwealth Arms 364
War Office Administration... 365
Supplementary Estimates 365
Motor Car Act 366
Licensing Bill Debate 366
Business of the House 367

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEE).—Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection.
Reports to lie upon the Table 367

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—Third Report brought up and read with Minutes of Evidence.
Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 253.] ... 367

Companies Consolidation Bill [LORDS]; **Post Office Consolidation Bill** [LORDS]; **and Statute Law Revision Bill** [LORDS].—Report from the Joint Committee in respect of Companies Consolidation Bill [Lords] pending in the Lords, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up and read.
Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 252.] ... 368

Cran Measures Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read the second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 341.] 368

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).—Ordered, That the proceedings on the Irish Universities Bill have precedence this day of the Business of Supply.—(*Mr. Asquith.*) 368

Irish Universities Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.
Captain Craig (Down, E.) 368
Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 372

Amendment proposed—
"In page 1, line 7, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the clause, to the word 'two,' in page 1, line 8, stand part of the Bill."
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr Birrell, Bristol N.) 375
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 376
Mr. Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 376
Mr. John Redmond, (Waterford) 388
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 380
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 382
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 385

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 231; Noes, 31. (Division List No. 213.)
Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, (Newington, Walworth) 391

Amendment proposed—
"In page 1, line 8, to leave out from the word 'found' to end of the subsection, and to insert the words 'one new University in Ireland, having its seat at Dublin.'"—*Mr. C. J. O'Donnell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part."
Mr. Birrell 393

Amendment negatived.
Captain Craig 394

Amendment proposed—
"In page 1, line 11, to leave out from the word 'corporate,' to the word 'and' in line 13, and to insert the words 'named the Royal University,' Dublin, and the 'Queen's University,' Belfast, respectively."—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell 394
Mr. Walter Long 395

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. Moore 395
Mr. Barrie 396

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 18, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided that any governing body under this Act shall be composed as to three-fourths thereof of laymen."—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 397
Mr. Walter Long 397
Mr. Charles Craig 399

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 71 ; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 214.)

Mr. Barrie 401

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out the words 'and Queen's College, Belfast.'"—(*Mr Hugh Barrie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell 407
Sir Philip Magnus (*London University*) 409
Mr. Butcher 409
Mr. Barrie 410
The Marquess of Hamilton (*Londonderry*) 410
Mr. Birrell 411
Mr. John Redmond 412
Sir E. Carson (*Dublin University*) 412
Mr. Birrell 415
Mr. C. J. O'Donnell 415

Amendment negatived.

Captain Craig 415

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'new,' to insert the word 'undenominational.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'undenominational' be there inserted."

Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 416
Mr. Birrell 416
Mr. Walter Long 417
Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool East, Toxteth*) 417
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 418
Mr. Dillon (*Mayo, E.*) 419
Mr. Hutton 420
Mr. Gwynn (*Galway*) 421
Mr. Verney (*Buckinghamshire, N.*) 422
Sir W. J. Collins (*St. Pancras, W.*) 422

Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) ... 423
Captain Craig ... 424
Mr. Massie (Wiltshire, Cricklade) ... 425

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes 32 ; Noes, 273. (Division List No. 215.)

Captain Craig ... 427

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'constituted,' to insert the words 'of laymen.' "—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'of laymen' be there inserted."

Mr. Moore ... 430

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Butcher ... 430

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, " to leave out the word charter,' and to insert the words "Schedule to this Act entitled, 'Constitution of Governing Bodies of Constituent Colleges.' "—(*Mr. Butcher.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'charter' stand part."

Mr. Birrell ... 432
Mr. William O'Brien (Cork) ... 436
Mr. Charles Craig ... 438
Mr. Moore ... 440
Sir William Anson ... 442
Mr. Butcher ... 443
Mr. Birrell ... 444

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 249 ; Noes 38. Division List No. 216.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out the word 'the,' and to insert the words 'any such new.' "—(*Mr Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, after the word 'Charter,' to insert the words 'or an alteration of an existing Charter.' "—(*Mr Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Sir Philip Magnus ... 448
Mr. Butcher ... 452

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 15, after the word 'which' to insert the words 'the Commissioners, and after the powers of the Commissioners determine.' "—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Birrell ... 453
Mr. Walter Long ... 454

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Butcher ... 456

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'may,' to insert the words 'by statute.'"—(*Mr Butcher.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell ... 458
Sir E. Carson ... 459
Mr. C. J. O'Donnell ... 460
Sir Wm. Anson ... 461

Amendment negatived.

Sir Philip Magnus ... 462

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, to leave out the word 'give,' and insert the words "recognise any college or institution in Ireland by giving.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus*).

Mr. Birrell ... 462

Question proposed, "That the word 'give' stand part of the Bill."

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, after the words 'give to' insert 'matriculated.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'matriculated' be there inserted"

Captain Craig ... 463
Mr. Moore ... 464

Amendment agreed to.

Further Amendment agreed to.

Captain Craig ... 464
Mr. Charles Craig ... 465

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 17, to leave out from the word 'type' to the second 'the' in line 20."—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'for' in line 19, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell ... 467
Sir W. J. Collins ... 467

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, after the word 'body,' to insert the words 'of the University.'"—(*Captain Craig*).

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill," put, and negatived.

Sir W. J. Collins ... 467
Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton) ... 469

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, after the word 'purpose,' to insert the words 'or to students who are pursuing studies otherwise than in a recognised college.'"—(*Sir William Collins.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. C. J. O'Donnell ... 470
Mr. John Redmond ... 472
Mr. Butcher ... 473
Mr. Birrell ... 474
Mr. T. M. Healy ... 475
Mr. Moore ... 476

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 38; Noes, 263. (Division List No. 217.)

Motion made and Question, "That further consideration of the Bill, as amended in the Standing Committee, be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Birrell,*)—put and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS [REMISSION].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the remission of the debts due to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland from certain Railway Companies, in pursuance of any Act of the present session, to grant money for the purpose of certain Local Loans out of the Local Loans Fund, and for other purposes relating to Local Loans."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.*) ... 479
Mr. T. M. Healy ... 480
Mr. Hobhouse ... 483
Mr. T. M. Healy ... 484
Mr. Forster (*Kent, Sevenoaks*) ... 486
Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyllshire*) ... 487
Mr. T. M. Healy ... 488
Mr. Hobhouse ... 490
Mr. Ainsworth ... 491
Mr. Markham (*Nottinghamshire, Mansfield*) ... 492
Mr. T. M. Healy ... 492
Mr. Hudson (*Newcastle*) ... 493

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported this day.

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; Bill read the third time, and passed ... 494

Naval Marriages Bill.—Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for this day.—(*Mr. McKenna*) ... 494

Registration Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered.

Bill read the third time, and passed ... 494

Page

Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill.—As amended, considered.

Sir Thomas Esmonde (*Wexford, N.*) 495
Mr. Connor O'Kelly 496
Mr. T. W. Russell 496

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Sixteen minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 24TH JULY, 1908.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—London (Westminster and Kensington) Electric Supply Companies Bill [Lords]; London Electric Supply Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 497

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill. Tyne Improvement Bill; Widnes Corporation Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to. 497

Margate Corporation Bill.—Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill.—Lords Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to 497

Honourable Artillery Company Bill [LORDS].—Leith Burgh Bill [LORDS]; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [Lords]; Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 497

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [LORDS].—Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment. ... 497

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow. 497

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed with Amendments 498

PETITIONS.

Children Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 498

Licensing Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table. Eight Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 498

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 498

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Two Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 498

July 24.]

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC

Treaty Series (No. 20, 1908).—Agreement between the United Kingdom and Italy respecting Commercial Travellers' Samples. To lie upon the Table ... 498

Peace Conference at the Hague (Miscellaneous, No. 5, 1908).—Further Correspondence respecting the Second Peace Conference; to lie upon the Table ... 498

Peace Conference at the Hague (Miscellaneous, No 6, 1908).—Final Act of the Second Peace Conference; to lie upon the Table ... 498

Board of Education.—Statement showing for each Secondary School, in respect of which Waiver Resolutions were passed by the Local Authority under Article 43 of the Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1907, the Articles which the Board were asked to waive and their decision as regards each Article; to lie upon the Table ... 499

Mines and Quarries (Fire at Hamstead Colliery).—Report by R. A. S. Redmayne, Esq.; to lie upon the Table ... 499

Basutoland.—Report of Proceedings of the Basutoland National Council 1908; to lie upon the Table ... 499

Natal.—Further Correspondence relating to Native Affairs in Natal; to lie upon the Table ... 499

Bankruptcy.—Twenty-fifth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under The Bankruptcy Act, 1883; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 254.] ... 499

Bankruptcy (General Rules).—Bankruptcy Rules, dated 6th July, 1908, made pursuant to the Bankruptcy Acts, 1883 and 1890; to lie upon the Table ... 500

Customs.—Fifty-second Report of the Commissioners of Customs; to lie upon the Table ... 500

Civil Services (Supplementary Estimate, 1908–9).—Revised Estimate of the Further Amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1909, for Public Education (Ireland); Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 255.] ... 500

High Court of Justice and Court of Appeal, Etc.—Account showing the Receipts and Expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 256.] ... 500

Sittings of the House.—Resolved, "That this House do meet To-morrow, at Ten of the Clock."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease*) ... 500

Guaranteed $2\frac{3}{4}$ Per Cent. Stock.—Return ordered, "of Guaranteed $2\frac{3}{4}$ Per Cent. Stock Issues under the Irish Land Act, 1903 ... 500

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Appointments in Armagh Post Office ... 500

Classification of Bournemouth Post Office ... 501

Irish Savings Banks Work ... 502

Page

Transfer of Postal Clerks from London to Dublin ... 502
British Post Office at Tientsin ... 504
Wages, Work and Cost of Living of Agricultural Labourers ... 505
Postal Employee and Portadown Disturbances ... 505
English Ancient Monuments—Terms of Reference ... 505
Vacant Post of Director of the Natural History Museum ... 506
Repair of Ballintry Pier ... 506
Rathlin Fishing Pier ... 506
Cairo Drainage Scheme ... 507
Board of Education Lifts ... 507
Education Grants —Deduction from Teachers Superannuation ... 507
Expenditure of Government Departments ... 508
Expenditure on Extra Police in Ireland ... 509
Purchase of the Kingston Estate—Mr. T. Sullivan's Holding ... 509
Roscommon Board of Guardians Clerk ... 511

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Report to lie upon the Table ... 511

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.—Special Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 257.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [257.] ... 511

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 19th October, and to be printed. [Bill 342.] ... 511

Irish Universities Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), further considered.

Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) ... 512
Mr. Moore (*Armagh, N.*) ... 512

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out the words 'the benefit of any privileges of matriculated students of the University or.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'or' in page 2, line 20, stand part of the Bill."

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) ... 513
Mr. Butcher (*Cambridge University*) ... 513
Sir Philip Magnus (*London University*) ... 514

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, after the word 'University' to insert the words 'who are pursuing a course a course of study at the University.'" —(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

July 24.]

Amendment proposed.

"In page 2, line 20, to leave out the word 'or' and to insert the word 'excluding. "—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Dr. Hazel (West Bromwich) ... 514
Mr. Hay Morgan (Cornwall, Truro) ... 524

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, at the end, to insert the words 'and provided that a student in a recognised or affiliated college or institution shall not be entitled to obtain a University degree unless he shall have completed a period of study of not less than two academical years in a constituent college of the University of Dublin or in the University of Belfast.'"—(*Dr. Hazel.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) ... 527
Mr. Butcher ... 533
Mr. William O'Brien (Cork) ... 537
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) ... 541
Mr. Birrell ... 544
Mr. Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) ... 548
Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton) ... 550
Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside) ... 551

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 75; Noes, 216. (Division List No. 218.)

Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) ... 555
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) ... 555

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 36, to leave out from the word 'sign' to end of subsection (2) of Clause 3, and insert the words 'I. A. B., do hereby promise that I will faithfully, and to the best of my ability, discharge the duties of professor, and I further promise and engage that in lecturing and examining, and in the performance of all other duties connected with my Chair, I will carefully abstain from teaching or advancing any doctrine, or making any statement, derogatory to the truths of revealed religion, or injurious or disrespectful to the religious opinion of any portion of my class.'"—(*Mr. Barrie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'under' in page 2, line 37, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell ... 557
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) ... 558
Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) ... 558

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 257; Noes, 29. (Division List No. 219.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 37, after the word 'Commissioners' to insert the word 'jointly.'"—(*Mr Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.) ... 561
Mr. Hay Morgan ... 563

Page

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 40, to leave out subsection (3) of Clause 3."—(*Sir W. Collins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Dillon 564
Mr. Butcher 565
Mr. Birrell... 565

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, lines 31 and 32, to leave out the words 'withhold his assent from,' and to insert the word 'disallow.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Butcher 567
Mr. Moore 567

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 35, at the end, to insert the words '(3) The governing body of a University or constituent college to which this Act applies, or any other person, corporation, or body directly affected by such statute, may, within three months from the notification thereof in the *Dubin Gazette*, petition His Majesty in Council to disallow the whole or any part thereof. (4) His Majesty in Council may refer any such petition to a Committee of the Privy Council in Ireland with a direction that the Committee hear the petitioner personally or by council, and report specially to His Majesty in Council on the matter of the petition. (5) If the Committee report in favour of the disallowance of the statute or any part thereof, His Majesty may, by Order in Council, disallow the whole or part thereof accordingly, but any such disallowance shall be without prejudice to the making of a new statute. (6) The costs of any petition hereunder may be regulated by the Committee to which the petition is referred.'"—(*Mr. Butcher.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 568
Mr. Butcher 569

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Charles Craig 569

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 2, after the first word 'of,' to insert the words 'a person nominated by the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, and a person nominated by the Royal College of Science, Dublin, and.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 569
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 570
Mr. Charles Craig 570

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Birrell 570

July 24.]

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 4, after the word 'period,' to insert the words 'not exceeding one year.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Captain Craig 570
Mr. Moore 571

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Clause 7."—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'sums' in page 5, line 15, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. T. M. Healy 572

Amendment negatived.

(*Mr. Massie* (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 573

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 37, after the words 'benefaction,' to insert the words 'and so long as the professorship or lectureship is titular only, and does not admit to the electoral, representative, or administrative powers of the ordinary professors or lecturers of the university, whether as to the Senate or the academic council or the general board of studies or any faculty except the faculty of theology, if and when such is constituted.'"—(*Mr. Massie*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 573
Sir Philip Magnus (*London University*) 573

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Holt (*Northumberland, Hexham*) 574

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 41, after the word 'funds,' to insert the words 'and in the event of any professor or lecturer being recognised under this subsection the governing body of the University shall not refuse recognition on equal terms to other professors or lecturers in theology or divinity on the ground of their theological opinions.—(*Mr. Holt*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 574
Mr. Moore 575

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 41; Noes, 260. (Division List No. 220.)

Mr. Massie 577

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 1, to leave out paragraph (*b*) of subsection (4) of Clause 7."—(*Mr. Massie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell 580
Mr. John Redmond 582
Mr. Butcher 583
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 583
Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (*Newington, Walworth*) 584

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 111; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 221.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 6, line 25, to leave out the word 'senate,' and to insert the words 'governing body.'"

"In page 6, line 26, to leave out the word 'their,' and to insert the word 'the.'"

"In page 6, line 26, after the word 'colleges,' to insert the words 'of the new University having its seat at Dublin.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. T. M. Healy ... 587

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, at the end of the clause, to add the words 'Nothing in this section shall preclude any money being provided by Parliament in addition to the sums provided under this section, either in augmentation of any sums contributed for the purpose of the Universities or colleges from other sources, or otherwise.'"—(*Mr. T. M. Healy*).

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) ... 588
Sir Philip Magnus ... 589

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 40, to leave out Clause 8."—(*Mr. Barrie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'for,' in page 7, line 2, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell ... 589
Mr. Moore ... 590
Mr. Gordon (Londonderry, S.) ... 590

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 33. (Division List No. 222.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 1, to leave out the word 'Saint.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Birrell ... 593

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 37, at end, to add the words 'and the governing body of each of the two new universities shall, so far as practicable, provide for any such students obtaining degrees on conditions not more onerous than those under which they could obtain corresponding degrees in the Royal University of Ireland.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, line 24, to leave out the word 'six,' and to insert the word 'seven.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 11, line 38, after the word 'provided,' to insert the words 'and in conditions specified.'"—(*Mr. Kettle.*)

July 24.

"In page 11, line 39, at end, to add the words 'and in the case of an existing officer who holds his office during the pleasure of His Majesty shall be so reappointed if His Majesty directs, notwithstanding anything in the statutes of the University or college.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 12, line 13, at end, to insert the words 'but no such provision need be made by the scheme for any existing officers who are appointed to offices in either of the two new universities, or of any of the constituent colleges of the new University having its seat at Dublin by virtue of the charter of the University or college.'"—(*Mr. Birrell*)

"In page 13, line 4, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'or of any charter granted thereunder.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

In page 13, line 4, after the word 'accepts,' to insert the words 'or is appointed to.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 14, line 22, at end, to insert the words 'The costs of all parties of and incident to an appeal shall be in the discretion of the committee by whom the appeal is heard.'"

"In page 14, line 26, at end, to insert the words 'and the mode in which any costs allowed may be recovered.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In Schedule 1, page 16, line 19, at beginning, to insert the words 'Members of Convocation.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Amendments agreed to, without discussion.

Mr. Moore 594

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 20, to leave out '4' and insert '3.'"—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That '4' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell 594

Amendment negatived.

Sir Philip Magnus 594

Mr. J. Devlin 595

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, after line 5, to insert the words 'Elected by the Belfast Technical Instruction Committee'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sloan (*Belfast, S.*) 595

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 13, to leave out '4' and insert '3."—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Question proposed, "That '4' stand part of the Bill."

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 18, line 2, to leave out the words 'a majority of the Commissioners,' and to insert the words 'at least five members of the joint committee.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Page

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS [REMISSION].—Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the remission of the debts due to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland from certain railway companies, in pursuance of any Act of the present session, to grant money for the purpose of certain Local Loans out of the Local Loans Fund, and for other purposes relating to Local Loans."

Resolution agreed to 596

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—Read a second time.
Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Whitley.*) 596

University of Durham Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered. Bill read the third time, and passed. 596

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1906-7.—Committee to consider the Surpluses and Deficits upon Navy and Army Grants for 1906-7, and the application of Surpluses to meet Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, To-morrow.—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Ordered, "That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented respectively on the 6th and 14th February last, be referred to the Committee."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*) 596

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at fourteen minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: SATURDAY, 25TH JULY, 1908.

The Lord DENMAN, chosen Speaker in the absence of the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Commissioners.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]—Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 597

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment to each Bill. 597

Registration Bill [H.L.]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments ... 597

Registration Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with the Amendments 597

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill (No. 180); Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill (No. 181). Brought from the Commons; read 1ª, and to be printed 597

University of Durham Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed and to be read 2ª on Monday next (The Viscount Ridley). (No. 182) 597

July 25.]

Universities Bill. Brought from the Commons ; read 1^{a} ; to be printed, and to be read 2^{a} on Monday next (The Earl of Crewe) (No. 183) ... 597

House adjourned at twenty minutes past One o'clock, to Monday next, at a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : SATURDAY, 25TH JULY, 1908.

The House met at Ten of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS] ; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords] ; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords] Read the third time and passed, with Amendments 598

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill. 6 Petitions in favour ; to lie upon the Table 598

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill. 2 Petitions in favour ; to lie upon the Table 598

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, (No. 4074 ; to lie upon the Table 598

Marriages, Births, and Deaths (Ireland).—Forty-fourth detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Marriages, Births and Deaths in Ireland, to lie upon the Table 598

Evictions (Ireland).—Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th June, 1908 ; to lie upon the Table 598

Diseases of Animals Acts.—Report of Proceedings by the Department of Agriculture and Technical instruction for Ireland, under the Diseases of Animals Acts ; to lie upon the Table 598

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The Channel of the Gaine 599
Prices of Beef 600
Equalisation of London Rates 609
Londonderry Post Office 609
Post Office Territorials 610
Spitalfields Markets 610
Meat Trade Trust Inquiry 610
Ex-Detective Constable Cosgrove, R.I.C. 611

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Labour in the Transvaal Mines 612
Great Britain and Siam 612
The Arrest of Mr. Luxenburg 613

Alleged Burning of Crofters' Houses ... ... [illegible]
Suppression of Vermin 613
Irish University Grants 614
Cattle-drives in Antrim and Down 614
Orange Demonstrations 614
The Vatican and the Irish University 615
Cranagill Orange Lodge Procession 615
Debates on Irish Matters 616

Irish Universities Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Gordon (*Londonderry, S.*) 616
Mr. Barrie (*Londonderry, N.*) 622

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Gordon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question.'"

Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 625
Sir George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) 628
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 631
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) 640
Mr. Butcher (*Cambridge University*) 646
Mr. William O'Brien (*Cork*) 650
Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 653
Mr. Samuel Young (*Cavan, E.*) 658
Mr. Wedgwood (*Newcastle-under Lyme*) 659

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 207; Noes 19. (Division List No. 223.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, passed.

Finance Bill.—Order for Third Reading, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 663
Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 669
Sir Edward Sassoon (*Hythe*) 670
Mr. Joynson-Hicks (*Manchester, N.W.*) 676

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'This House declines to proceed with a measure which, while reducing substantially the tax on sugar, the produce of foreign countries, does nothing to relieve the burden of the tax on tea, an infinitesimal part of which is imported from possessions other than our own; and, while parting with a large part of revenue, renders the discharge of prospective obligations of unknown magnitude, embarrassing to the finances and injurious to the credit of the State.'"—(*Sir Edward Sassoon.*)

Page

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Lloyd George, Carnarvon Boroughs*) 680
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 692
Mr. Harmood-Banner (*Liverpool, Everton*) 697
Mr. J. M. Henderson (*Aberdeenshire, W.*) 699

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read the third time, and passed.

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Whitley*) 700

Cran Measures Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Whitley*) 700

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at seventeen minutes before Four o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 27TH JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE FURTHER PROOFS REQUIRED by the Standing Orders Committee has been proved before them:—Ards Railways.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 701

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.

The Acting Chairman of Committees (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) 701

Moved, "That the Order made on the 25th day of March last, 'That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next,' be dispensed with and that the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to, and Bill read 2ª accordingly.

Dover Graving Docks Bill.

Lord Brassey 702

Moved, "That the Order made on the 25th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Brassey.*)

Lord Glantawe 702
Lord Weardale 703
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 703
The Earl of Granard 704

On Question, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed for To-morrow.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 704

Gosport Gas Bill; Central Ireland Electric Power Bill; Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill; Holderness Water Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons. ... 704

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be considered To-morrow. 704

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 704

Honourable Artillery Company Bill [H.L.]; Leith Burgh Bill [H.L.]; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 704

Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments The said Amendments agreed to, with an Amendment, and Bill returned to the Commons. 705

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill; Tyne Improvement Bill; Widnes Corporation Bill; Margate Corporation Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 705

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2^{a} (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3^{a} To-morrow 705

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments; committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with 705

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Return of the number of steam trawlers registered at ports in the States of Western Europe in the year 1907 705

Diseases of Animals Acts.—Report of proceedings as regards Ireland, for the year 1907 705

Board of Education.—Statement showing for each secondary school in respect of which waive resolutions were passed by the local education authority under Article 43 of the Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1907, the articles which the Board were asked to waive, and their decision as regards each article 705

Treaty Series, No. 20 (1908.)—Agreement between the United Kingdom and Italy, respecting commercial travellers' samples 705

Miscellaneous.—No. 5 (1908). Further correspondence respecting the Second Peace Conference, held at the Hague in 1907 [Cd. 4081.] No. 6 (1908). Final act of the Second Peace Conference, and conventions and declarations annexed thereto 706

Trade Reports: Annual Series.—No. 4074. Peru 706

July 27.] Page

Basutoland.—Report of proceedings of the Basutoland National Council, 1908, and correspondence as to affairs of Basutoland 706

Natal.—Further correspondence relating to native affairs in Natal. Despatch from the Governor of Natal forwarding a Bill to make special provision for the trial of natives accused of certain crimes 706

Customs.—Fifty-second Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs 706

Marriages, Births and Deaths (Ireland).—Annual Report of the Registrar-General 706

Evictions (Ireland).—Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th June, 1908 706

Queen's College, Galway.—Annual Report of the President 706

Queen's College, Cork.—Annual Report of the President 706

Post Office.—Fifty-fourth Report of the Postmaster-General on the Post Office 707

Meteorlogical Committee.—Third Annual Report for the year ended 31st March, 1908.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie upon the Table ... 707

Lunacy.—Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy ... 707

Bankruptcy.—Twenty-fifth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 131 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883. General Rule, made pursuant to the Bankruptcy Acts, 1883 and 1890, Warrants and Arrests under Section 27 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 707

Mines and Quarries (Fire at Hamstead Colliery).—Report by R. A. S. Redmayne, Esq. 707

High Court of Justice and Court of Appeal, etc.—Account showing the receipts and expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal 707

Superannuation.—Return for the year ended 31st March, 1908, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted under Rule 2 of the Regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the "Superannuation Act, 1887," to hold civil employment of profit under public departments 707

Land Registry.—Account of receipts and payments in respect of the Land Registry, for the year ended 31st March, 1908 707

Clergy (West Indies).—Return of the amount payable on 5th January 1908, out of the Consolidated Fund for Ecclesiastical purposes in the West Indies. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 708

Ireland (Proclaimed Counties).—Return respecting; laid before the House, and to be printed. [No. 184.] 708

Finance Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Wednesday next.—(*The Earl of Crewe.*) [No. 185] ... 708

Page

Safety of Life at Sea.

Lord Muskerry ... 708

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, the modified regulations which have been adopted recently by the Board of Trade in respect to the qualifying time in charge of a watch required of those candidates for Board of Trade certificates as mate or master who have served an apprenticeship on approved sea-going training vessels are a departure from assurances given in this House by the Board of Trade, and that it is desirable that the new regulations should be withdrawn before they can become in any way operative."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell ... 716
Lord Lyveden ... 720
The Marquess of Salisbury ... 721
Lord Muskerry ... 724

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Cavalry for Scotland.

The Earl of Rosebery ... 724
The Under-Secretary of State for Scotland (Lord Lucas) ... 724

Deputy-Lieutenancies.

The Earl of Rosebery ... 725
Lord Lucas ... 726
Lord Ashbourne ... 727

Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill. [Second Reading.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Denman ... 727

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland) Bill. [Second Reading.]—Order of the Day for Second Reading read.

Lord Denman ... 728

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill. [Second Reading.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Denman ... 728

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order).

[Lord Balfour of Burleigh in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :

The Earl of Donoughmore ... 729

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 13, after the word 'thereof' to insert the words, 'Provided that the local authority, within the meaning of the same section in the City of London, shall be the mayor, aldermen, and commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.' "—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Viscount Midleton ... 730
Earl Beauchamp ... 731
The Earl of Donoughmore ... 732

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to, and Bill reported without Amendment.

Moved, "That the Standing Committee be negatived."—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

The Earl of Halsbury ... 732
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) ... 732
Viscount Midleton ... 733

On Question, Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Telegraph (Construction) Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order).

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 :

The Earl of Granard ... 733

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 6 and 7, to leave out the words, "in whom such land is vested or.' "—(*The Earl of Granard*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 8, after the word 'remains' to insert the words 'Provided that if such consent is withheld or any condition is attached thereto to which the Postmaster-General objects, a difference shall be deemed to have arisen between the Postmaster-General and that person, and sections three, four, and five of the Telegraph Act, 1878, shall apply accordingly as if it were a difference arising under that Act.' "—(*The Earl of Granard*).

Viscount Midleton ... 734

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To insert, after the words 'Provided that,' the words 'in cases where such land is not vested in the London County Council.' "—(*Viscount Midleton*).

The Earl of Granard ... 735
The Marquess of Lansdowne ... 735

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Page

Remaining Clauses agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee, and to be printed, as amended. [No. 186.]

Companies (Consolidation) Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order).

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 734

Moved, "That the Amendments agreed to by the Joint Committee be inserted."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of the Amendments to be received on Wednesday next.

Married Women's Property Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Stradbroke 736

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl of Stradbroke*).

The Earl of Halsbury 736

Lord Allendale 737

Moved, "That the debate be adjourned."—(*The Earl of Stradbroke.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned till To-morrow.

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Marchamley 737

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Lord Marchamley.*)

Lord Ashbourne 738

Lord Denman 739

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

University of Durham Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Viscount Ridley 739

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). An Amendment moved, and negatived; Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow 740

Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill.—Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed 740

Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) Bill [H.L.].—**Commons Bill** [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3^{a} To-morrow 740

Page

Coroners (Ireland) Bill.—Provisional Orders (Procedure) Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3a To-morrow ... ... [illegible]

Wild Birds Bill.—Read 3a (according to order), and passed ... ... [illegible]

Costs in Criminal Cases Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3a To-morrow 741

Irish Universities Bill. [Second Reading.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Camperdown ... ... [illegible]
The Earl of Crewe ... ... [illegible]

Moved "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*The Earl of Crewe*).

Lord Ashbourne ... ... [illegible]
Lord Cranmore and Browne ... ... [illegible]
Lord Clonbrock ... ... [illegible]
Lord MacDonnell of Swinford ... ... [illegible]
The Earl of Mayo ... ... [illegible]
Lord Killanin ... ... [illegible]
The Earl of Donoughmore ... ... [illegible]
The Marquess of Lansdowne ... ... [illegible]
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Fitzmaurice) ... [illegible]

On Question, Bill read 2a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

House adjourned at five minutes before Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 27TH JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH)—Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow ... ... [illegible]

SALMON, TROUT, AND RIVER TWEED FISHERIES BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO NOT COMPLIED WITH)—Salmon, Trout and River Tweed Fisheries Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders ... ... [illegible]

South-Western Suburban Water Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to ... ... [illegible]

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]. (King's Consent signified)—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... [illegible]

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway Bill [LORDS]. – As amended, considered 806

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 806

Keighley Corporation Bill [LORDS]. As amended, considered 806

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time. (*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 806

Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill [LORDS]. —As amended, considered; Amendment made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 806

Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 807

Thames River Steamboat Service Act (1904) Amendment Bill [LORDS]. —As amended, considered; a Clause added; Bill to be read the third time 807

Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill according read the third time, and passed with Amendments 807

River Wandle Protection Bill [LORDS]. —Read a second time, and committed.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 82, 211, 236, and 237 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed To-morrow.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*) 807

Blackburn Corporation Bill (BY ORDER).—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 807

Crystal Palace Company Bill [LORDS].—Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)... 807

STANDING ORDERS (PRIVATE BUSINESS.) - Standing Order 26A was read, and amended, in line 2, by leaving out the words "the Plans and Sections," and by inserting the words "so much of the Plans and Sections as relates to the portion of the work by which the banks, foreshore, or river-bed may be affected."

And in line 12, by leaving out the words "the river is subject to a Board of Conservators," and by inserting the words "there be a Board of Conservators constituted for the conservancy of the river."

Standing Order 82 was read, and amended, in line 5, by leaving out the words "and such Copies shall be," and by adding at the end of the

July 27.] Page

Standing Order, the words "together with Copies of the estimates and statements deposited in accordance with Standing Order 36a (if any)."

Standing Order 172 was read, and amended, in line 11, by inserting after "36a," the words "or under General Order made in pursuance of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899."

Standing Order 173a was read, and amended, in lines 30 and 31, by leaving out the words "and shall be circulated with the Votes."

175*a*. Ordered, That notice in writing of any Bill relating to England or Ireland, and containing provisions whereby any application of the property of any charity not authorised by the Lands Clauses Consolidation Acts, shall be directed, or the patronage or the constitution of any charity, or the right of any charity to any property, shall be affected, or setting up or taking power to set up or to take over or interfere in the management of any school or other educational foundation or institution, or to levy any rate or raise money for any such purpose, shall be given to the Attorney-General for England or Ireland, as the case may be, and no such Bill shall be taken into consideration by the Committee on the Bill until the House has received a Report from the Attorney-General on such Bill, and such Report shall stand referred to the Committee on the Bill.

Resolved, That this Order be a Standing Order of this House.

Standing Order 188a was read, and amended, in line 4, by leaving out the words "and circulated with the Votes."

Standing Order 220 was read, and amended, in lines 2 and 3, by leaving out the words "and circulated with the Votes."—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*) 808

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Natal.—Despatch from the Governor of Natal forwarding a Bill to make Special Provision for the Trial of Natives accused of certain crimes; to lie upon the Table 809

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Return of the number of Steam Trawlers registered at Ports in the States of Western Europe; to lie upon the Table 809

Queen's College, Cork.—Report of the President for the Session 1907–8, with Appendices, to lie upon the Table 809

Queen's College, Galway.—Report of the President for the Session 1907–8 to lie upon the Table 809

Meteorological Committee.—Third Report of the Meteorological Committee to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, for the year ending 31st March, 1908; to lie upon the Table 809

Post Office.—Fifty-fourth Report of the Postmaster-General; to lie upon the Table 809

Public Income and Expenditure.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 258.] 810

Civil List Pensions.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 259.] 810

Land Registry.—Account of Receipts and Payments in respect of the Land Registry; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 260.] 810

Page

Clergy (West Indies).—Return of the Amount payable on 5th January, 1908, out of the Consolidated Fund for Ecclesiastical purposes in the West Indies; to lie upon the Table 810

Superannuation Act, 1887.—Return for the year ended 31st March, 1908, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted, under Rule 2 of the Regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Act, to hold civil employment or profit under Public Departments; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 261.] 810

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—Caledonian Canal.—One-hundred-and-third Report of the Commissioners, to be printed. [No. 262.]

Lunacy.—Return of the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ending on 30th June, 1908 810

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Provincial Engineers (P.O.) Staff 810
Trawlers' Depredations on Lewis Fisheries 811
Motor Cab Regulations 812
Motor Cab Capacities 812
French Import Duties on Elastic Tissues 813
Australian Commonwealth Arms 813
London Police Holiday 813
London Railway Cab Service 814
Home Work 814
Outworkers' Lists 814
Infection in Outworkers' Premises 815
Animal Dealers—Dog Licenses 816
Book Imports 816
Shorthand Writers' Fees 816
Limavady and Dungiven Railway Company 817
Windsor Motorists' Prosecution 818
Automatic Motor Speed Limits 818
Paupers' Clothing Contracts 819
Vaccination 819
Turnchaple Admiralty Contracts 820
Deptford Victualling Yard Coopers 820
Obsolete Warships 820
New Armoured Cruisers 821
Rosyth 821
Admiralty and the Press 822
Pembroke Dock Engine-fitters 822
Wireless Telegraphy 823
Rosyth 823

July 27.] Page

Sanitation in the Island of Lewis ... 823
Vatersay ... 824
Willesden Education Dispute ... 825
Teachers' Registration Council ... 825
Agricultural Unrest at Cayo ... 826
Scottish Probation of Offenders ... 828
Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill ... 828
Irish Land Stock ... 829
Old-Age Pensions ... 829
Military Churches in India ... 829
Births and Deaths in India ... 830
Rathdowney Prisoners in Tullamore ... 831
Rathdowney Police Charge ... 831
Egrecourt Labourers' Cottage Scheme ... 832
Irish Primary Education Grant ... 832
Ballynahinch Orange Celebration ... 832
Crime in Galway ... 833
Land Commission Report ... 834
Land Purchase Agreements ... 834
Boxwell Estate, Wexford ... 834
Service of Writs in County Cork ... 835
Irish Intermediate Board Rules ... 836
War Office Engineers ... 837
Royal Military College, Sandhurst ... 837
Railways in British East Africa ... 838
Crown Servants in Ceylon ... 838
Native Education in South Africa ... 839
Dinizulu ... 839
Shetland Cable ... 839
Wakefield Post Office ... 840
Bristol Post Office ... 840
Telegraph Messengers ... 841
Phœnix Park Powder Magazine ... 841
Irish Ordnance Survey Staff ... 842
Duleek Survey Staff ... 842
Poultry Farms ... 843
Rating of Chapels and Schools ... 843
Edinburgh Small Holdings Application ... 844
Hired Men at West India Dock Stores ... 844
Royal Dockyard Joiners ... 845
Londonderry Quay Larency Case ... 845
Richmond Royal Houses ... 846

Page
Coal Carriage Wastage Allowance 846
Census of Production 847
Royalties in Patents 847
National Revenues 847
Hotel Licences 848
Hindu Temples and Mahomedan Mosques... 848
Drumkeerin Evicted Tenants 849
Belcoo Loan Fund Company 849
Maghery Sports 850
Mountmellick Labourers' Cottages 851
National Education Board Secretaries 852
Leslie Estate, Ballbay 852
Belfast Lough Foreshore 853
Millford Estate, Ballinrobe 853
Tanderagu Labourers' Cottages 854
Hop Report 855

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Wireless Telegraphy 855
Territorial Force and the Civil Power 856
6th Battalion Royal Highlanders 856
Fife Imperial Yeomanry—Case of Private Rennie 856
Officers' Quarters on Foreign Service 858
Soldiers and Jury Service 859
British Garrisons Abroad 860
Recruits' Pay... 861
Officers Training Corps, Camp, etc. 861
Royal Engineer Special Reserve 862
Territorial Regiments—Instructors' Pay 862
Inns of Court Volunteers 863
Woolwich Common 864
The Union Jack 865
British Officers at Foreign Manœuvres 865
Grantham Barracks 866
Territorial Cyclists 866
Cyclist Companies 866
British Force in Natal 867
Hong Kong—Loss through Government's Opium Policy 867
East African Protectorate 868
Land Tenure in East Africa 868
South African Compensation Fund 869
Portuguese East Africans in the Transvaal Mines 869
Dinizulu's Salary 869

July 27.] Page

Natal Indemnity Bill ... 871
Dinizulu's Trial ... 871
Alleged Flogging of Witnesses ... 873
Martial Law in Natal—Indemnity Bill ... 874
Dinizulu's Chieftainship ... 875
Land in Zululand—Alleged Breaches of Faith ... 875
Legal Status of Zulus ... 876
Shipping Claims against Russia ... 876
The Case of Mr. Luxenburg ... 877
San Thome Cocoa Industry ... 878
Ambergate Reservoir Works ... 878
Convict Prisons—Female Directors ... 879
Merthyr Tydfil Police ... 879
Confidential Documents as Waste Paper ... 880
Asiatics in the Transvaal ... 880
Automatic Couplings ... 881
Weights and Measures Stamping Fees ... 882
Marine Insurance ... 883
Provincial Homes Investment Company ... 884
Meat Supply—The Proposed Inquiry ... 884
London Electricity Bills ... 886
Wales and Post Office Clothing Contracts ... 886
Newcastle-under-Lyme—Postal Pay ... 887

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Point of Order ... 888

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; Report to lie upon the Table ... 889

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order Confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow ... 889

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill, without Amendment; Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill; Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill; Holderness Water Bill, with Amendments ... 889

NEW BILL.

Factory and Workshop Act (1901) Amendment (No. 2) Bill.—To be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 343.] ... 890

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the Borough of Shoreditch (Haggerston Division), in the room of Sir William Randal Cremer, deceased.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*) 890

Supply (18th Allotted Day.)

Considered in Committee.)

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

July 27.] Page

Army Estimates, 1908-9.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the sum, not exceeding £840,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Pay, Bounty, etc., of the Special Reserves and Militia to a number not exceeding 132,737, including 2,000 Militia Reserve), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909."

The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 890
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 898
Mr. Courtenay-Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 906

Motion made and Question put, "That a sum not exceeding £839,900 be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Mr. Guy Baring (Winchester) 910
Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover) 911
Mr. W. Nicholson (Hampshire, Petersfield) 912
Lord Joicey-Cecil (Lincolnshire, Stamford) 917
Captain Morrison-Bell (Devonshire, Ashburton) 918
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 921
Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow) 923
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Acland, Yorkshire, Richmond) 926
Mr. Carlisle (Herts, St. Albans) 930
Captain Morrison-Bell 934
Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis) 936

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 77; Noes, 231. (Division List No. 224.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Civil Service Estimates, 1908-9. Class II.

2. Motion made and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £40,830, be granted to His Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

Mr. A. Ponsonby (Stirling Burghs) 939
Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire W.R., Ripon) 944
Sir Charles W. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 955
Earl Percy (Kensington, S.) 961
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 965
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 978
Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford) 982
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 985
Sir Edward Grey 986
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 986
Sir William Bull (Hammersmith) 988
Sir Edward Grey 988

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

CLASS I.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £37,000 (including a Supplementary sum of £5,000), be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will

come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Houses of Parliament Buildings."

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported upon Wednesday; Committee also report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:

Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 989

Amendment proposed.

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'consent' to insert the words 'voluntarily and without intimidation.'"—*(Mr. William Rutherford.)*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 990

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Birrell 991

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 13, to leave out from the word 'Commission' to the end of the clause.'"

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 992
Mr. William Rutherford 993

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Companies Bill [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:

Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 993

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, after the word 'Possession,' to insert the words 'to which this Act applies, and'"—*(Mr. Rawlinson.)*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Sir H. Kearley, Devonport) 994
Mr. William Rutherford 995

Amendment negatived.

Mr. William Rutherford 996

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word '1907,' to insert the words 'and complied with all the other requirements of Section thirty-five, including an address to which all notices or processes may be sent or served in accordance with such section, and continues from time to time to comply therewith.'"—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir H. Kearley 997
Mr. William Rutherford 997
Mr. Markham (Notts, Mansfield) 998
Sir H. Kearley 999
Mr. William Rutherford 1,000

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 32 ; Noes, 168. (Division List No. 225.)

Clause 2 :

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee proceeded to a division.

Mr. JOSEPH PEASE and the MASTER of ELIBANK were appointed Tellers for the Ayes, and, there being no Members willing to act as Tellers for the Noes, the Chairman declared that the Ayes had it.

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Public Works Loans Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. William Rutherford 1003
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) ... 1003
Mr. William Rutherford 1004

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 :

Mr. William Rutherford 1004
Mr. Hobhouse 1006

Clause agreed to.

Mr. William Rutherford 1006

Clauses 3, 4, and 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 :

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 1, to leave out the words 'any of the purposes for which,' and to insert the words 'the acquisition of land or the purchase, erection, construction, alteration, or enlargement of any building or permanent work by.'"—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Question put, and negatived,

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. William Rutherford 1007

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. William Rutherford 1008

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment.

"After the word 'by' to insert the words 'or for'"—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Hobhouse 1009

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 4, line 3, to leave out the words 'is for the time being authorised by," and to insert the words 'in pursuance of.'"

"In page 4, line 51, to leave out the words 'to borrow.'"—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule :

Mr. William Rutherford ... ... — 1010

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered this day.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 :

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :

Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Connor O'Kelly (Mayo, N.) 1012
Sir A. Acland-Hood (Somerset, Wellington) 1012

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 34 ; Noes, 137. (Division List No. 226.)

Clause agreed to.

Schedule.

Mr Everett (Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1013

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, to leave out lines 7 and 8."—(*Mr. Everett.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1017
Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 1018
Mr Courthope (Sussex, Rye) 1019
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 1021

Page

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.) 1021

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir Samuel Scott.*)

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 32; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 227.)

Sir Samuel Scott 1023
Mr. Acland 1023
Mr. Luttrell (Devonshire, Tavistock) 1023

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 29 and 30."—(*Mr. Luttrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

Mr. John Burns 1026

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury) 1026

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out line 13."—(*Mr. Mackarness.*)

Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland.)
Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield 1028
Mr. John Burns 1031
Mr. Cathcart Wason 1036

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald 1037

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 41 and 42."—*Mr. Ramsay Macdonald.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

Mr. Maddison (Burnley) 1042
Mr. John Burns 1043
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1045
Mr. William Rutherford 1046
Mr. John Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 1047

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.) 1050
Mr. Hobhouse 1053

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported to the House without Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

Mr. J. MacVeagh 1054
Mr. Hobhouse 1055
Mr. John Ward 1055

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

July 27.] *Page*

Naval Marriages Bill.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1 :

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 :

Mr. William Rutherford 1056
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. J. A. Pease, Essex, Saffron Walden*) 1056
Mr. Carlile (*Hertfordshire, St. Albans*) 1057
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty (*Dr. Macnamara, Camberwell, N.*) 1057

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment to the House, read the third time, and passed

Agricultural Holdings Bill [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1 :

Mr. William Rutherford 1059
The Treasurer of the Household (*Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.*) 1059

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 41 agreed to.

Clause 42 :

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 41, at end, to insert the words 'Provided that where such a tenancy was a tenancy from year to year the compensation payable in respect of an improvement comprised in the Third Schedule to this Act shall be such (if any) as could have been claimed if this Act had not been passed.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Carlile 1059
Sir Edward Strachey 1059

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

Bill reported with an Amendment; as amended to be considered to-morrow.

Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Committee read, and discharged. Bill committed to a Standing Committee.—(*Mr. J. A. Pease.*) 1060

Navy and Army Expenditure, 1906–7.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

I. Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended 31st day of March, 1907, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Navy Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the

Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - - - - -	1,041,698	8	7
Total Deficits - - - - - -	644,285	12	7
Net Surplus - - - - - -	£397,412	16	0

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services be sanctioned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned.'—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Mr. William Rutherford 1063
Dr. Macnamara 1063
Mr. William Rutherford 1063
Mr. John Ward 1064

Question put, and agreed to.

II. Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Army Services has not exceeded the Aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - - - - -	1,336,708	4	1
Total Deficits - - - - - -	42,029	13	4
Net Surplus - - - - -	£1,294,678	10	9

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services be sanctioned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned.—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Mr. Carlile 1067
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Acland, Yorkshire, Richmond) - 1067

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Two minutes after Four o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 28TH JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dover Graving Docks Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported with Amendments 1069

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 1069

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House forthwith ... 1069

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Goverment Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House forthwith ... 1069

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [H.L.]; Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway Bill [H.L.]; Keighley Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [H.L.]; Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1069

South West Suburban Water Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1069

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments to be considered To-morrow 1070

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 1070

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received to-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with 1070

Local Government Provisional Orders (No 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be 3ª To-morrow 1070

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committe negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received to-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with 1070

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to 1070

Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1070

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1070

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3.) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendment considered (according to order), and agreed to 1071

PETITIONS.

Old-Age Pensions Bill—Petition against proceeding with until the Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law has been issued; read, and ordered to lie upon the Table 1071

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill.—Petition against; read, and ordered to lie upon the Table 1071

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Merchant Shipping (Loss of Life).—Return showing the lives lost by wreck, drowning, or other accident 1071

Commercial, No. 5 (1908) (Suez Canal).—Returns of Shipping and tonnage, 1905, 1906, and 1907 1071

Local Government Board (Ireland).—Annual Report 1071

Irish Land Commission.—Report of the Commissioners for the period from 1st April, 1907, to 31st March, 1908.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1071

Pacific Cable Act, 1901 (Account 1907–1908).—Account showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901 1071

Battleships, Armoured Cruisers, and Destroyers.—Moved, that there be laid before the House a Return showing the comparative strength in First Class battleships less than twenty-five years old; armoured cruisers less than twenty years old; and destroyers built and building of Great Britain, the United States of America, France, Germany, and Japan, on 1st April, 1908 (*The Earl of Cawdor*); agreed to, and ordered accordingly 1072

Companies Bill [H.L.]. —Returned from the Commons agreed to 1072

Telegraph (Construction) Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Thursday next 1072

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª To-morrow (*The Earl of Crewe*). [No. 187] 1072

Naval Marriages Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª To-morrow (The Lord Granard (*E. Granard*)). [No. 188] 1072

July 28.]

Page

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. Then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order), and dispensed with. Amendments reported; Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons ... 1072

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

The Earl of Rosebery 1073

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1077
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1078
The Earl of Halsbury 1082
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1084
Earl Cromer 1086

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 5, to insert at the beginning of the clause the words 'Until the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fifteen.'"—(*Earl Cromer.*)

On Question, "That these words be here inserted,"

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 77; Not Contents, 45.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 10, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'the person who is in receipt of a pension on the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fifteen shall not be deprived of that pension by reason of the expiry of this Act.'"—(*Earl Cromer.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Duke of Devonshire 1094

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 15, after subsection (3) to insert the following new subsections:—'(4) For the purposes of this Act there shall be opened an account at the Bank of England called "The Old-Age Pensions Account," and there shall be paid to this account such money as may from time to time be provided by Parliament towards defraying the costs and expenses incurred in Great Britain in the execution of this Act, and all other sums received in respect of old-age pensions under this Act, and directed by regulations under this Act to be paid into the Old-Age Pensions Account. (5) The costs and expenses incurred in Great Britain in the execution of this Act shall be paid by the Local Government Board subject to regulations to be made by the Treasury out of the money standing to that account. (6) At the end of every financial year, accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Old-Age Pension's Account shall be made up in such form and with such particulars as may be directed by the Treasury, and shall be audited by the Comptroller and Auditor-General as public accounts in accordance with such regulations as the Treasury may make, and shall be laid before Parliament together with his report thereon.'"—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1096
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1097

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Lord Avebury 1098

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 1, to insert the following new clause: '(1) A person born on the first day of January nineteen hundred and nine and a person who on that day is under sixty-five years of age shall not be entitled to a pension under this Act. (2) The Treasury may make regulations enabling persons not entitled to pensions under this Act to provide the like pensions for themselves, and shall cause tables to be constructed for that purpose in which interest shall be calculated at the rate of four per cent. per annum. (3) Where a person, who on the first day of January nineteen hundred and nine is above the age of forty-one and under the age of sixty five, desires to provide a pension for himself as aforesaid, but is unable to pay the full contribution that is required by the tables from a person of his age, the Treasury may pay for him so much of that contribution as exceeds the contribution that is required by the tables from a person of the age of forty-one.'" —(*Lord Avebury.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1099
Viscount Ridley 1099
Lord Atkinson 1102

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To insert after the words 'as verified,' the words 'wherever practicable.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1102
Viscount Wolverhampton 1103
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1104

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Lord Avebury 1104

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'must,' to insert the words 'satisfy the local pension committee that.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1104

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and subject to any exceptions provided by these regulations.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhamnton.*)

Viscount St. Aldwyn 1105
Viscount Wolverhampton 1106
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1106

July 28.] Page

Viscount Wolverhampton 1107
The Marquess of Salisbury... 1107
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Fitzmaurice) ... 1108
Lord Ashbourne 1109
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1110

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Clinton 1111

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 26, after the word 'Kingdom,' to insert the words 'and such regulation shall provide that a person shall not be disqualified by reason only of absence beyond the seas during the whole or part of the qualifying period, either on actual naval or military service on behalf of the Crown, or where his domicile in the United Kingdom is continuously retained in the performance of any duly arising from, or incidental to, any office, trade, service, or employment.' "—(*Lord Clinton*).

Viscount Wolverhampton 1113
Lord Zouche of Haryngworth 1114
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1114
Viscount Wolverhampton 1115
Viscount St Aldwyn 1115
Viscount Knutsford... 1115
The Marquess of Salisbury... 1116
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1117

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Muskerry 1117

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 26, after the word 'Kingdom,' to insert the words 'in the case of all masters and seamen of British nationality, service at sea shall be deemed sufficient to constitute a residence under the terms of this Act.' "—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1117

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 1, after the first 'the,' to insert the word 'yearly.' " —(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Avebury 1118

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 1, to leave out the words 'means of the,' and after the word 'person,' to insert the words 'must satisfy the local pension committee that his means.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 :

Viscount St. Aldwyn 1118

Page

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 7, to leave out the words 'the 31st day of December, 1910, unless.'"—(*Viscount St. Aldwyn.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1120
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1121
The Earl of Camperdown 1122
Viscount Wolverhampton 1122
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1123

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Clinton 1123

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 17, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'the temporary or occasional maintenance of that person or by means of.'" —(*Lord Clinton.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1124

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Viscount Goschen 1124

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 30, to leave out the words 'according to his ability, opportunity, and need, in order to insert the word 'diligently.'" —(*Viscount Goschen.*)

Lord Fitzmaurice 1126
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1127

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Viscount Goschen 1128

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 34, to leave out the word 'for,' and to insert the words 'during the last.'"—(*Viscount Goschen.*)

Lord Fitzmaurice 1128
The Marquess of Salisbury 1129

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 34 and 35, to leave out the words 'up to attaining,' and to insert the words 'immediately his attainment of.'" —(*Viscount Goschen.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Saltoun 1130

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 17, to insert the following words 'If the Court before whom he is convicted so orders.'"—(*Lord Saltoun.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1131

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4:

Viscount St. Aldwyn 1131

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 40, to leave out the words 'which, though capable of investment or profitable use, is not so invested or profitably used by him,' and to insert the words 'if such property, being at the time capable of realisation, were realised and invested in the purchase of a Government annuity for the life of such person. Provided that the house in which such person resides, and any furniture or effects necessary for its occupation, shall not be considered as property that could be realised for the purchase of such annuity.'"—(*Viscount St. Aldwyn.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1134

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1135
Lord Fitzmaurice 1136
The Marquess of Salisbury 1137
The Earl of Crewe 1138
Viscount Ridley 1138

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 6, after the word 'person,' to insert the words 'but this provision shall not include the value of the maintenance of a person by relatives who are by law compellable to maintain that person.'"—*Viscount Ridley.*)

Lord Fitzmaurice 1138
Viscount Ridley 1139
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1140

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Viscount Ridley 1141
The Marquess of Salisbury 1142
Viscount Wolverhampton 1142
Lord Sanderson 1143
The Marquess of Salisbury 1143
Lord Fitzmaurice 1143
Viscount Ridley 1144

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6 agreed to.

Clause 7 :

Lord Atkinson 1144

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 11, after the word 'question,' to insert the following new subsection: '( ) If the pension committee after the receipt of the aforesaid report do not within the time prescribed proceed to give their decision on the claim or question so reported upon, the recommendation or opinion of the pension officer as expressed in his report shall, as far as practicable, be deemed and taken to be a decision of the pensions committee upon the same, and shall be acted upon and treated accordingly.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1145

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 20, after the word 'them,' to insert, 'If a local pension committee refuse or neglect to consider any claim for a pension or to determine any question within a reasonable time, any person who would have the right under this provision to appeal against the decision of the local pension committee may appeal as if the pension committee had given such a decision.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Atkinson 1146

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 20, to add the words, "That a member of the committee who disapproves of the decision shall be deemed to be a party aggrieved within the meaning of the Act.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

On Question, clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8 :

The Duke of Devonshire 1147

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 30, after the word 'county' to insert the words 'and shall consist either wholly or partly of members of the appointing council, but the members of such council shall be a majority of the whole committee.'"—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

Lord Fitzmaurice 1148

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Viscount Midleton 1150

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 30, after the word 'county,' to insert the words 'for the purpose of this sub-section the expression "borough" means and includes a metropolitan borough and the City of London.'"—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

Viscount Wolverhampton 1150
Viscount Midleton 1151

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Duke of Devonshire 1151

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, to leave out lines 31, 32, and 33, and to insert the following new subsection: 'The Local Government Board may have power to appoint such persons as they shall select, not exceeding three in number, to serve as *ex-officio* members of any local pension committee.'"—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

Lord Atkinson 1152
Lord Fitzmaurice 1152
Lord Atkinson 1154
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1154
The Earl of Crewe 1155

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Clinton 1156

Amendment moved—

"To insert the words 'Each local pension committee should be so constituted as to contain representatives of the other local authorities within their area.'"—(*Lord Clinton.*)

Lord Fitzmaurice 1157
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1158

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Earl of Mayo 1159

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, lines 37 and 38, to leave out the words 'either absolutely or under such conditions as they think fit.'"—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

Lord Fitzmaurice 1159

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Duke of Devonshire 1160

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 40, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'other than the power to give a decision on a claim within the meaning of this Act.'"—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

Lord Fitzmaurice 1161

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 40, after the word 'Act,' to insert the following new subsection: '( ) The Local Government Board may appoint any person or any persons not exceeding three in number to be a member or members of any local pensions committee, or of any sub-committee appointed by the latter, who shall, when appointed, have all the rights of ordinary members of such committees.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9:

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 7, after the word 'obtaining,' to insert the words 'or continuing.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 8, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'either for himself or for any other person, or for the purpose of obtaining or continuing an old-age pension under this Act for himself or for any other person at a higher rate than that appropriate to the case.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Camperdown 1161

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 9, after the word 'misrepresentation,' to insert the words 'or if it appears that any person has directly or indirectly deprived himself of any income or property in order to qualify himself for the receipt of an old-age pension, or for the receipt of an old-age pension at a higher rate than that to which he would otherwise be entitled under this Act.' "—(*Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Atkinson 1162

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 11, after the word 'labour,' to insert the following new subsection: '( ) The pension officer may at any time, without the matter having been referred to him, call upon and require a person in receipt of an old-age pension to establish that he has not since the same was granted to him become disqualified to receive it, and the pension officer shall inquire into the matter of the pensioners' disqualification and report on the same to the pension committee, who shall receive and, as far as applicable, act upon the said report as if it were a report received under the provisions of Clause 7, subsection (7).' "—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

Lord Haversham 1163
Lord Atkinson 1163

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 10:

The Earl of Camperdown 1163

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 17, after subsection (2) to insert the following new subsection: '(3) Every regulation under this Act shall be laid before each House of Parliament forthwith, and if an address is presented to His Majesty by either House of Parliament within the next subsequent twenty-one days on which that House has sat next after any such regulation is laid before it, praying that the regulation may be annulled, His Majesty in Council may annul the regulation, and it shall thenceforth be void, but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder.' "—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived.

The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow, and the Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 189.)

Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill; Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª to-morrow 1164

Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1164

Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill; Polling Arangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed ... 1165

July 28.] *Page*

Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1165

Commons Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order.)

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 1165

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 17, after the word 'sheep,' to insert the word 'goats.'"—(*Earl Carrington.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Coroners (Ireland) Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), with the Amendments, further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons ... 1165

Provisional Orders (Procedure) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1165

Married Women's Property Bill—Debate on the motion for Second Reading resumed (according to order).

The Earl of Stradbroke 1165

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill; University of Durham Bill.—House in Committee (according to order): Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 1166

Grand Jury (Ireland) Act, 1836, Amendment Bill [SECOND READING.]—

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Denman 1166

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Battleships, Armoured Cruisers and Destroyers.—Return respecting; laid before the House (pursuant to Order of this day), and to be printed. (No. 190) 1166

House adjourned at ten minutes past Twelve o'clock a.m., till a quarter past Four o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, 28TH JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Holderness Water Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill; Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill.—Lords Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to 1167

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 1167

Page

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 1167

Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 1167

Crystal Palace Company Bill [LORDS]—Reported without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time 1167

River Wandle Protection Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time 1167

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to, Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, Wild Birds Bill, without Amendment.

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill, London County Council (General Powers) Bill, Gosport Gas Bill, Central Ireland Electric Power Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords], Leith Burgh Bill [Lords], London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Amendments to Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [Lords], with an Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, [Edinburgh and District Water Order Confimation Bill [Lords] 1167

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 344] 1168

PETITIONS.

Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1168

Licensing Bill.—2 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1168

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—2 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1168

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Loss of Life at Sea.—Return showing the lives lost by Wreck, Drowning or, other Accident in British sea-going Merchant Ships; to lie upon the Table 1168

Local Taxation Account, 1907–8—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 263] 1168

Local Taxation Licenses, etc., 1907–8.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 264] 1169

Irish Land Commission.—Report of the Commissioners for the period from 1st April, 1907, to 31st March, 1908; to lie upon the Table 1169

July 28.] Page

Local Government Board (Ireland).—Annual Report of the Local Government Board for Ireland; to lie upon the Table 1169

Suez Canal (Commercial, No. 5, 1908).—Returns of Shipping and Tonnage passing through the Suez Canal, 1905, 1906, and 1907; to lie upon the Table 1168

Trustee Savings Banks.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 265] 1168

Pacific Cable Act, 1901.—Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the Money received, expended, and borrowed, and Securities created under the said Act; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 266] 1168

Deaths from Starvation or Accelerated by Privation (London).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 267] 1169

Members of Parliament.—Order [23rd June] for an Address for a Return relative thereto, read and discharged; and, instead thereof:—

Address for "Return of the names of every Member returned to serve in the Twenty-seventh Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland appointed to meet 3rd December, 1900, and dissolved 8th January, 1906, specifying the names of the county, city, university, or place for which each Member was returned (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 365, of Session 1901)."—(*Sir William Bull*) 1169

Offences in County Armagh (Ireland).—Return ordered, "showing the number of convictions for indictable and non-indictable Offences committed in the districts in Ireland 1169

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Addition to Phœnix Park 1171
Matcham and Co. and the Fair Wages Clause 1171
Sub-letting of Messrs. Lester and Perkins' Contracts 1172
Cost of Living in Welsh Provincial Towns 1172
Sunday Duty in the Post Office 1173
Promotion in the Customs—Mr. Clarke's Change 1174
Colonial Audit Branch 1174
Education Problem 1175
Dismissal of Married Teachers at Aberdare 1176
College-trained Teachers in Elementary Schools 1176
Coastguards and the Naval Manœuvres 1177
Independent Order of Foresters—Funds of Toronto 1177
Tullaghan Tenant 1178
Naval Court Martial 1178
Creech Grange Post Office 1179
Sligo Post Office—Night Duties 1179

July 28.]

Page

Thames Steamers and the Conveyance of the Mails 1180
Small-Pox among Post Office Employees 1180
Shetland Cable Breakdown 1181
Bristol Post Office 1181
Willesden Education Committee 1182
Certified Training Teachers 1182
Sheep Dipping in North Wales 1183
Small Holdings Act—Tonbridge Eviction Case 1183
Horse Breeding 1184
Scottish Sheriffs and Insurance Company Directorships 1184
British Museum Extension 1185
Officers on Retired Pay 1185
East London and the Pension Scheme 1185
Dromard Evicted Tenant 1186
Knocklong Evicted Tenants 1186
Land Purchase in Co. Limerick 1187
Fermoy Urban Council Meetings 1188
Irish Assistant Teachers 1189
Shoeburyness Foreshore 1189
Territorial Foreshore 1189
Territorial Uniform Contracts 1189
Bermuda Engineer Stores 1190
Territorials at Brecon Public Meeting 1190
Orissa... 1191
Registration of Titles in Scotland 1191
Rates in the Island of Lewis 1191
Syre Settlers 1192
Post Office Surveyors—Subsistence Allowances 1192
Revenue Statistics 1193
American Cattle 1195
Scotch Smokeless Coal 1195
Naval Paymasters 1196
Regent's Canal 1197
Income-Tax 1197
Ballymahon Evicted Tenant 1198
Clonrellick Lands 1198
Claremorris National School 1198
Rathdowney Disturbances 1199
Sir George Collhurst's Estates 1200
Irish School Teachers' Grievances 1201
New Forest Military Camps 1201
Colonial Auditors 1202

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

British-built Warships 1204
Apprentices on Naval Contract Work 1205
Wallsend Slipway Company's Employees 1206
Admiralty Payments to Quantity Surveyors 1207
Defence of Sea Trade Routes 1207
German Naval Policy 1209
H.M.S. "Invincible"—Fair Wage Clause 1209
German Naval Expenditure 1210
The Admiralty and the Press 1211
Chain Cable Contracts 1212
Land Trade between Persia and British India 1212
Sylhet Bomb Factory 1213
Gun Running on the Afghan Frontier 1213
Sedition in Northern India... 1214
Indian Civil Service 1214
Indian Excise Administration 1214
Calcutta Liquor Shops—Hours of Closing 1215
Calcutta County and Foreign Licences 1215
The Sentence on Mr. Tilak 1216
Bombay Factory Workers' Disturbances 1218
Law of Transportation in India 1219
Prosecutions for Sedition in India 1219
Sentences for Treason at Tinnevelly 1219
Treatment of Prisoners in India 1220
India Relief Works 1220
Bombay Factories Commission 1221
Carib Canal, St. Vincent 1221
St. Vincent Eruption Relief Fund 1221
Carib Canal Loan 1222
Parsee Indians in Natal 1222
Island of St. Vincent Revenue 1223
St. Vincent Relief Fund—The Carib Canal 1223
South African Compensation Fund 1223
Crown Colonists Stranded in England 1224
Kingston Wharves and Railways 1224
King's House, Jamaica 1224
The Sultanate of Bruni 1225
Trade of Bruni 1226
West Indian Banana Trade 1226
Dominica Light Railway 1227
Imports of Live Cattle 1228

Page
Cancellation of Venezuelan Concessions 1228
Franco-Canadian Treaty 1229
The Release of Mr. Clark Kennedy 1229
The Czar of Russia 1230
The Scots College at Rome 1230
The Russo-Japanese War—British Claims... 1230
The Imprisoned Suffragists 1231
Medical Officers' Reports 1231
Out-workers Returns 1231
Tramcar Speeds in London 1233
Disabled Motor 'Buses 1234
Isle of Man Excursion Steamers 1235
Port of London Inquiry 1235
London Traffic Commission Report... 1236
Meat Trade Inquiry... 1236
The All-Red Route 1237
Severn Foreshore 1238
Shoeburyness Foreshore 1238
Motor Competitions on Public Roads 1239
Driffield Guardians Vaccination Contract 1239
Motor Car Dust Nuisance 1240
Disclosure of Official Information 1240
Irish Department of Agriculture Official Salaries 1240
Canadian Cattle Imports 1241
Illegal Trawling in the Moray Firth 1241
Natal Act of Indemnity 1242
Land Law (Ireland) Acts 1242
Government Army Policy 1243
The Speaker and Mr. Swift MacNeill 1243

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 345] 1244

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 346] 1244

Business of the House (Supply).—Ordered, "That on this day, notwithstanding anything in Standing Order No. 15, Business other than Business of Supply may be taken before Eleven of the Clock."—(*Mr. Secretary Haldane*) 1244

Supply [19th Allotted Day.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES 1908–9.

CLASS II.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,450, be granted to His Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, including a grant in aid of certain expenses connected with emigration."

Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square) 1244
The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby) 1260
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 1274
Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 1275
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 1283
Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough) 1295
Earl Winterton (Sussex, Horsham) 1302

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,350, be granted for the said service."—(*Earl Winterton.*)

Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 1306
Mr. Hamar Greenwood (Yorkshire) 1308
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 1311
Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) 1318
Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) 1320
Mr. Boulton (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 1323
Colonel Seely 1325

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 92 ; Noes, 247. (Division List No. 228.)

And, it being after Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 15, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Vote under consideration.

Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,450, be granted for the said Service," put, and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded to put severally the Questions, "That the total amounts of the Votes outstanding in each Class of the Civil Services Estimates, including Supplementary Estimates, and the total amount of the Votes outstanding in the Estimates for the Navy, the Army (including Ordnance Factories), and the Revenue Departments, be granted for the Services defined in those Classes and Estimates—

CLASS I.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £608,168, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS II.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,145,045, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the

year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 282 ; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 229.)

CLASS III.

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,685,768, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 299 ; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 230.)

CLASS IV.

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,217,512, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 261 ; Noes, 129. (Division List No. 231.)

CLASS V.

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £366,236, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS VI.

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,684,845, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS VII.

8 "That a sum, not exceeding £382,104, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

Question put, and agreed to.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £5,562,700, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Navy Services."

Question put, and agreed to.

July 28.] *Page*

Army Estimates, 1908–9.

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £13,505,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Army Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories)."

Question put, and agreed to.

Revenue Departments Estimates, 1908–9.

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £11,821,531, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs, and Telephones."

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow.

Ways and Means.—Resolved, "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, the sum of £69,157,274, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow 1354

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1354

Public Works Loans Bill.—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed 1354

Agricultural Holdings Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed 1354

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee,)

Clauses 1 to 29 agreed to.

Clause 30:

The Treasurer of the Household (*Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.*) 1335

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 7, to leave out the words 'Acts of 1883 and 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act of 1908.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 1355
The Attorney-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 1356
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 1356
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 1357
Mr. Walter Long 1357
Mr. Asquith 1359
Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 1359
Sir F. Banbury 1360

Amendment—

Clause as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 31 to 46 inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 47 :

Amendments proposed—

"In page 30, line 6, to leave out the words 'three of the Market Gardeners' Compensation Act, 1895,' and to insert the words 'forty-two of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908.'"

"In page 30, lines 19 and 20, to leave out the words '(England) Acts, 1883 to 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act, 1908.'"

"In page 30, lines 24 and 25, to leave out the words 'three of the Market Gardeners' Compensation Act, 1895,' and to insert the words 'forty-two of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908.'"

"In page 30, line 28, to leave out the word '1900,' and to insert the word '1908.'"

"In page 30, line 38, to leave out the words '(England) Acts, 1883 to 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act, 1908.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 48 to 54 inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 55 :

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Clause 55."—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 56, 57, and 58, agreed to.

Clause 59 :

Amendment proposed—

"In page 37, line 25, to leave out the words '(England) Acts, 1883 to 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act, 1908.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendment agreed to—

Clauses 59 to 64 agreed to.

Schedule :

Amendments proposed—

"In page 42, line 22, to leave out the words '(England) Acts 1883 to 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act, 1908.'"

"In page 42, line 23, to leave out the words 'those Acts,' and to insert the words 'that Act.'"

"In page 42, lines 24 and 25, to leave out the words 'those Acts,' and to insert the words 'that Act.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendments agreed to, and the Bill, as amended, reported, and to be considered To-morrow.

Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Rawlinson 1362
The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) ... 1362
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 1363
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 1363
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1363

July 28.]

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1906–7.

Resolutions reported.

I.—Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Navy Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz. :—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - -	1,041,698	8	7
Total Deficits - - -	644,285	12	7
Net Surplus - -	£397,412	16	0

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services be sanctioned.

1. "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

II.—Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Army Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - -	1,336,708	4	1
Total Deficits - - -	42,029	13	4
Net Surplus - -	1,294,678	10	9

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services be sanctioned.

2. "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

Resolutions agreed to.

Cran Measures Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 1367

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment; Bill read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nineteen minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, WEDNESDAY, 29TH JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—Committed ... 1369

Thames River Steamboat Service Act, 1904 (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1369

Holderness Water Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill: Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1369

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to ... 1369

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendment considered (according to order), and agreed to ... 1369

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow 1369

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed 1369

Dover Graving Docks Bill.

The Acting Chairman of Committees (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) 1369

Moved, "That Standing Order No. 143 be considered in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said Bill, and that the Bill be now read 3^a."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*).

On Question, Motion agreed to; Bill read 3^a, and passed.

THE STANDING ORDERS.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1370

Moved, "That the Standing Order be amended as follows:—*Note.*—The words struck through are to be omitted, and the words printed in Italics are to be inserted. 30. Where by any Bill power is sought to take or *interfere with* any churchyard, burial ground, or cemetery, or any part thereof, or to disturb the bodies interred therein, or where power is sought to take any common or commonable land, as the case may be, a copy of so much of the plans, sections, and books of reference required by these Orders to be deposited in the office of the clerk of the Parliaments in respect of such Bill as relates to such churchyard, burial ground, or cemetery, common, or commonable land, shall, on or before the thirtieth day of November, be deposited at the Office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and a copy of so much of the said plans, sections, and books of reference as relates to such common or commonable lands shall, on or before the said day, be deposited at the office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. 134. In the case of any Bill whereby any municipal corporation, district council, improvement commissioners, joint board or joint committee, or other local authority in England or Wales are authorised to borrow money for any purpose within the jurisdiction of the Board of Trade or the Local Government Board, estimates showing the proposed application of the money for permanent works shall, except so far as the exercise of the borrowing power is made subject to the sanction of the respective Board, be recited in the Bill as introduced into Parliament and proved before the Committee. Copies of the estimates and statements deposited in accordance with Standing Order 36*a or under General Order made in pursuance of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act*, 1899, shall be laid before the Committee for the purposes of this Order."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*).

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—Order of the Day read for the consideration of the Commons' Amendments.

Moved, "That these Amendments be agreed to."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

Earl Beauchamp 1372
The Earl of Camperdown 1372

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill—Amendment reported (according to order) then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order), and dispensed with. Bills read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1373

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order), then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order), and dispensed with. Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1373

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Lotteries and Indecent Advertisements.—Report from the Joint Committee and to be printed. [No. 198.]

Minutes of Evidence, laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out ... 1373

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Interim Report of proceedings under the Small Holdings and Allotments Acts to 30th June, 1908 1373

Tramway Orders.—Report of proceedings under the Tramways Act, 1870, during the season of 1908 1373

Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1898.—Return showing the total payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Accounts for the financial year 1907–1908.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1373

Polling Districts (County of Durham).—Order made by the council of the county of Durham.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie upon the Table 1373

Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889.—University Court Ordinance, No. 28 (Edinburgh, No. 10). Regulations for higher degrees in arts and science. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. [No. 193] ... 1374

Page

Public Works Loans Bill.—Brought from the Commons; to be read 2ª To-morrow.—(*The Earl of Crewe*) 1374

Cran Measures Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to ... 1374

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment to be printed, and to be considered To-morrow. [No. 191] 1374

Agricultural Holdings Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment to be printed, and to be considered To-morrow. [No. 192] 1374

MOTOR CAR LEGISLATION.

Lord Willoughby de Broke 1374
Lord Montague of Beaulieu 1380
Lord Allendale 1383
The Earl of Halsbury 1386
Earl Russell 1389
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1392
The Earl of Donoughmore 1392

Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill.—Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee."—(*Lord Denman.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1393
The Earl of Mayo 1394
Lord Denman 1394

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

The Earl of Donoughmore 1396

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1396

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 4, to insert the following new clause: 'Any person who knowingly removes from his premises, or sells or disposes of to any other person, or imports into any district any infected bees or any infected article or appliance used in connection with bee-keeping, shall be guilty of an offence under this Act, and shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding, for the first offence, five pounds, and for the second or any subsequent offence ten pounds.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Lord Denman 1397

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To leave out line 3, and insert the words 'any bees infected with bee pest or foul brood, or any'; and in line 4, after the word 'bee-keeping' to insert the words 'and infected with that disease.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

July 29.] *Page*

Clauses 5 and 6 agreed to.

Clause 7 :

The Earl of Donoughmore 1397

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 12, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'isolation, cleaning, disinfection, or,' and after the word 'bees' to insert the words 'bee products or.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Lord Denman 1397

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendment to be received To-morrow, and Bill to be printed as amended (No. 195).

Finance Bill [Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Viscount St. Aldwyn 1398
Lord St. Davids 1409
Earl Cromer 1413
Lord Faber 1415
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1419

On Question, Bill read 2ª; Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order); further Amendments made. Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow, and to be be printed as amended. [No. 196] 1426

Friendly Societies Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment, Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1426

Legislation by Reference.

The Earl of Camperdown 1426
The Lord Chancellor 1427

Companies (Consolidation) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order).

The Lord Chancellor 1427

Moved, "That the Amendments be taken as a whole."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Moved, "That the Amendments be agreed to."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow, and to be printed as amended.

Irish Land Administration.

Lord Clonbrock 1428
Lord Denman 1428

The Imprisoned Suffragists.

Earl Russell 1428
Earl Beauchamp 1430

Naval Marriages Bill.—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Granard 1433

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 1433

SECONDARY EDUCATION (WALES).

Lord Glantawe 1433

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing the number of subscribers, and the amount of money subscribed voluntary by the Welsh people towards Secondary Education as the result of the passing of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889.—(*The Lord Glantawe.*)

Earl Beauchamp 1436

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

STRENGTH OF REGULAR AND TERRITORIAL ARMIES.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1437

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for a Return showing the strength of the Regular Army, Special Reserve, and Territorial Army on 1st October, 1908:—Strength of the Regular Army on the Home Establishment on 1st October, 1905, and 1st October, 1908: Cavalry; Artillery (Horse and Field Garrison); Foot Guards; Infantry of the Line; other arms; total. Number of recruits attested for Regular Army, 1st October, 1907, to 1st October, 1908: Militia and Special Reserve: Strength of Militia, 1st October, 1905: Infantry; Artillery. Strength of Special Reserve, 1st October, 1108: Infantry; Artillery. Number of recruits, Militia: (*a*) Attested for Militia; (*b*) Transferred to Regular Army: 1st October, 1903, to 1st October, 1904; 1st October, 1904, to 1st October, 1905; 1st October, 1905, to 1st October, 1906; 1st October, 1906, to 1st October, 1907. Number of recruits for Special Reserves:—(*a*) Attested for Militia or Special Reserve; (*b*) Transferred to Regular Army: 1st October, 1907, to 1st October, 1908. Number of Militiamen under twenty, 1st October, 1905. Number of Special Reservists under twenty, 1st October, 1908. Volunteers:—Number of Volunteers, 1st October, 1905: (*a*) Infantry; (*b*) Artillery. Number of Territorial Army, 1st October, 1908: (*a*) Infantry; (*b*) Artillery. Volunteer recruits, 1st October, 1904, to 1st October, 1905. Recruits for Territorial Army or Volunteers, 1st October, 1907, to 1st October, 1908.—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne for Viscount Midleton.*)

Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order).

Viscount Wolverhampton 1438
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1439

Amendment moved to the proposed Amendment—

"To add the words 'where no such certificates or documents are obtainable.'"—(*Viscount St. Aldwyn.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 21, after the word 'and' to insert the words 'if the term of imprisonment to which he is sentenced exceeds one month he shall be disqualified.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton*).

The Earl of Camperdown 1439

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 4, after the word 'him, to insert the words 'as to produce the largest income that can be reasonably obtained from it.'"—(*Viscount St. Aldwyn.*)

Lord Fitzwilliam 1440

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 20, to leave out from the word 'them' to the end of line 26, and to insert the words 'if any person is aggrieved by the refusal or neglect of the local pension committee to consider a claim for a pension or to determine on any question referred to them, that person may apply in the prescribed manner to the central pension authority, and that authority may, if they consider that the local pension committee have refused or neglected to consider and determine the claim or question within a reasonable time, themselves consider and determine the claim or question in the same manner as on an appeal from the decision of the local pension committee.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

Lord Atkinson indicated that he was satisfied with the Amendment of the noble Viscount.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Atkinson 1441
Viscount Wolverhampton 1441

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 7, to add a further sub-clause (*d*) The expression "party aggrieved" shall include a member of the said committee who has taken part in the consideration of the report and has dissented from the decision.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Fitzmaurice 1442

Amendment moved—

"In page 8, line 37, to omit the words 'means and.'"—(*Lord Fitzmaurice.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 38, after the word 'London,' to insert the words 'and the expression "council of a borough" includes the council of a metropolitan borough, and in respect to the City of London the mayor, aldermen, and commoners of the City of London in common council assembled.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, amendment agreed to.

Page

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 18, to insert the words, 'Any reference in this Act to the pension authority shall be construed as a reference to the pension officer, the local pension committee and the central pension authority, or to any one of them, as the case requires."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Viscount Wolverhampton 1443

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, lines 24 and 25, to leave out the words 'it appears that.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Viscount Wolverhampton 1444
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1444

Bill to be read 3ᵃ To-morrow, and to be printed as amended. (No. 197.)

Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill; Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland) Bill.—Read 3ᵃ (according to order), and passed 1444

Lunacy Bill [SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for Second Reading read.
The Lord Chancellor 1444

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ᵃ."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ᵃ, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill [SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for Second Reading read.

The Earl of Granard 1445

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Bill read 2ᵃ, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill.—Bill read 3ᵃ (according to order).—(*Lord Denman.*)

Lord Denman 1445

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, to leave out subsection (1) of Clause 5."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Costs in Criminal Cases Bill.—Read 3ᵃ (according to order), and passed ... 1446

Married Women's Property Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ᵃ To-morrow 1446

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order).

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 9, after the word 'of,' to insert the word 'Parliamentary.'"—(*Lord Denman*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 12, to leave out the words 'for Ireland.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1446

University of Durham Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed ... 1446

Grand Jury (Ireland) Act, 1836, Amendment Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1446

Registration Bill [H.L.]—Commons' Amendments considered (on Motion), and agreed to 1446

House adjourned at half-past Ten o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 29TH JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Criccieth Water and Improvement Bill; Padiham Urban District Council Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 1447

Central Ireland Electric Power Bill; Gosport Gas Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Lords' Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to 1447

Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Lords' Amendments to Commons' Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to 1447

Crystal Palace Company Bill [LORDS].—Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed without Amendment 1447

River Wandle Protection Bill [LORDS].—Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed without Amendment 1447

Page

Thames River Steamboat Service Act (1904) Amendment Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That Standing Order 213 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1447

Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1447

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered To-morrow 1448

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to:—Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill; Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill; Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill, without Amendment.

Coroners (Ireland) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Dover Graving Docks Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to:—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]: Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway Bill [Lords]; Keighley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill [Lords]; Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [Lords]; Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Amendment to:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, Commons Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, Provisional Orders Procedure Bill [Lords] 1448

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table... 1449

Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1449

Licensing Bill.—6 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table. 2 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table... 1449

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill.—2 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1449

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Tramway Orders.—Report of the Proceedings under the Tramways Act, 1870, during the Session of 1908; to lie upon the Table 1449

Tramways and Light Railways (Street and Road).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 268] ... 1499

Polling Districts (County of Durham).—Order made by the Council of the County of Durham; to lie upon the Table 1449

July 29.] Page

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Interim Report under the Small Holdings and Allotments Acts to the 30th June, 1908; to lie upon the Table 1450

Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1898.—Return showing the Total Payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account for the financial year 1907–8; to lie upon the Table 1450

Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance).—University Court Ordinance No. 28 (Edinburgh, No. 10); to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 269] 1450

Admiralty Casualties, etc.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 270] 1450

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Lancaster).—Further Return relative thereto; to be printed. [No. 271.]

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Lancaster) and Inquiry into Charities (County Borough of Preston) and Inquiry into Charities (County Borough of Barrow-in-Furness).—Further Returns and Return relative thereto; to be printed. [No. 272]

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Wilts).—Further Return relative thereto; to be printed. [No. 273.]

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Berks).—Further return relative thereto; to be printed. [No. 274] 1450

Civil Servants (Retirement at the age of Sixty-five).—Treasury Minute 1450

County Courts (Plaints and Sittings).—Address for Return 1450

Educational Expenditure (Colonies)—Address for Return 1450

East India (Prosecutions for Speeches, etc.)—Address for Return ... 1452

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Treatment of the Crew of the "Strathyre" 1452
County Westmeath Re-valuation Cost 1453
Delay in Appointment of Sub-postmaster at Dunleer 1453
Examination for Overseers at Cork Post Office 1453
Telegraphic Delay at Cork 1454
Mess Payment System in the Navy 1455
Spark Catchers on Factory Chimneys 1455
Education Grants 1456
Naval and Military Courts of Inquiry 1456
Breeding of Kerry Cattle 1456
Promotion in the King's Liverpool Regiment 1457
Territorial Associations and Rifle Shooting 1457
Appointments and Rank of Officers on the Special Reserve 1458
Direct British Steamship Line to East Africa 1458
Religious Instruction in Prussian, Bavarian and Belgian Schools 1458
Letter Deliveries at Derreenavurrig and Bullough 1459

Page
Hastings and St. Leonards Post Offices 1459
"Nut Butter" 1459
Exchequer and Audit Department Officials 1460
Agricultural Credit Banks 1462
Applications for Small Holdings in Yorkshire (North Riding) 1463
Headford Kenmare Train Services 1463
Establishment of a Model Farm at Castlequin 1464
Appointments of Scottish Lords-Lieutenant 1465
Scottish Crofting Legislation 1466
Rate Arrears in the Island of Lewis 1466
Rebuilding of Houses in the Island of Lewis 1466
Corporation of London and Cleaning of Spitalfields Market 1467
Duke of York's School, Chelsea—Suggested Open Space 1467
Suggested Naval Base at Invergorden 1468
Bisley Camp—Traders' and Hawkers' Licences 1468
Spirit Duties 1468
Hop Substitutes 1469
Grant for Rebuilding School at Curraheen 1469
Improvement of Boat Slips at Roads and Glen 1470
Evictions on the McGillicuddy Eagar Estate 1470
Delay in Sale of the King Harman Estate... 1471
Purchase of the Estate of Mr. D. C. O'Connell 1471
Tramp Nuisance at Blackrock 1471
Evicted Tenants Act in County Cavan 1472
Sale of the Estate of Mary B. Falkner 1472
Reinstatement of Mr. Wm. Aherne 1473
Superannuation of Irish National School Teachers 1473
Increased Grants for Irish Workhouse Teacher 1474
Reinstatement of Patrick M'Clushy 1474
Claims of John D. M'Auliffe 1475
Claims of Mrs. Mary Callaghan 1475
Killarney Land Commission Appeal 1475
Distribution of Holding on the Blacker-Douglas Estate 1476
Date of Completion of the Duke of York's School 1476
Bullets used by the British Teams at the Olympic Games Shooting Match ... 1476
Drafting of Bills 1476
Scottish Crofting Legislation 1477

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

German Destroyers 1478
Germany *v.* British Shipbuilding Programmes 1479
Deptford Victualling Yard 1481
War Office Expenditure on Aeronautical Work 1481

July 29.]

Page
Hired Horses for the Military 1482
North Riding Territorial Association 1482
Notts and Derby Regiment... 1482
Mr. Tilak's Trial 1483
Rioting in Bombay 1483
Indian Public Works Staff 1484
Imperial Conference Secretariat 1484
Natal Idemnity Act 1485
Inland Revenue Fines 1485
Rates in the Western Hebrides 1486
Lyon King-at-Arms 1487
Brecon Open-air Meetings 1487
Workmen's Compensation—Kettering Judgment 1488
Literature in Prisons 1489
Motor Cab Regulations 1489
Robbery and Violence in Yorkshire 1490
Meat Trade Inquiry 1491
British East Africa—Native Labour Rules 1492
Edenbridge Labourer's Eviction 1493
Millport Telegraph Service 1493
Postal Employee's Attacks on the Hobhouse Committee 1494
Rushden Postmen's Wages 1494
Work for School Children 1495
Douglas Hall, Hoxton 1496
Bermondsey County Council School 1497
London County Council School at West Square 1497
Llangollen School 1498
Penmachno School 1498
Newspapers Files for Members 1499
Provincial Homes Investment Company 1499
Thurso Steamboat Service 1500
Burning of Crofter's House in Sutherlandshire 1500
Farrihy Evicted Tenant 1501
Cranagill Orangemen 1502
Sales by the Estates Commissioners 1502
Dickson Estate, Doon 1503
Ballyneety Evicted Tenant 1503
Clery Minors Estate, Limerick 1504
Police Protection in Ireland 1504
Ballyvourneen Evicted Tenant 1505
Outrages in Ireland 1505
Orange Demonstration in Fermanagh 1505
De Blaquiere Estate, Clare 1506

Page

Irish School Literature 1506
Warrenpoint Excursion Fatality 1508
The Bank of Ireland 1508
Irish Land Stock 1510
Irish Land Purchase Act 1511
The Licensing Bill 1511
Business of the House 1512

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Report to lie upon the Table 1512

Lotteries and Advertisements.—Report from the Joint Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 275] 1512

Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 13th October, and to be printed. [Bill 347] 1513

Coroners (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 349] 1513

NEW BILL.

Grocers' Licences (Abolition) Bill.—To be read a second time upon Tuesday, 13th October, and to be printed. [Bill 348.]

SUPPLY [20TH ALLOTTED DAY] [28TH JULY].

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

CLASS II.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £31,450, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, including a Grant in Aid of certain Expenses connected with Emigration."

CLASS I.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £608,168, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services.

CLASS II.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,145,045, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services.

CLASS III.

4. "That a sum not exceeding £1,685,768, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services.

CLASS IV.

5. "That a sum not exceeding £8,217,512, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimate for Civil Services.

CLASS V.

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £366,236, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

CLASS VI.

7. "That a sum not exceeding £1,684,845, be granted to his Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

CLASS VII.

8. "That a sum not exceeding £382,104, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in receipt of the Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services."

NAVY ESTIMATES 1908–9.

9. "That a sum not exceeding £5,562,700, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Navy Services."

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £13,505,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Army Services, including Army Ordnance Factories."

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £11,821,531, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs, and Telephones."

First two Resolutions read a second time, and postponed.

Third Resolution read for a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) ... 1519
Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) ... 1528
Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) ... 1530
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) ... 1537
Mr. Everett (Suffolk, Woodbridge) ... 1538
Mr. Chaplin (Surrey, Wimbledon) ... 1539
Sir Francis Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) ... 1541
Sir Philip Magnus (London University) ... 1545
Mr. Curran (Durham, Jarrow) ... 1547
Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) ... 1552
Mr. Dobson (Plymouth) ... 1553
Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton) ... 1554
Mr. G. A. Hardy (Suffolk, Stowmarket) ... 1559
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1560
Sir Charles W. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) ... 1575
Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley) ... 1585
Mr. Gill (Bolton) ... 1588
Mr. Atherley Jones (Durham, N.W.) ... 1592
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) ... 1597
Mr. Akers-Douglas (Kent, St. Augustine's) ... 1600
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1602

And, it being Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 15, proceeded to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Report of the Resolution then under consideration.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 15, to put forthwith the Questions, That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of each Class of the Civil Services Estimates, the Navy Estimates, the Army Estimates, and the Revenue Departments Estimates.

CIVIL SERVICES ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

CLASS I.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class I. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided:—Ayes, 247; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 232.)

CLASS II.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class II. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 233.)

CLASS III.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class III. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided:—Ayes, 254; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 234.)

CLASS IV.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class IV. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 249; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 235.)

CLASS V.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class V. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 258; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 236.)

CLASS VI.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class VI. of the Civil Service Estimates," put, and agreed to.

CLASS VII.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class VII. of the Civil Service Estimates," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Navy Estimates," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Army Estimates," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Revenue Departments Estimates," put, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS [28TH JULY].

Resolution reported,

"That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, the sum of £69,157,274 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Hobhouse 1628

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill.—"To apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and nine, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time to-morrow 1628

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1628

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1628

Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 :

Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 1629
The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury*) ... 1629

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 :

Mr. Rawlinson 1622

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the word 'April' and insert the word 'September.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'April' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Runciman 1630
Mr. Rawlinson 1630
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 1630

Question put and negatived.

Question, "That the word 'August' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Post Office Sites Bill [LORDS].—Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, three to be nominated by the House, and two by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented five clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee.

Ordered, That the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel or Agents, be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That three be the quorum.—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

EAST INDIA LOANS [RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION WORKS AND GENERAL PURPOSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom, on the security of the Revenues of India, by the creation and issue of capital stock, bonds, debentures or bills. (1) A sum not exceeding £200,000,000 for the following purposes :—(a) The construction, extension and equipment of railways in India by State agency or through the agency of companies. (b) The repayment of the principal of any bonds or debentures issued by any such company under the guarrantee of the Secretary of State. (c) The discharge of any obligations incurred by the Secretary of State by reason of the purchase of any railway or the determination of any contract from or with such company. (d) The construction of irrigation works in India. (2) A sum not exceeding £5,000,000 for the general purposes of the Government of India—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow 1631

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered.

Lords Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'eleven' and to insert the word 'ten.'"

Mr. Mooney (Newry) 1632
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University)... 1632

Lords Amendments agreed to.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-one minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, THURSDAY, 30TH JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [H.L.]; River Wandle Protection Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to 1633

London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Gosport Gas Bill; Central Ireland Electric Power Bill; Padiham Urban District Council Bill; Criccieth Water and Improvement Bill; Dover Graving Docks Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments, agreed to 1633

Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons, agreed to 1633

Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. [No. 201] 1633

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Moved, "That Standing Order No. XXI. be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting; and that the order for the Third Reading of the Old-Age Pensions Bill have precedence of the other notices and Orders of the Day."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

Agreed to, and ordered accordingly 1633

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Crewe) 1633

Moved, "That Standing Order No. XXXIX. be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills.

The Acting Chairman of Committees (Lord Balfour of Burleigh) ... 1634

Moved, "That Standing Orders No. 92 and 93 be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, also the time for depositing Documents relating to any Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, which would otherwise expire during the Autumn Recess, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order) and passed 1634

Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill.—The King's consent signified; read 3ª (according to order) and passed 1634

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Board of Education.—Report on the Consultative Committee upon the school attendance of children below the age of five 1634

Statistics—Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1893–1907. Fifty-fifth number 1635

Railway Returns.—Returns of the capital, traffic, receipts, and working expenditure of the railway companies of the United Kingdom 1635

Wages and Hours of Labour.—Report on changes in rates of wages and hours of labour in the United Kingdom in 1907 1635

Strikes and Lock-outs.—Reports on strikes and lock-outs and on conciliation and arbitration boards in the United Kingdom 1635

Navigation and Shipping.—Annual Statement of the United Kingdom ... 1635

Prisons Ireland.—Thirtieth Report of the General Prisons Board for Ireland 1635

Trade Reports: Annual Series.—Nos. 4075 to 4082... 1635

Navy (Pay).—List of exceptions to the King's Regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty 1635

Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill, 1908.—Table of comparison between the provisions of the Bill and existing enactments 1636

Metropolitan Police (Royal Commission).—Report of the Commissioners upon the duties of the Metropolitan Police.

Presented, (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1636

Foreshores.—Treasury Minute, directing the application of moneys received by the Board of Trade in respect of the rights and interests of the Crown on the foreshores of the United Kingdom 1636

Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1906 (Dispensing Powers).—Report by the Board of Trade 1636

Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888 (Section 31).—Tenth Report by the Board of Trade 1636

Railway Servants (Hours of Labour).—Report by the Board of Trade respecting their proceedings under the Railway Regulation Act.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1636

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be printed, and to be considered To-morrow. [No. 200] 1636

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill; Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill. —Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1637

Port of London Bill.—Report from the Joint Committee that the Bill ought to be allowed to proceed. The proceedings of the Committee and the minutes of evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out 1637

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.
The Chancellor of the Duchy (*Viscount Wolverhampton*) 1637

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Irish Universities Bill.—Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

The Earl of Mayo 1637
Lord Killanin 1639
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1641

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:

The Earl of Donoughmore 1644

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, to leave out from the word 'them' to the end of the subsection and to insert the following new subsection:

"(4) In every charter granted under this Act by which a governing body is constituted for a constituent college, provision shall be made by which those members who are officers of the college, together with those who are elected by either the senate of the University or the graduates of the University who are members of the college, shall jointly amount to at least three-fourths of the total number of such governing body, exclusive of any co-opted members, who shall in no case exceed four in number.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

The Earl of Crewe 1647
Lord Ashbourne 1649
The Earl of Mayo 1650
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 1651
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1651
Lord Stanley of Alderley 1653
The Earl of Dunraven 1654
The Earl of Donoughmore 1655

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Clonbrock 1655

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 15, after the word 'which' to insert the words 'the Commissioners, and after the powers of the Commissioners to determine.'"—(*Lord Clonbrock.*)

The Earl of Crewe 1656
Lord Ashbourne 1656

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Lord Ashbourne 1656

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'may,' to insert the words 'by statute.'"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

The Earl of Crewe 1657

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 :

The Earl of Crewe 1658

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 43, after the word 'divinity,' to insert the words 'Provided that no test of religous belief shall be imposed by the governing body of either of the two new Universities or any constituent college on any such professor or lecturer as a condition of his appointment or recognition by the governing body as such professor or lecturer.'" —(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

Lord Robertson 1658
The Earl of Crewe 1661
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1663

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 :

The Earl of Crewe 1664

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 35, after the word 'statute,' to insert the words '(3) The governing body of a University or constituent college to which the statute relates, or any other person, corporation, or body directly affected by the statute, may, within three months from the notification thereof in the Dublin *Gazette*, petition the Lord-Lieutenant in Council to disallow the whole or any part thereof. (4) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may refer any such petition to the Irish Universities Committee, with a direction that the committee hear the petitioner personally or by counsel, and report specially to the Lord-Lieutenant in Council on the matter of the petition. (5) If the committee report in favour of the disallowance of the statute of any part thereof, the Lord-Lieutenant may, by Order in Council, disallow the whole or part thereof accordingly, but any such disallowance shall be without prejudice to the making of a new statute.'"—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

Lord Ashbourne 1665

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6 :

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, lines 1 to 3, to leave out subsection (2) and to insert the following new subsection : '(2) The Dublin Commissioners shall be the Right Hon. Christopher Palles, Alexander Anderson, John Pius

Boland, Sir William Francis Butler, Denis Joseph Coffey, Stephen Gwynn, Henry Jackson, Sir John Rhys, the Most Rev. William James Walsh, Bertram Coghill Alan Windle; and the Belfast Commissioners shall be His Honour James Johnston Shaw, Samuel Dill, the Rev. Thomas Hamilton, Donald Macalister, Robert T. Martin, Sir Arthur William Rücker, Johnson Symington.' "—(*The Earl of Crewe*.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7:

Lord Killanin 1666

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 22, after the word 'buildings,' to insert the words 'including residential buildings.' "—(*Lord Killanin.*)

The Earl of Crewe 1667

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Earl of Crewe 1667

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'benefaction,' to insert the words 'and the professor or lecturer is not eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies, or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology.' "—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Killanin 1668

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line, 39, after the word 'funds,' to insert the words 'or (*b*) the erection of any church, chapel, or place of religious worship or observance by means of private benefaction within or without the precincts of the University or college.' "—(*Lord Killanin.*)

The Earl of Crewe 1669
The Earl of Camperdown 1670
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1670
The Marquess of Ripon 1671

On Question, "That those words be there inserted,"

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 32; Not Contents, 31.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to,

Clauses 8 to 16 agreed to.

Clause 17:

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 17, as amended, agreed to.

The Earl of Crewe 1673

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 17 to insert the following new clause: '(1) There shall be a committee of the Privy Council in Ireland styled the Irish Universities Committee. The committee shall consist of such number of members of the Privy Council in Ireland, not being less than 5, as the Lord-Lieutenant may think fit to appoint, two at least being persons who are or have been Judges of the Supreme Court. (2) The powers and duties of the Irish Universities Committee may be exercised and discharged by any three or more members of the committee, so long as one of those members is a person who is or has been a Judge of the Supreme Court. (3) The costs of all parties of and incident to the hearing of any petition or appeal under this Act which is heard by the Irish Universities Committee shall be in the discretion of the committee. (4) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may make rules generally for regulating the procedure of the Irish Universities Committee, and may, by those rules, prescribe the time within which any appeal under this Act may be made, and the mode in which any costs allowed under this Act may be recovered.'"—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

Lord Ashbourne 1675

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To add, at the end of subsection (2) the words 'and in the case of appeal under Section 17, then so long as two of those members are persons who are or have been judges of the Supreme Court.'"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

The Earl of Crewe 1675

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX., having been suspended), Amendments reported; Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Telegraph (Construction) Bill; Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order). Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bills read 3ª with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1676

Finance Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1676

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1676

Naval Marriages Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 3ª, and passed 1676

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1676

Lunacy Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1677

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 3ª, and passed 1677

Married Women's Property Bill: Grand Jury (Ireland) Act, 1836, Amendment Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1677

Public Works Loans Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order). Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1677

Agricultural Holdings Bill.—Commons' Amendment considered (according to order).

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 1677

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Commons in the said Amendment."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

Lord Clinton 1678
Earl Carrington 1679

On Question, agreed to.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—Commons' Amendment considered (according to order).

Commons' Amendment—

"In page 1, line 13, to leave out from the word 'commission' to the end of the clause."

The Earl of Crewe 1680

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Commons in the said Amendment."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1681
Lord Clonbrock 1681

On Question, agreed to.

METROPOLITAN POLICE—REPORT OF COMMISSION.

Earl Russell 1682
Earl Beauchamp 1685
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1686

SCOTTISH DIVORCE LAW.

Earl Russell 1686
The Lord Chancellor 1687

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 30TH JUNE, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dover Graving Docks Bill.—Lords' Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to 1687

Lower Thames (Grays) Dock Bill (BY ORDER).—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn 1687

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 1687

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Considered; read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1688

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to:—Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill; Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland) Bill; Costs in Criminal Cases Bill; University of Durham Bill; Finance Bill; Naval Marriages Bill; Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill; Married Women's Property Bill; Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill; Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill, without Amendment.

Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, with an Amendment.

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill; Telegraph (Construction) Bill; Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill; Old-Age Pensions Bill; Irish Universities Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to:—Agricultural Holdings Bill [Lords]; Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Amendments to:—Registration Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Thames River Steamboat Service Act (1904) Amendment Bill [Lords], without Amendment 1688

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—2 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table. 13 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1688

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1689

Women's Enfranchisement Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1689

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Local Taxation Returns (England).—Annual Returns for 1905–6, Parts V.–VIII.; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 276] 1689

Prisons (Ireland).—Thirtieth Report of the General Prisons Board (Ireland); to lie upon the Table 1689

Strikes and Lock-outs.—Report on Strikes and Lock-outs of 1907, and on Conciliation and Arbitration Boards; to lie upon the Table 1689

Board of Trade (Labour Department) (Changes in Wages, etc.).—Report on Changes in Rates of Wages and Hours of Labour in the United Kingdom; to lie upon the Table 1689

July 30.] *Page*

Navigation and Shipping.—Annual Statement for the United Kingdom; to lie upon the Table 1689

Railway Returns.—Returns of the Capital, Traffic Receipts, and Working Expenditure of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom; to lie upon the Table 1689

Statistical Abstract (United Kingdom).—Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom, in each of the last fifteen years; to lie upon the Table 1690

Railway Servants (Hours of Labour).—Report by the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under the Railway Regulation Act, 1893; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 278] 1690

Railway and Canal Traffic Acts, 1888 and 1894.—Tenth Report by the Board of Trade of Proceedings under Section 31 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 279] ... 1690

Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1906 (Dispensing Powers).—Report by the Board of Trade of the cases in which they have exercised their powers under Section 78 of the Merchant Act, 1906, during the year ended 31st May, 1908; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 280] 1690

Navy (Exceptions to King's Regulations).—List of Exceptions to the King's Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances; to lie upon the Table 1690

Fleets (Great Britain and Foreign Countries).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277] 1690

Naval Expenditure (Principal Naval Powers).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 281] 1690

Naval Casualties.—Return presented relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 282]... 1691

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2075 to 4082; to lie upon the Table 1691

Board of Education.—Report of the Consultative Committee upon the School Attendance of Children below the Age of Five; to lie upon the Table ... 1691

Metropolitan Police (Royal Commission).—Report of the Commissioners upon the duties of the Metropolitan Police. Vols. II. and III.; to lie upon the Table 1691

County Courts (Plaints and Sittings).—Return presented relative thereto; to lie upon the table and to be printed. [No. 283]... 1691

Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill, 1908.—Table of Comparison between the Provisions of the Bill and existing Enactments; to lie upon the Table 1691

Paupers and Dependants (Scotland).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 284] 1691

Naval Expenditure (Principal Naval Powers).—Return presented, relative thereto, to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 281] 1691

Civil Servants (Retirement at the Age of Sixty-five).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 286] ... 1692

Foreshores.—Treasury Minute, directing the application of moneys received by the Board of Trade in the year ended 31st March, 1908, in respect of the rights and interests of the Crown in the Foreshores of the United Kingdom; to lie upon the Table 1692

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Inquiry into Charities (County of Devon).—Further Return relative thereto; to be printed. [No. 287] 1962

Merchant Shipping, 1907.—Copy ordered, "of Tables showing the Progress of Merchant Shipping in the United Kingdom and the principal Maritime Countries" 1692

Iron and Steel, 1907.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum and Statistical Tables showing the production and consumption of Iron Ore and Pig Iron, and the production of Steel, in the United Kingdom and the principal Foreign Countries in recent years, and the Imports and Exports of certain classes of Iron and Steel Manufactures" 1692

Coal Tables, 1907.—Copy ordered, "of Statistical Tables relating to the production, consumption, and imports and exports of Coal in the British Empire and the principal Foreign Countries in each year from 1885 to 1907.

Tea and Coffee, 1908.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum and Statistical Tables showing the consumption of Tea and Coffee in the Principal Countries of Europe, the United States, and certain British Colonies" 1693

Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884.—Address for "Return showing the working of the Regulations made in 1886 for carrying out the Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884" 1693

Navy and Army (Inquiries).—Return ordered, "giving in chronological order, according to the dates of publication of the Reports, a list of all Inquiries into Naval and Military affairs which have been held since the year 1800, the Reports of which have been published as Parliamentary Papers" 1693

Scottish Local Authorities (Deputation Expenses).—Return ordered, "of Expenses during each of the five years ending the 15th day of May, 1908, of Deputations to London in connection with (*a*) Public General Bills; (*b*) Private Bills or Provisional Orders; and (*c*) other purposes; incurred by the following bodies in Scotland (to be separately stated for each body), viz.: Town councils, county councils, district committees, district lunacy boards, parish councils, distress committees, school boards, educational trusts, and water, gas, dock, harbour, or other commissioners or trustees liable to make Returns under the Local Taxation Returns (Scotland) Act, 1881" 1693

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Congestion Commission 1694
Crockenden and Casey Estates, Cavan 1694
Drumlinny Evicted Tenant... 1694
Grant to Reinstated Tenant at Effernagh 1695
Port of London Bill... 1695
Patents Act, 1907 1695
Spitalfields Market 1696

July 30.] Page

Council of Judges—Annual Report ... 1696
Ely Estate Evicted Tenants ... 1697
Open Air Meeting Prosecutions ... 1697
Death from Anesthetics ... 1698
Motor Ambulances ... 1698
Wheeled Litter Ambulances ... 1699
Ridenham Village Green ... 1700
Fishery Authorities ... 1701
Distemper in Dogs ... 1701
Old-Age Pension Regulations ... 1702
Volunteer Quartermaster-Sergeants ... 1702
War Office Uniform Contracts ... 1702
Woolwich Ammunition Stores ... 1703
Long Service Medals for Volunteer Officers ... 1703
Exchequer and Audit Department Staff ... 1704
Colonial Audit Branch ... 1705
Cost of Birth Certificates ... 1705
Mohill Seed Loan ... 1705
Evicted Tenants on Lord Harlech's Estate ... 1706
Mong Evicted Tenant ... 1706
Crofter Estate Evicted Tenant ... 1707
Portadown Orange Arch ... 1707
Caledonian Petty Sessions Court ... 1707
Wexford Labourers' Cottage Scheme ... 1709
Irish Intermediate Education Inspectors ... 1710
Queens County Evicted Tenants ... 1711
Lord Listowel's Estate ... 1712
Mr. H. Frank's, North Kerry Estate ... 1712
Intermediate Education Rules ... 1713
Blacker Douglas Estate, North Kerry ... 1713
Deaths from Disease in India ... 1713
Madras Deputy Collector's Appeals ... 1714
State of Jasdan ... 1715
Importation of Spirits into Nigeria ... 1716
Exchequer Audit Department ... 1716
Jamaica Relief Fund ... 1716
Imports of Continental Hops ... 1718
Hop Harvest in the United States ... 1718
Hop Average in England and America ... 1718
Consumptive Emigrants to Canada ... 1721
Scottish Crofters ... 1721
Price of Beef in Chicago and New York ... 1721

Page
Imports of Foreign Hops 1722
Tarbert Pier—Lock Tyne 1725
Churches (Scotland) Commission 1726
Partial Exemption Scholars 1727
Police Day of Rest 1727
English Industrial Schools 1728
English Hop Average 1728
Cattle Disease 1728
Unemployment in the Building Trade 1729
Greenwich Park Night Watchman 1729
Strangers' Lobby Mosaics 1730
Weir Hospital Grant 1731
Aberdeen Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve 1731
Burning of Bonar Bridge, Crofter's House 1731
Beer Brewing Statistics 1732
Old-Age Pensions and Workhouse Pensioners 1733
West Africa Nickel Coinage 1733
Inland Revenue Chemical Officers 1733
Captain Bryce Wilson 1733
Shoebury Fishery Rights 1735
Irish Territorial Force Officers and Jury Service 1736
Director of Army Finance 1736
Printing of Government Bills 1736
Rosyth 1737
Fisheries Investigations Report 1737
Customs Warehouses Stock-taking 1737

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Submarine Dangers 1738
Report on the Naval Manœuvres 1739
Royal Naval Reserve 1739
Trial Trips of New Vessels 1739
Messrs. G. Corderoy and Co. and the Admiralty 1740
Naval Discussions 1741
Naval Ordnance Department and Petitions from Employees 1742
Overtime in Deptford Victualling Yard 1742
Deptford Victualling Yard Storehouse Staff 1743
Naval Courts Martial 1743
Contracts for Destroyers 1644
Naval Officers and the Press 1744
Progress in India 1745
Afforestation in India 1746

July 30.] Page

Indian Administrative Reforms 1746
Mr. Tilak's Conviction 1747
St. Luci Property Tax Bill 1748
Dinizulu's Salary 1749
Transvaal Public Service 1749
British Indian Traders in the Transvaal 1750
White Labour on the Rand 1750
The Gilbert Islands 1751
Egyptian Schools and English Teachers 1751
Brigandage in Turkey 1752
German Arrest of the Trawler "General" 1753
German Arrest of the Trawler "Taurns" 1754
Imprisonment of M. Tchaikovsky in St. Petersburg 1754
Persian Imports of Arms—Proposed Russian Loan 1755
Colonel Leakhoff's Action in Teheran 1755
Increase in Lunacy 1756
Provincial Homes Investment Company 1756
Motor 'Bus Breakdowns 1757
Illicit Hawking of Beer 1757
Metropolitan Police 1758
Arlesey Asylum Brewery 1758
International Securities Corporation Limited 1758
Shunting Fatality at Leeds 1759
Fraudulent Building Societies 1759
Unemployment Statistics 1760
Unemployment in Manchester 1760
Distress at Erith 1761
Police Traps for Motorists 1761
Refusal of a Charter to Eastbourne 1762
Oldham Postman's Wages 1763
Putney Telephone Exchange 1763
Government Pensions 1764
Royal London Friendly Society 1764
Reorganisation of the Customs 1766
Ballinorley (Sligo) Teacher's Residence 1767
Miltown Evicted Tenants 1768
Clovelly Evicted Tenants 1768
Ballinorley National School... 1769
Fair Rent Notices 1772
The All-Red Route 1773
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill 1773

NEW BILLS.

White Phosphorous Matches Prohibition Bill.—To be read a second time upon Monday, 12th, October, and to be printed. [Bill 351[... ... 1774

Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill.—To be read a second time upon Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 352] 1774

Crofters' Commons Grazings Regulation Bill.—To be read a second time upon Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 353] 1774

Local Government (Scotland) Bill.—To be read a second time upon Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 354] 1774

Transfer of Goods Bill.—To be read a second time upon Wednesday, 14th October, and to be printed. [Bill 356] 1775

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 355] 1775

Irish Universities Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 358] 1775

Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendment to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 361] 1775

Telegraph Construction Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 360] 1775

Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 359] 1775

Port of London Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Joint Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 350] 1775

Commons Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 357] 1775

Business of The House (Private Business).—Motion made, and Question proposed—"That the Proceedings on any Private Business set down for consideration at 8.15 this evening by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means may be entered upon at any hour, and be not interrupted under any Standing Order regulating the sittings of the House."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 1776
Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 1776
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire E.) 1777
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1778
Mr. Asquith... 1780

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House of Commons (Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms.—Ordered that Mr. Barlow be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease*) 1781

Consolidated Fund) Appropriation) Bill.—Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now a second time."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1781
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1792
Mr. Bridgeman (Shopshire, Oswestry) 1796
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1800
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1808
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 1814
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) ... 1819
Mr. Stuart Wortley... 1822
Sir Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) 1823
The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) ... 1826
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1831
Mr. William Jones (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) 1833
Mr. Montagu (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton) 1835
Sir George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 1836
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1842
Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 1844

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down for consideration by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

London and District Electricity Supply Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this Bill be read a second time."

Mr. Chaplin (Surrey, Wimbledon) 1846
Mr. Timothy Davies (Fulham) 1848

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 1851
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. McKinnon Wood, Glasgow, St. Rollox) 1852
Mr. Rowlands (Kent, Dartford) 1858
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 1861
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 1862
Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) 1863
Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster) 1868
Sir John Benn (Devonport) 1869
Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks) 1872
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Churchill, Dundee) 1873
Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square) 1878
Mr. John Ward (Stoke-upon-Trent) 1880

Mr. CHAPLIN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 156 ; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 237.)

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided :—Ayes, 138 ; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 238.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill.—Postponed proceeding on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time.'," resumed.
Question again proposed.

Mr. Swift MacNeill 1885
Earl Winterton (Sussex, Horsham) 1890
The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, M.) ... 1892
Mr. Clynes (Manchester, N.E.) 1893
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 1896
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, S.) 1897
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forforshire) 1901

Questions put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.

EAST INDIA LOANS (RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION WORKS AND GENERAL OFFICES—Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom, on the Security of the Revenues of India, by the creation and issue of capital stock, bonds, debentures or bills ;—(1) A sum not exceeding £20,000,000, for the following purposes: (*a*) The construction, extension, and equipment of railways in India by State agency or through the agency of companies ; (*b*) the repayment of the principal of any bonds or debentures issued by any such company under the guarantee of the Secretary of State ; (*c*) the discharge of any obligations incurred by the Secretary of State by reason of the purchase of any railway or the determination of any contract from or with such company ; (*d*) the construction of irrigation works in India. (2) A sum not exceeding £5,000,000 for the general purposes of the Government of India."
Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Hobhouse ... 1903

East India Loans Bill.—"To empower the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise money in the United Kingdom for the construction, extension, and equipment of railways in India, by State agency or through the agency of companies, for the construction of Irrigation Works, and for other purposes," presented accordingly, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 362] 1904

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee 1904

Coroners (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to ... 1904

Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered.
Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1904

Greenwich Hospital.—Resolved, "That the Statement of the estimated Income and Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation for the year 1908–9 be approved."—(*Mr. Lambert*) 1904

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, FRIDAY, 31st JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

No Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order.
The same was ordered to lie on the Table 1905

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Brought from the Commons 1905

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1905

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to... 1905

Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill.—Moved, "That the Order made on the 25th day of March last, 'That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

The Acting Chairman of Committees (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) ... 1905
The Marquess of Salisbury 1907
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1908
Lord Stanley of Alderley 1908

On Question, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly.

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Navy (Battleship and Cruiser Repairs).—Return of the amount of money spent during the last two years on the repairs of battleships and cruisers launched since 1st January, 1898, together with the period of the repairs in each case. Ordered to be laid before the House.—(*The Earl Cawdor*; for the *Lord Ellenborough.*)... 1908

Port of London Bill.—Report of the Joint Committee with the proceedings of the Committee (Laid upon the Table yesterday); to be printed. [No. 202.] 1908

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Agricultural Statistics, 1907. Vol. XLII., Part III. 1908

Treaty Series, (No. 22 1908).—Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America providing:—For the conveyance of persons in custody for trial either in the Dominion of Canada or the United States through the territory of the other; and for reciprocal rights in wrecking and salvage in the waters contiguous to the boundary between the Dominion of Canada and the United States; Signed at Washington, 18th May, 1908 1908

Trade Reports: Annual Series.—No. 4083. Japan. Tainan (South Formosa) 1908

Queen's College, Belfast.—Annual Report of the President, for the year 1907–1908 1908

Fishery Investigations.—Report of the Committtee appointed to inquire into the scientific and statistical investigations now being carried on in relation to the fishing industry of the United Kingdom 1908

National Gallery, Ireland.—Report of the Director to the Board of Governors and Guardians, for the year 1907.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1908

Shop Hours Act, 1904 (West Riding of Yorkshire).—Order made by the council of the county of West Riding of Yorkshire, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the urban districts of Ravensthorpe, Soothill Nether, and Thornhill. Laid before the House, and ordered to lie on the Table 1909

Navy (Battleship and Crusier Repairs).—Return respecting. Laid before the House (pursuant to Order of this Day) and to be printed. [No. 204.] 1910

Telegraph (Construction) Bill; Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1910

Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1910

Coroners (Ireland) Bill; Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill; Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments, agreed to 1910

Friendly Societies Bill.—Read 3ª (according to Order) further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1910

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to Order) and agreed to 1910

Public Works Loans Bill; Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—Read 3ª (according to Order, and passed 1910

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—Returned from the Commons with several of the Amendments agreed to; and several others disagreed to; with reasons for such disagreement.

Moved "That the Commons reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords Amendments be considered."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe.*)

Moved "That the House do not insist on the said Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

Earl Cromer 1911
The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (*Viscount Wolverhampton*) ... 1913

July. 31] Page

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1913
The Earl of Crewe 1919
The Marquess of Salisbury 1922

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

Viscount Midleton 1924
Viscount Wolverhampton 1925

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

Viscount St. Aldwyn 1926
Viscount Wolverhampton 1927

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

The Earl of Camperdown 1926
Lord Atkinson 1929
Viscount Wolverhampton 1929
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1930
Lord Ashbourne 1930
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1930

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

Viscount St. Aldwyn 1931

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on that part of the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhawpton.*)

Lord Atkinson 1933
Viscount Midleton 1933

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

The Earl of Camperdown 1934

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved to resolve, "That this House, although not insisting upon its Amendments to the Old-Age Pensions Bill, does not accept the Reasons offered by the House of Commons, or consent that the said Reasons should hereafter be drawn into a precedent. The Bill is, in the opinion of this House, not one for the grant of aids and supplies to His Majesty in Parliament, and involves questions of policy affecting the treatment of necessitous persons, in which both Houses are concerned, and with which this House has in the past been accustomed to deal."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

The Lord Chancellor 1935
The Earl of Halsbury 1936
The Earl of Dartmouth 1937
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1937
The Earl of Crewe 1938
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1938

On Question—

Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 37 ; Not-Contents, 23.

Irish Universities Bill.—Returned from the Commons with several of the Amendments agreed to, and one of the Amendments disagreed to, and an Amendment made in lieu thereof.

The Earl of Crewe 1941

Moved, "That the Commons' Amendments to the Lords' Amendments be agreed to."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That this House do not insist on that part of the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1942

On Motion, Question agreed to.

Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill [H.L.].

Commons' Amendments considered (on Motion), and agreed to 1942

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Read 1ª ; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. [No. 203.] 1942

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 31st JULY, 1908.

The House met at 12 of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill (by Order).—Read the third time, and passed. 1942

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; to lie upon the Table. 11 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1942

NATAL (TRIAL OF DINIZULU).—Petition for inquiry; To lie upon the Table 1943

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Queen's College, Belfast.—Report of the President for the year 1907–8 ; to lie upon the Table 1943

Offences (Ireland).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 289] 1943

Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 290] 1943

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order made by the Council of the County of the West Riding of Yorkshire, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops, within the urban districts of Ravensthorpe, Soothill Nether, and Thornhill; to lie upon the Table 1943

Taxes and Imposts.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 291] 1943

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Agricultural Statistics, 1906. Vol. XLII. Part III. Prices and supplies of Corn, Live Stock, and other Agricultural Produce; to lie upon the Table 1943

Treaty Series (No. 22, 1908.)—Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America providing: (1) For the Conveyance of Persons in Custody for Trial either in the Dominion of Canada or the United States through the Territory of the other; and (2) for Reciprocal Rights in Wrecking and Salvage in the Waters contiguous to the Boundary between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. Signed at Washington, 18th May, 1908. Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 30th June, 1908; to lie upon the Table 1944

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 4083; To lie upon the Table 1944

Statistical Abstract (Foreign Countries).—Statistical Abstract for the principle and other Foreign Countries in each year from 1896 to 1905–6; to lie upon the Table 1449

Trade (Foreign Countries and British Possessions).—Abstract and detailed Tables showing Countries of Consignment of Imports and Countries of Ultimate Destination of Exports; to lie upon the Table ... 1944

Denmark (New Customs Tariff).—Translation of the Law establishing a New Customs Tariff for Denmark; together with comparison, as far as possible, of the Rates of Customs Duty contained in the New Tariff with the rates at present in force, and the English equivalents of both; to lie upon the Table 1944

Gas Undertakings.—Return order, "relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom" 1944

Gas Undertakings (Local Authorities).—Return ordered, "relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom belonging to Local Authorities for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1908 1945

Emigration and Immigration.—Copy ordered, "of Statistical Tables relating to Emigration and Immigration from and into the United Kingdom in the year 1907, and Report to the Board of Trade thereon." 1945

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Men Employed by Tramway Companies 1945
Acquisition of Estate of Mrs. Charlotte E. Hynes 1945
Acquisition of Untenanted Evicted Holdings on the Warren Estate 1946

Page
Listowel Fair Rent Applications 1946
Scottish Firms and Post Office Contracts 1947
"The Iron and Coal Trade Review" 1947
Postmen's Duty at Port Talbot 1948
Tenders for New Scottish Fishery Cruisers 1948
Irish Fisheries Grant Supplementary Estimates 1948
The Jasdan Succession 1949
Naval Officers and Foreign Languages 1949
Pay for Rough Carpentry Work in Government Workshops 1950
Loss of H.M.S. "Whiting" 1950
Postal Delay at Waterville and Caherdaniel 1951
Bolton Postal Staff 1951
Manchester Postal Staff 1951
Postal Telegraphic Duties at Bournemouth 1952
Post Office Accommodation at Ballymoney 1952
Deaths under Anæsthetics—Suggested Royal Commission 1952
Cost of Reformatories and Industrial Schools 1953
Cost of Prisons 1954
Cost of Inebriate Homes 1954
Cost of Lunatic Asylums 1955
Overworking of Children and Young Persons 1956
Cost of Police 1957
Annual Cost of Poor Relief... 1958
Adjustment of Financial Relations between County and Borough Councils ... 1958
Heating, Lighting, and Cleaning of Scottish Schools 1959
Appeal Against Magistrates' Decision in the Cleve Case... 1959
War Office Accounting Officer 1959
Increased Salaries for Excise Officers 1960
Salaries of Excise Officers 1960
Supplementary Estimates 1961
Purchase of the Hort Estate 1961
Unpaid Mess Debts contracted by Staff Sergeant Scully, Dublin Metropolitan Police 1963
Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement of Mr. James Sisk 1964
Treatment of Irish School Inspectors 1964
Royal Irish Constabulary Bill 1965
Irish Education Grants 1965
Welsh Disestablishment 1966

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The Jasdan Successor 1967
Unemployment in Gateshead 1967
Friday Sittings in the Autumn 1968

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill.—Lords' Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to ... 1968

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.—Resolved, That this House do meet To-morrow, at Ten of the Clock.—(*Mr. J. Pease.*) 1968

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1968

Old-Age Pensions Bill.

Lords Amendments considered.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 1, line 5, after '(1),' to insert the words 'until the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fifteen.'"

Motion made, and Question, "That this house doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendments," put and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 1, line 21, at end, to insert the words 'as verified wherever practicable by certificates of birth or baptism or in the absence of such certificates by census returns or other official documents, or where no such certificates or documents are attainable in such other manner as may seem sufficient to the pension authorities.'"

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1971

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1971
Mr. Lloyd-George 1971
Lord R. Cecil 1972

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'must' to insert the words 'satisfy the pension authorities that.'"

Mr. Lloyd-George 1973

Motion made, and Question, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put. and agreed to.

Lords Amendments—

"In page 2, line 24, to leave out the first 'have,' and to insert the words 'he has,' and to leave out the second 'have,' and to insert the word 'has.'"

"In page 2, line 1, to leave out the words 'means of the,' and after the word 'person,' to insert the words 'must satisfy the pension authorities that his yearly means.'"

"In page 2, line 2, to leave out the word 'must,' and to insert the word 'do.'"

Agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 7, to leave out from the word 'until' to the word 'Parliament' in line 9.'"

Motion made, and Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendments."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*)—put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 2, line 24, to leave out the word 'for,' and to insert the words 'during the last.'"

Mr Lloyd-George 1974

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 1974
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1975
Mr. Lloyd-George 1975
Lord R. Cecil 1976
Mr. Lloyd-George 1976
Lord R. Cecil 1976
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 1977
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1978
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1979
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1979

Lords Amendment disagreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 3, line 17, after the word 'and' to insert the words 'if the term of imprisonment to which he is sentenced exceeds one month he shall be disqualified.'"

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1980
Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley) 1980
Lord R. Cecil 1981
Mr. Asquith 1981

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 145; Noes, 33. (Division List No. 239.)

Lords Amendment—

"In page 4, line 2, after the word 'him,' to insert the words 'as to produce the largest income that can be reasonably obtained from it.'"

Mr. Lloyd-George 1983
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1985
Mr. Lloyd-George 1987
Mr. Bowles 1987
Mr. Goulding (Worcester) 1988
Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 1989
Mr. Jesse Collings 1989
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1990
The Attorney-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) 1990
Sir H. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.) 1991

Mr. Crooks 1991
Lord R. Cecil 1992
Mr. Mond (Chester) 1993
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) 1993

Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment" put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, line 20, at end, to insert the words '(*d*) if any person is aggrieved by the refusal or neglect of a local pension committee to consider a claim for a pension, or to determine any question referred to them, that person may apply in the prescribed manner to the central pension authority, and that authority may, if they consider that the local pension committee have refused or neglected to consider and determine the claim or question within a reasonable time, themselves consider and determine the claim or question in the same manner as on an appeal from the decision of the local pension committee.'"

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment" put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, after subsection (*d*) to insert the words '(*e*) The expression 'party aggrieved' shall include a member of the said committee who has taken part in the consideration of the report and has dissented from the decision.'"

Mr. Lloyd-George 1994

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. A. J Balfour 1994

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, line 30, at end, to insert the words 'for the purposes of this subsection the expression "borough" includes a Metropolitan borough and the city of London, and the expression "council of a borough" includes the council of a Metropolitan borough, and as respects the City of London, the mayor, aldermen, and commons of the City of London in Common council assembled.'"

Motion made and Question, "That the House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, after line 40, to insert as a new subsection '(3) The Local Government Board may appoint any person or any persons not exceeding three in number to be a member or members of any local pensions committee, or of any sub-committee appointed by the latter, who shall, when appointed, have all the rights of ordinary members of such committees.'"

Motion made, and Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 6, after line 6, to insert as a new subsection: '(6) Any reference in this Act to pension authorities shall be construed as a reference to the pension officer, the local pension committee, and the central pension authority, or to any one of them, as the case requires.' "

"In page 6, line 7, after the word 'obtaining,' to insert the words 'or containing.' "

Agreed to.

Lords Amendment.

"In page 6, line 8, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'either for himself or for any other person, or for the purpose of obtaining or continuing an old-age pension under this Act for himself or for any other person at a higher rate than that appropriate to the case.' "

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1996
Mr. Lloyd-George 1997

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 6, line 9, after the word 'representation,' to insert the words 'or if any person directly or indirectly deprives himself of any income or property in order to qualify himself for the receipt of an old-age pension, or for the receipt of an old-age pension at a higher rate than that to which he would otherwise be entitled under this Act.' "

Mr. Lloyd-George 1997

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Lord R. Cecil 1997
Mr. Lloyd-George 1997

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 6, after line 11, to insert as a new subsection: '(2) The pension officer may at any time, without the matter having been referred to him, call upon and require a person in receipt of an old-age pension to establish that he has not since the same was granted to him become disqualified to receive it, and the pension officer shall inquire into the matter of the pensioner's disqualification and report on the same to the pension committee, who shall receive and, as far as applicable, act upon the said report as if it were a report received under the provisions of Section 7, subsection (*c*) of this Act.' "

Mr. Lloyd-George 1998

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment.' "—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. Bowles... 1998
Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars) 1999

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 7, after line 17, to insert as a new subsection: '(3) Every regulation under this Act shall be laid before each House of Parliament forthwith, and if an Address is presented to His Majesty by either House of Parliament within the next subsequent twenty-one days on which that House had sat next after any such regulation is laid before it, praying that the regulation may be annulled, His Majesty in Council may annul the regulation, and it shall thenceforth be void, but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder.'"

Agreed to.

Committee of seven Members appointed to draw up reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords to the Bill.

Committee nominated of—Mr. Asquith, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, and Mr. Eugene Wason.

Three to be the quorum.

Committee to withdraw immediately.—(*Mr Lloyd-George.*)

Irish Universities Bill.—Lords Amendments considered.

Lords Amendments—

"In Clause 3, after the word 'divinity,' to insert the words 'Provided that no test of religious belief shall be imposed by the governing body of either of the two new Universities or any constituent college on any such professor or lecturer as a condition of his appointment or recognition by the governing body as such professor or lecturer.'"

"In page 3, after line 35, to insert the following new subsections: '(3) The governing body of a University or constituent college to which the statute relates, or any other person, corporation, or body directly affected by the statute may, within three months from the notification thereof in the Dublin *Gazette*, petition the Lord-Lieutenant in Council to disallow the whole or any part thereof. (4) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may refer any such petition to the Irish Universities Committee with a direction that the Committee hear the petitioner personally or by counsel, and report specially to the Lord-Lieutenant in Council on the matter of the petition. (5) If the committee report in favour of the disallowance of the statute or any part thereof, the Lord-Lieutenant may, by Order in Council, disallow the whole or part thereof accordingly, but any such disallowance shall be without prejudice to the making of a new statute.'"

"In page 4, lines 1 to 3, to leave out subsection (2) and to insert as a new subsection '(2) The Dublin Commissioners shall be the Right Hon. Christopher Palles, Alexander Anderson, John Pius Boland, Sir William Francis Butler, Denis Joseph Coffey, Stephen Gwynn, Henry Jackson, Sir John Rhys, The Most Rev. William Walsh, Bertram Coghill Alan Windle; and the Belfast Commissioners shall be His Honour James Johnston Shaw, Samuel Dill, the Rev. Thomas Hamilton, Donald Macalister, Robert T. Martin, Sir Arthur William Rucker, Johnson Symington.'"

Agreed to.

July 31.]

Page

Lords Amendment—

> "In page 5, line 39, after the word 'funds,' to insert the words 'and the professor or lecturer is not eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies, or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology; or (*b*) the erection of any church, chapel, or place of religious observance by means of private benefaction within or without the precincts of the University or college.'"

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) 2001

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 2002
Mr. Kettle (*Tyrone, E.*) 2003
Mr. Jesse Collings (*Birmingham, Bordesley*) 2005
Mr. Butcher (*Cambridge University*) 2006
Lord Edmund Talbot (*Sussex, Chichester*) 2006
Mr. Hay Morgan (*Cornwall, Truro*) 2007
Mr. Haviland Burke (*King's County, Tullamore*) 2008
Sir Philip Magnus (*London University*) 2008
Mr. Massie (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 2009
Mr. Walsh (*Lancashire, Ince*) 2009
Mr. Byles (*Salford, N.*) 2010
Mr. Verney (*Buckinghamshire, N.*) 2011

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 142; Noes, 40. (Division List No. 240.)

Lords Amendment—

> "In page 5, line 41, after the word 'teaching' to insert the word 'or' and leave out the words 'or religious worship.'"

Agreed to.

An Amendment made to the Bill in lieu of the Lords Amendment—

> "In page 5, line 39, which was disagreed to, by inserting in page 5, line 41, at the end thereof, the words 'and no professor of or lecturer in theology or divinity shall be eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Remaining Lords' Amendments agreed to.

Committee appointed to draw up reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by the Lords to the Bill.

Committee nominated of, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Birrell, Mr. Bright, Mr. Walter Long, and Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Three to be the quorum.

To withdraw immediately.—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Telegraph (Construction) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 2013

Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 2014

Whale Fisheries Ireland Bill.—Lords Amendment to omit subsection (1) of Clause 5 considered.

Mr. Mooney (*Newry*).

The Attorney-General for Ireland (*Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange*) 2014

Lords Amendment agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT (AUTUMN SITTINGS).

Mr. Asquith ... 2014

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House at its rising to-morrow do adjourn until Monday, 12th October, next; that for the remainder of the session Government business have precedence at every sitting; that at the conclusion of Government business on each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that on Fridays the House, unless it otherwise resolves, shall at its rising stand adjourned until the following Monday."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Sir Charles W. Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) ... 2016

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'next,' to the end of the Question."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Asquith ... 2018
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 2018
Sir Francis Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) ... 2019
Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (*Leicester*) ... 2020
Mr. J. MacVeagh (*Down, S.*) ... 2021
Mr. Jowett (*Bradford, W.*) ... 2023
Mr. Asquith ... 2024

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. A. E. W. Mason (*Coventry*) ... 2025
The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby*) ... 2028
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) ... 2034
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) ... 2037
Mr. Essex (*Gloucestershire, Cirencester*) ... 2040
Mr. Gretton (*Rutland*) ... 2042
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 2045
Mr. Morrell (*Oxfordshire, Henley*) ... 2050
Mr. Montagu (*Cambridgeshire, Chesterton*) ... 2053
The Treasurer of the Household (*Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.*) 2055
Mr. Seddon (*Lancashire, Newton*) ... 2058
Mr. Gladstone ... 2061
Mr. Cleland (*Glasgow, Blackfriars*) ... 2063
Mr. Dundas White (*Dumbartonshire*) ... 2066
The Secretary for Scotland (*Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire*) ... 2067
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) ... 2069
Mr Whitley (*Halifax*) ... 2069
Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) ... 2070

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That this House, at its rising to-morrow, do adjourn until Monday, 12th October next; that for the remainder of the session Government business have precedence at every sitting; that at the conclusion of Government business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that on Fridays the House, unless it otherwise resolves, shall at its rising stand adjourned until the following Monday.

Old-Age Pensions Bill.

Reasons for disagreeing to several of the Lords Amendments reported, and agreed to.

To be communicated to the Lords.—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*) 2070

Irish Universities Bill.

Reasons for disagreeing to one of the Lords Amendments reported, and agreed to.

To be communicated to the Lords.—(*Mr. Birrell.*) 2070

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to,—Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Public Works Loans Bill, without Amendment:—

Friendly Societies Bill, with Amendments:—

Amendments to Small Holdings and Allotments Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to consolidate The Companies Act, 1862, and the Acts amending it." [Companies Consolidation Bill [Lords.]

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Lunacy Acts, 1890 and 1891." [Lunacy Bill [Lords.] 2070

Friendly Societies Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered and agreed to. 2072

EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 31st July; *Mr. Churchill*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 292.] 2072

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nine minutes after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, SATURDAY, 1st AUGUST, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Report of proceedings at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888 2073

Denmark (New Customs Tariff).—Translation of the law establishing a new customs tariff for Denmark 2073

Statistics.—Statistical Abstract for the principal and other foreign countries in each year from 1896 to 1905-1906 2073

Trade.—Annual statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions, 1907. Supplement to Volumes I. and II. 2073

Board of Education.—Outline of the successive legislative and administrative conditions affecting the relation of the Board of Education to Agricultural Education.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 2073

Aug. 1.] Page

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Standing Order No. XXXIX considered (according to order), and suspended for this day's sitting 2073

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Commons Regulations (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill.—Moved, that Standing Order No. 102B be dispensed with (Lord Steward (*E. Beauchamp*) (for the Earl Carrington)); agreed to; Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended); Bill read 3^{a}, and passed 2073

Friendly Societies Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments, agreed to 2074

Consolidated Funds (Appropriation Bill.—Brought from the Commons. Read 1^{a}: Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 2^{a} (The Lord Steward (*E. Beauchamp*): Committee negatived; Bill read 3^{a}, and passed 2074

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent.

1. Consolidated (Appropriation). 2. Finance. 3. Patents and Designs. 3. Fatal Accidents (Damages) (No. 2.) 5. Police (Superannuation). 6. Public Health (Markets in Rural Districts). 7. Post Office Savings Bank. 8. Tobacco Growing (Scotland). 9. Wild Birds. 10. Companies. 11. Polling Districts (County Councils). 12. Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs). 13. Cran Measures. 14. Evicted Tenants (Ireland). 15. Agricultural Holding. 16. Public Works Loans. 17. Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland). 18. Small Holdings and Allotments. 19. Bee Pest (Ireland). 20. Friendly Societies. 21. Naval Marriages. 22. Expiring Law Continuance. 23. Old-Age Pensions. 24. Isle of Man (Customs Duties). 25. Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland). 26. Naval Lands (Volunteers). 27. Whale Fisheries (Ireland). 28. Cost in Criminal Cases. 29. Married Women's Property. 30. Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland). 31. University of Durham. 92. Grand Jury (Ireland) Act,1836, Amendment. 33. Registration. 34. Coroners (Ireland). 35. Endowed Schools (Masters). 36. Irish Universities. 37. Telegraph (Construction). 38. Public Offices Sites (Extension). 39. Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation. 40. Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation. 41. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1). 42. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2). 43. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3). 44. Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation. 45. Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation. 46. Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation. 47. Land Drainage Provisional Order. 48. Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order. 49. Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation. 50. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1). 51. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2). 52. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 3). 53. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4). 54. Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation. 55. Falkirk and District Water Order Confirmation. 56. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London). 57. Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation. 58. Tramways

Orders Confirmation (No. 2.) 59. Gas and Water Orders Confirmation. 60. Gas Orders Confirmation. 61. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1). 62. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2). 63. Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3). 64. Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, &c.) Order Confirmation. 65. Marriages Provisional Order. 66. Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation. 67. Wye Fisheries Provisional Order. 68. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1). 69. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2). 70. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4). 71. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5.) 72. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6). 73. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7). 74. Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8). 75. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9). 76. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10). 77. Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11). 78. Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation. 79. Commons Regulations (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order. 80. Conway and Colwyn Bay Joint Water Board. 81. Lincoln Corporation. 82. North Eastern Railway. 83. North East London Railway. 84. Bury and District Joint Water Board. 85. Draycott Gas. 86. Cardiff Railway. 87. King's College London (Transfer). 88. Audenshaw Urban District Council. 89. Trawe Valley Gas. 90. Bristol Tramways. 91. Cambrian Railways. 92. North British and Mercantile Insurance Company. 93. Upton Town Hall. 94. Blaydon and Ryton Water (Transfer). 95. Bromley and Crays Gas. 96. Stockport Corporation. 67. Humber Commercial Railway and Dock. 98. Southwell District Gas. 99. Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer). 100. Seaham Harbour Dock. 101. Camborne Water. 102. Briton Ferry Urban District Council. 103. Bristol Corporation. 104. Leicester Corporation. 105. Rochester Bridge. 106. Doncaster Corporation. 107. Motherwell Burgh Extension, etc. 108. Swinton and Mexbrough Gas. 109. Merthyr Tydfil Corporation. 110. Garw and Ogmore Gas. 111. Barry Railway. 112. Metropolitan District Railway. 113. Taff Vale Railway. 114. Northern Assurance Company. 115. Commercial Union Assurance Company. 116. Leeds Corporation. 117. Pontypridd Water. 118. Bognor Gas Light and Coke Company. 119. South Wales Electrical Power Distribution. 120. Aire and Calder Navigation. 121. Glyncorrwg Urban District Council. 122. Wishaw Burgh Electrical, etc. 123. Wolverhampton Corporation. 124. Finchley Urban District Council. 125. Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway, Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford-upon-Avon Junction Railway, and East and West Junction Railway (Amalgamation). 126. London County Council (Tramways and Improvements). 127. London County Council (Money). 128. Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment). 129. Honourable Artillery Company. 130. Leith Burgh. 131. London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway. 132. Liverpool Corporation (General Powers). 133. Tyne Improvement. 134. Widnes Corporation. 135. Margate Corporation. 136. Manchester Corporation. 137. Burnley Corporation. 138. Ammanford Urban District Council Water. 139. Metropolitan Electric Tramways. 140. Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water. 141. Wath and Bolton Gas Board. 142. South West Surburban Water. 143. Blackburn Corporation. 144. Keighley Corporation. 145. Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway. 146. Thames River Steamboat Service Act 1904 (Amendment). 147. Holderness Water. 148. London United Tramways. 149. Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2). 150. Sligo and Arigna Railway. 151. Criccieth Water and Improvement. 152. Padiham Urban District Council. 153. Central Ireland Electric Power. 154. Gosport Gas. 155. London County Council (General

Powers). 156. Ravensthorpe Urban District Council. 157. Crystal Palace Company. 158. River Wandle Protection. 159. Dover Graving Docks. 160. Tollemache Estate 2074

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Twelve o'clock, to Monday, the 12th of October next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: SATURDAY, 1st AUGUST, 1908.

The House met at Ten of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Children Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 2078

Daylight Saving Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 2078

Licensing Bill.—3 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table. 19 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 2078

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Fishery Investigation.—Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the Scientific and Statistical Investigations now being carried on in relation to the Fishing Industry of the United Kingdom; to lie upon the Table ... 2079

National Gallery (Ireland).—Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1907; to lie upon the Table 2079

Local Taxation Licences, &c., 1907–8.—Return presented, relative thereto to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 293.] 2079

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Report of the Proceedings at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under The Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888; to lie upon the Table... 2079

Board of Education.—Outline of the successive Legislative and Adminstrative Conditions affecting the relation of the Board of Education to Agricultural Education; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants in County Monaghan... 2079
Open Air Schools 2080
Welsh School Case 2080
Recognition of Training Colleges 2080
Structural Improvements of Denominational Schools in Single-School Areas ... 2081
De Blaguiere Estate, County Clare 2081
H.M.S. "Defence" 2083
Naval Programmes 2083
H.M.S. "Indomitable" 2084
Naval Manœuvres 2084
Milk Prosecutions 2084

Page
Fish Landed in Isle of Lewis 2085
Ribble Fisheries 2085
Action of Kildorrery Magistrates 2086
Birmingham Postal Servants and their Rates of Pay 2086
Old Age Pensions—Charities and Annuities 2086
Bombay Riots—Sentences 2087
Justification for Sentence for Sending Seditious Telegrams 2087
Rioting in Bombay 2087
Deputy Lieutenants in Queen's County 2088
Distribution of Land in County Cavan 2088
Baths in Constabulary Depot, Dublin 2089
Constabulary Recruits in Dublin 2089
Royal Irish Constabulary Depot Canteens 2090

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Director-General of Army Finance 2091
Kitcheners' Fighting Scouts 2092
Alcohol Imports into Nigeria 2093
Indemnity Acts—Precedent for Governors witholding Assent 2093
Dinizulu 2094
Motor Speeds in London 2095
Liverpool Prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act 2096
Sutherlandshire Evictions—Burning of a Crofter's House 2096
Tobacco Growing in Scotland 2097

Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be read a third time."

Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury) 2097
Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough) 2099
Mr. Byles (Salford, N.) 2100
The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby) 2100
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 2101
Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 2102
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 2103
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 2104

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they do not insist on their Amendments to the Old-age Pensions Bill to which this House has disagreed.

Aug. 1.] Page

That they do not insist on their Amendment to the Irish Universities Bill to which this House has disagreed, and agree to the Amendment made by the Commons to the Amendment made by the Lords without Amendment.

That they have agreed to,—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation Bill, Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to—Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill [Lords], without Amendment,

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners... 2106

The House went ;—and, having returned ;...

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal assent to a number of Acts (*see* page 2074).

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House, without Question put, till Monday, 12th October.

Adjourned at Twenty-three minutes after 12 o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXCIII.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JANUARY IN THE EIGHTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 22nd July, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill.—The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn.

Margate Corporation Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill.—Committed for To-morrow.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners.

Falkirk and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway, Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford-on-Avon Junction Railway, and East and West Junction Railway (Amalgamation) Bill [H.L.]; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [H.L].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5)—Bradfield (Rural Order)—Report from the Select Committee; That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the said Order, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The Orders made on the 15th instant respecting the commitment of the Bill to a Select Committee in regard to the said Order discharged.

Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, &c.) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Herschell), and reported from the Committee. [No. 174.]

PETITION.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Petition against; of persons signing; read, and ordered to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

DAIRIES, COWSHEDS, AND MILK SHOPS (IRELAND).

The Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milk Shops (Ireland) Order of the 3rd February 1908, and correspondence addressed to local authorities in Ireland with respect to the said Order: Laid before the House (pursuant to Order of yesterday) and to be printed. [No. 171.]

INLAND REVENUE.

Fifty-first Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Inland Revenue, for the year ended 31st March, 1908.

TRADE REPORTS, ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4071. Germany (Dantzig); No. 4072. Russia (Moscow); No. 4073. Turkey (Baghdad.)

COLONIES ANNUAL.

No. 566. Northern Territories of the Gold Coast: Report for 1907.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Seventy-sixth Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, with Appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1908.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie upon the Table.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 173.]

NEW BILL.

LUNACY BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Lunacy Acts, 1890 and 1891.—Was presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 172.]

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, before coming to the actual provision of this Bill I should like to call your Lordships' attention to some proceedings germane to the subject dealt with by the Bill. I refer to the discussion which took place on "Marriage in Christendom" at the Pan-Anglican Congress, and I think your Lordships will find that some rather strange expressions of opinion were there made which did not entirely agree with the legislation as it stands in this country. The chair was occupied by the Bishop of Montreal, and the discussion turned largely upon the subject of divorce in general and upon the re-marriage of divorced persons in Christendom and the attitude of the Church towards it.

Perhaps the most violent speech on the subject was one made by a layman at that Congress, Mr. G. W. E. Russell, who attached great importance to what I might call the high ecclesiastical view of marriage and of divorce, and he said that there was a lamentable tendency even among Church people to compromise and to concession. He asked whether the re-marriage of divorced people was repudiated as legalised concubinage. I am glad to say that that extreme view did not commend itself to all present even at that Congress. He went on to say that he desired to reaffirm publicly his conviction that marriage was a sacramental institution and that marriage was perpetual. Your Lordships are well aware that by the Articles of the Church of England itself it is expressly declared that marriage is not a sacrament, and therefore no person who professes to be in entire agreement with the Church of England can properly describe marriage as being called a sacrament by his Church, differing in that, as your Lordships know, from the Roman Catholic Church. On that the argument was founded that the marriage was indissoluble.

Canon E. F. Brown said that marriages of Christian men and women were, strictly speaking, indissoluble. It was not, he said, the function of the Church, whatever the view of the State, to re-marry any person who had a husband or wife alive. He added that—

> "In this matter the Church of England ought to take her stand by the Church of Rome."

That is a perfectly possible view, and so long as that view is limited to persons who accept it and believe it, there is no objection to their holding it and acting upon it. But I submit to your Lordships that there is no reason why those who do not hold that view; why those who do not take that extreme view of marriage as a sacrament; and, still less, why those who, like myself, are free-thinkers and give no allegiance at all to the principles which underlie the doctrines of the Church, should be bound by the views taken by other people. When we come to the question of legislation, I venture to suggest that the considerations which should guide us are considerations of public policy and expediency, and that no matter how large, important, or influential a section of the community hold particular views on this question, they should be left themselves to observe the particular views they hold without attempting to impose them upon others. At the end of the discussion the chairman said—

> "It rejoiced his heart to hear the magnificent conservative ring of the note which had been sounded on the question of marriage."

And he went on to say—

> "However the State might use its power to limit the lifelong force of the marriage tie, the Church, as long as it remained Christian, must follow Christ, even though such following might bring it into partial or open conflict with the State."

I have no objection to these views if held and acted upon by individuals, but there is no sort of reason why individuals who hold these views should attempt to force them upon individuals who do not hold them. When you come to consider the matter from the point of view of the State, which by the speakers at the Congress was sharply distinguished from the point of view of the Church, you have to consider what is expedient and advantageous.

Since I last presented this measure to your Lordships I have received support from a quarter which, from the point of view of legislation and of knowledge of the subject, is, I think, entitled to carry much more weight than the Pan-Anglican Congress. I refer to some observations which were made by Sir Gorell Barnes, the President of the Divorce Court, in the case of Dodd *v.* Dodd. Sir Gorell Barnes is eminently fitted to know the hardships and difficulties which occur in the present marriage law, and the great disadvantages that are inseparable from a condition of things where we allow very freely judicial separation, while limiting strictly the right to re-marry and complete freedom from the marriage tie; and he made these observations on a case which arose from a magistrate's order. By recent legislation more and more powers have been given to magistrates to make orders for judicial separation which cause a husband and a wife to live apart, and which have practically all the effect of an order for judical separation made by the Divorce Court. After pointing out the large extent to which these judicial separations are being obtained—some 7,000 a year—the President went on to say—

> "Applied first in an age remote and in a state of society different from the present, the remedy of permanent separation for matrimonial grievances would always seem to have been injudicious, even in days when persons could not escape from their surroundings as they can now, and when they were more amenable to the pressure and censures of the Church, and is now probably to be regarded as more unsatisfactory still and as tending to demoralisation and providing inadequate justice to the innocent. At the time of the Reformation, the Royal Commission issued by Henry VIII. and renewed by Edward VI., composed of ecclesiastics, civilians, and common lawyers, inquired into this subject. The project of reforming the law came to an end with the death of the latter king, but the Commissioners' Report was printed in the reign of Elizabeth, under the title '*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*,' and the recommendations were to the effect (*inter alia*) that separation *a mensa et thoro* should be abolished as productive of great abuses and scandal in the marriage state, and that, while restrictions and punishments should be imposed upon the guilty party, the innocent party should be permitted to obtain a divorce for, among other grounds, desertion: *see* Reeve's History, 2nd ed., vol iv., pp. 546, 547, summarising Ref. Leg. Eccl. 47-56. Desertion is a ground in Scotland and in certain other countries. Nothing, however, was done by the Legislature, and marriage remained indissoluble, except by Act of Parliament, until 1857, when, after much controversy, the Act of that year was passed, which can hardly be held to have attained to finality. By it the right of divorce was given, but confined to the cases specified therein. The remarks of Mr. Bishop in his work on marriage and divorce (s. 37), on the

> state of things which existed in England before that Act, are deserving of a most careful perusal. But the figures I have given above show the limited application of this Act, especially having regard to the great increase in the population of this country."

The President went on to say, and this is what I have often ventured to urge on your Lordships—

> "That the tendency of these orders is to encourage immorality, bearing in mind that human nature is what it is, and the classes of persons with whom the magistrates usually have to deal, I doubt whether anyone. of experience sufficient to judge, will deny. That is the opinion which I have formed after a long experience in this Court, where case after case shows what so often follows from these orders, and discloses a most unsatisfactory state of things. It is an opinion in accord with that expressed in very forcible language by Mr. Bishop on the subject of divorce *a mensa et thoro*, s. 29, where he collects the opinions of certain distinguished writers on the subject."

Continuing, the President said—

> "Moreover these orders really impose a more serious penalty in the cases to which they apply than a decree of divorce would; for the result of a decree of judicial separation against a man is more severe to him, and in certain cases even to a woman, than a decree of divorce. The consequences of each are, in most cases, very much the same, except that the former imposes the disability of re-marriage while the latter does not; so that, for instance, a man may be more severely punished for the offence of adultery than for the same offence coupled with cruelty or desertion for two years or upwards; and, further in the latter case, the wife has the option of choosing whether she shall apply for separation or divorce. . . . I am anxious not to travel out of my province, which is *jus dicere non jus dare*, but the point as to how the Act of 1895 can be administered, with regard to the non-cohabition part of the order, by the magistrates who have, as noticed above, certain discretionary powers and can to a certain extent control the working of the Act so as to prevent, as far as possible, evil results, gives rise to the foregoing penal observations; and having, since I first sat on this bench in 1892, found it necessary to make myself familar with the history of the laws governing the relations of husband and wife, and the discussions which have from time to time taken place relating thereto, more particularly at the time of the passing of the Act of 1857, and the results of those laws, of which experience in this Court gives very considerable opportunities of judging, it is desirable, in my judgment, as bearing on the subject under consideration, to express the conviction, which has forced itself upon me, that permanent separation without divorce has a distinct tendency to encourage immorality and is an unsatisfactory remedy to apply to the evils which it is supposed to prevent. That the present state of the English law of divorce and separation is not satisfactory can hardly be doubted. The law is full of inconsistencies, anomalies, and inequalities amounting almost to absurdities; and it does not produce desirable results in certain important respects. Whether any, and what, remedy should be applied raises extremely difficult questions, the importance of which can hardly be over-estimated, for they touch the basis on which society rests, the principle of marriage being the fundamental basis upon which this and other civilised nations have built up their social systems; and it would be most detrimental to the best interests of family life, society, and the State to permit of divorces being lightly and easily obtained, or to allow any law which was wide enough to militate by its laxity against the principles of marriage. It is not necessary for me now to express a formal and final opinion upon these serious questions, but the consideration of what I have found it necessary to deal with in this judgment brings prominently forward the question whether, assuming that divorce is to be allowed at all, as it has been in England by judicial decree for the past fifty years and for a long time before that by Act of Parliament, any reform would be effective and adequate which did not abolish permanent separation, as distinguished from divorce, place the sexes on an equality as regards offence and relief, and permit a decree being obtained for such definite grave causes of offence as render future cohabitation impracticable and frustrate the object of marriage; and whether such reform would not largely tend to greater propriety and enhance that respect for the sanctity of the marriage tie which is so essential in the best interests of society and the State. It is sufficient at present to say that, from what I have pointed out, there appears to be good reason for reform, and that probably it would be found that it should be in the direction above indicated. The petition for divorce in this case must be dismissed, for the wife has only proved adultery, and that is not sufficient to enable her to obtain a decree of divorce; and it will not be any satisfaction to her to know that if her case had arisen and her suit could have been brought in Scotland or most other civilised countries she would have succeeded."

The learned President of the Divorce Court, in that judgment, expressed in words far better than any that I could use, the evils which arise from the present state of things; and the concluding sentence of that judgment, I venture to say, should suggest to your Lordships that the subject of my Bill is worthy of your consideration. In the concluding sentence Sir Gorell Barnes points out that in Scotland, and in almost every other civilised country, a remedy would have been open to the aggrieved spouse if desertion had taken place. There is no need for me to recapitulate what is so well said by the President as to the evils of a state of permanent separation, where no re-marriage is possible. You distinctly and deliberately, by that legislation, put people in a position of temptation from which many of them suffer, and which does not lead to good manners and good morals in the State.

By this Bill I propose to deal with one, and one only, of those grounds which are now grounds for judicial separation—I mean the ground of desertion. The operative clause of the Bill has the effect, by inserting in the Matrimonial Causes Act certain additional words, of making desertion without cause for two years and upwards a ground for divorce. I do not conceal from myself or from your Lordships, that that is a very considerable change to make, but I venture to commend it to the House on the grounds of the judgment of Sir Gorell Barnes which I have read. I also venture to commend it to your Lordships on the ground which he mentions at the end of his judgment that it is already the law in most civilised countries, and even in a country so near to us as Scotland. There is this difference between the law in Scotland and the law as proposed in this Bill, that in Scotland the desertion has to be for three years and upwards; but as the term which now exists in the Matrimonial Causes Act for desertion is two years, and as this term has been generally adopted in English legislation, I thought it best to put that period in this Bill.

It has been said before, and may be said again, that this is a subject which ought to be taken up by the Government and considered by a Commission or Committee and that no private member ought to attempt to legislate upon it. I quite agree that this is a matter which ought to be taken up by the Government and considered by a Commission or Committee; but it is not taken up, and meanwhile many thousands of people every year suffer great hardship from the existing law. That is my only excuse for again calling attention to the subject. The matter is one which is of great importance and can only be fitly dealt with by the Government of the day; and it is, I venture to think, a matter not so difficult as it is sometimes represented to be. I think a conclave of lawyers would find a remedy for the existing state of things without very much difficulty. But the present Bill has one merit, which was insisted upon by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack in the discussions on the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. That is that it only deals with one point. At any rate it has that merit. I submit the subject to your Lordships for discussion because some settlement ought to be arrived at in the matter, and your Lordships, I think, must realise that when a man in the position of the President of the Divorce Court, holding high judicial office, feels it necessary to make so explicit and so clear a statement as to the disadvantages, the inequalities, and the evil effects of the present law, there must be some grievance which calls for a remedy. I, therefore, beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Earl Russell.*)

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL: My Lords, I came here this afternoon in order to read prayers, not even knowing that this Bill was to be before your Lordships' House; but seeing it on the Paper I remained, and having heard the speech of the noble Earl in moving the Second Reading I cannot sit still. For the last fortnight I have been acting as chairman of a large committee of bishops of the Lambeth Conference to make a report upon marriage problems, the first being divorce. We have had evidence from bishops from all parts of the world as to the mischiefs that have resulted from weakening the marriage laws. In one of the States of the United States of America they are exceedingly pleased with themselves because, by the creation of anti-divorce committees, they have actually made such an improvement as this—that instead of the legislature having twelve causes for divorce the number has been brought down to seven; and they are very proud indeed of having done so much. Other States have not got so far. The evidence that we have from all parts of the world goes to show that if you once begin to weaken the marriage laws you never know where you will stop. In one of the United States one marriage out of every six is pronounced terminated by the courts of law. I do not propose to go into any of these details. I am perfectly certain that the social state is built upon the principle of the family life, and the family life is built upon the principle of the sanctity of marriage. To dare to tamper with all that by just one little bit of piecemeal legislation, slipping in another cause for divorce, whereas there is now only one, seems to me unworthy of the suggestion of the noble Earl and quite impossible for your Lordships' House to look at. Many of us are looking forward to the time when the very strong pronouncement of one whom I can call my friend, the President of the Divorce Court, will be taken up, not, if I may say so, by a miserable piece of piecemeal legislation like this, but by a great and important Royal Commission. When that Royal Commission sits they will have before them, I believe, evidence which will tend rather to stringency than to leniency with regard to the marriage laws. I entreat your Lordships not to look at a piece of legislation of this description.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn): My Lords, last year or the year before, in reference to a Bill on the subject of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, I had occasion to warn your Lordships of the danger of doing more than proceed step by step in reference to the marriage laws. They are very complicated; they touch the life of the nation at its very source and are of the utmost importance in every way. Therefore, I ventured to submit to your Lordships that any interference with those laws could only be taken up one question at a time, so that it could be seen exactly what you were doing. This Bill undoubtedly has the merit claimed for it by the noble Earl that it deals with only one question at a time. I am afraid that is the only merit I can see in the Bill. The proposal, if I rightly understand the Bill, is that a man or woman may be divorced on the ground of desertion without cause for two years and upwards. That is the proposal which is made in the Bill. I will say nothing at all about the sanctions of other kinds affecting marriage, I would simply point out that the noble Earl's Bill amounts to this, that divorces practically may be obtained at discretion or almost at discretion by the parties to the marriage. The woman being the weaker of the two, the man might very easily by his conduct cause his wife to desert him for two years and then get rid of her. I must say for myself that the proposal in the Bill is absolutely impossible and is one to which I will not at any time consent. Therefore, when the question of the Second Reading is put I shall vote in the negative.

On Question,

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 2; Not-contents, 61.

CONTENTS.

Russell, E. [*Teller.*]
Pirrie, L. [*Teller.*]

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Bedford, D.
Devonshire, D.

Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.

Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Camperdown, E.
Carrington, E.
Cawdor, E.
Coventry, E.
Craven, E.
Crewe, E.
Dartrey, E.
Liverpool, E.
Mar, E.
Mar, and Kellie, E.
Mayo, E.
Morley, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Waldegrave, E.

Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Churchill, V.
Goschen, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
St. Aldwyn, V.

Bristol, L. Bp.

Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Avebury, L.
Balfour, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Braye, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton*)
Calthorpe, L.
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Ellenborough, L.
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall.*)
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Haversham, L.
Heneage, L.
Herschell, L.
Henry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)

The Lord Bishop of Bristol

Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Langford, L.
Lawrence, L.
Lucas, L.
Michelham, L.
Newton, L.
Oriel, L. (*V. Massereene.*)
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Sanderson, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)

THE SHOP HOURS ACT.

LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, I rise to move for a Return of the Closing Orders which have been confirmed by the Home Office under the Shop Hours Act, and specifying those which have been for the hairdressers' trade; and of those now under consideration. I have been requested to do so in order to show the working of the Act. So far as I have been able to ascertain the number of Closing Orders made in 1906 was 103, in 1907 29, and in 1908 41, or a total of 173. Considering that the Act is permissive, the result, if not all that might have been hoped, is satisfactory. It shows what may be done. The figures for London are, however, disappointing, mainly because instead of appointing the London County Council to administer the Act in London, as proposed in our Bill, the House of Commons inserted borough councils. The borough councils are, I doubt not, quite as disposed to assist in securing reasonable hours, but it has been found difficult to get them to agree on the same time. Still, even in London, hairdressers have been successful, which shows that if other trades were as energetic they might be equally successful. The hairdressers are anxious to know the number of Closing Orders which have been made for their trade. I believe this information would be useful, and hope there may be no objection to granting it.

Moved, "For a Return of the Closing Orders which have been confirmed by the Home Office under the Shop Hours Act, and specifying those which have been for the hairdressers' trade; and of those now under consideration."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE LORD STEWARD (Earl BEAUCHAMP): My Lords, the Home Office will be glad to give the information for which the noble Lord asks, but they trust the noble Lord will be good enough to be content if they postpone supplying him with the information, on the ground that if a Return were made at once it would be for a broken period only. What I suggest is that the noble Lord should withdraw his Motion this afternooon and that later on information should be supplied for the whole year. If the information were given for a complete period it would be more useful, especially in view of the legislation which is contemplated for next session. So far as the past months of this year are concerned, the noble Lord would be able, by investigation, to find out for himself the number of Orders which have been published, because at regular intervals in Lords' and Commons' Papers there are to be found the numbers and the names of the Orders confirmed under the Shop Hours Act; so that for the time being, at any rate, the noble Lord would be able to discover these figures for himself. I hope that, in these circumstances, the noble Lord will withdraw the Motion and allow the information to be submitted later for a complete period.

LORD AVEBURY: I am much obliged to my noble friend for meeting me so far. With reference to hairdressers, I do not think the returns enable one to distinguish between that and other trades, and the hairdressers were particularly anxious that the number of Orders relating to them should be given. The suggestion which the noble Earl has made is a most reasonable one, and I shall be very happy, in those circumstances, to withdraw my Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HOME DEFENCE.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS, in whose name the following Notice stood on the Paper—"To call attention to the following Resolution unanimously passed by the House of Lords on the 10th of July 1905, 'That it would be a danger to the Realm, and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war, to trust to it alone for home defence; and, inasmuch as it is admitted that the Navy cannot guarantee us against so-called hostile "raids," it is the more needful that our land defences should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt, in any form, a hostile landing on our shores'; and further, to show how the War Office has signally failed to give effect to the said Resolution,"—said: My Lords, it was my intention to have taken this Notice off the Paper, but I was asked by a friend in this House to let it remain. He wisely said that the more this subject was discussed the better, and therefore I allowed the Notice to remain. It was in consequence of the debate last week on the Motion of the noble Duke, the Duke of Bedford, that I thought of taking my Notice off the Paper. That debate went fully into the question of armaments, and the alterations that have been made by His Majesty's Government—so fully that it did not appear to me necessary to say anything with regard to the Motion.

I need not, therefore, refer to the figures, but I will quote a passage from the speech of the noble Lord the Under-Secretary of State for War, which I think shows, more than anything else, the state in which we are in the matter of defence on land. Lord Lucas the other night, at the end of his speech, said—

> "He hoped your Lordships would recognise that they were going through a transitory stage, and that it was too early to judge whether the Territorial Army would be a success or not. They had only touched the fringe of the recruiting system, and they must wait to see whether the result on the whole was satisfactory or not."

Do you think that is a satisfactory state to be in? The Secretary of State for War has got rid of the old military system. He has reduced the Army; he has abolished the Volunteers and established in their place the Territorial Force, and now you have to wait until the "terriers" are full grown. That is not the way in which the safety of this nation should be looked after. I venture to protest against it as being most dangerous and absolutely to be resisted, if possible, by this House.

I do not know how you can resist it. You can only resist it by repealing that Act and restoring what you have taken away. It is true that the old military system rested on compulsion, but it has never been enforced. Every occupant of the Front Benches and every man who has been Secretary of State for War

knows that it has not been enforced, not, generally, from national reasons, but from party reasons. In the course of his speech the other night the Duke of Bedford gave utterance to a statement which I venture to question. The noble Duke said he was convinced that compulsory military service was impossible. Now, in Scotland, in the Scottish Church, we have a long and a short catechism. I will not put a long catechism to the noble Duke, but a very short one. I wish to know on what authority he makes that statement. Will he kindly tell this House on what authority he says that it is impossible in this country to enforce compulsion? I believe that compulsion is the only possible way of settling this question. I ask my noble friend—Can he quote any authority in his favour, except the two front benches? I grant him every Secretary of State except Lord Herbert, whose statue records what he thought about it. He wanted it, but could not get it from his Government. That is why his head is bowed.

I have, as far as I could, tested public opinion in this country upon this vital question. I sent round circulars to all urban and county authorities asking them two questions. The first was whether they were satisfied with the state of things at present in England as regards home defence on land. In 75 per cent. of the answers the reply was "No." The other question was: Do you believe that the people of this country would object to a modified form of compulsory service? Two to one replied "No." I set those authorities against the *ipse dixit*—it is nothing else—of the noble Duke. With regard to the county which is represented by our great War Minister, who is called a modern Napoleon by the *Westminster Review*, in the year 1905 I invited the constituents of the Secretary of State to meet me in the Market Hall of Haddington and talk over this question of home defence and compulsory service. They came, and I read to them the Resolution which your Lordships passed, and which I think it is well that I should read now. It is as follows—

> "That it would be a danger to the Realm, and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war, to trust to it alone for home defence; and, inasmuch as it is admitted that the Navy cannot guarantee us against so-called

hostile 'raids,' it is the more needful that our land defences should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt, in any form, a hostile landing on our shores."

Further, I asked whether they would agree to compulsory service in the modified form which I proposed.

What was that modified form? I may say that I am dead against compulsory service for everybody. There is a body in this country, the National Service League, who propose that everybody should serve compulsorily for home defence. The old principle of our military law was the Crown's right to call upon its subjects compulsorily to serve for home defence, and the law which gave that power has been done away with. If you were situated on the Continent of Europe and the only division between you and another country that had universal compulsory service was a red line on the map, you would be obliged to have it; but you have the sea around you and a fleet, though I do not believe that you should trust to the Fleet alone. But, when you have that, why should every man be required to serve, when by the law which the modern Nopoleon has repealed you had what was called the ballot? I know what some of my friends of the National Service League will say. The National Service League and those noble Lords who are associated with it will say it is very unfair that men should be chosen for service by ballot; but, if that league were condemned to death, would it object to decimation? Would the Duke of Bedford, Viscount Hardinge, or Lord Newton object?

LORD NEWTON: Yes.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: The ballot will do all that you possibly want, and it is on that ground that I feel strongly on this question. I believe that it is not only the better way, but that it is the only way in which you can make this country safe at home. That it will bear hardly on the people is not true. What the meeting in the town of Haddington accepted was my modified proposal of the ballot, which should apply to a man only once in his life, and that when he was twenty. The result would be in the case of a young working man of twenty that he would as a result of being drilled receive more wages. The effect of drill upon working men of that age would be to enable them to earn higher wages after they had undergone military training. A large employer of labour told me that he would be willing to pay 1s. 6d. a week more in wages to such a man. I dare any noble Lord on either of the front benches to deny that the method which I advocate is the only way in which the problem can be solved.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord LUCAS): My Lords, I listened with great interest to the speech of the noble Earl, who quoted a passage from a speech which I made a few days ago in your Lordships' House and in which I stated that it was too early to judge of the results of the Territorial Army scheme. I would ask that that remark should be coupled with what I had previously said, which was this—that we have at the present moment 180,000 men in the Territorial Force, in place of the 260,000 that we had in the Yeomanry and in the Volunteers before. I said that according to high military opinion that force, even if it grew no larger, and were unaided by any other military force, would be far more capable of defending this country than the larger number which existed previously, simply and solely because it had been given the organisation to enable it to take the field. I will not say that the force is at present, but as soon as they begin to understand their duties, they will become, more competent and efficient for the purpose of home defence than the Volunteers and Yeomanry, unorganised as they were, would have been, and therefore to that extent we are better off than we were before. On the question of increasing the force from its present strength of 180,000 to 300,000, which we wish it to reach, I then made the remark which the noble Lord did me the honour to quote, in which I said that no judgment could be formed until the County Associations had had time really to deal with the recruiting problem, and that that was a question bound to take a considerable time.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: How long?

LORD LUCAS: I think it will vary. In the case of the biggest county of all, London, probably the members of the County Associations would ask for two years before they could properly organise their recruiting; but in the case of other counties they will be much quicker. It is impossible to manufacture an entirely new Army in the course of these three months. That must be remembered; but I absolutely deny that, even at the present moment, we have lost anything in military efficiency or in power for the defence of this country. The noble Earl did not go into the question which, after all, is at the root of all these matters—the numbers required for the purpose of home defence. The question of numbers is the important question in this case, and I listened to hear what the noble Earl's views were on that question. Some noble Lords may hold that the Militia ballot is fair and that it would produce a more efficient force; but I do not see why, if in the opinion of the Government's military advisors the task which the second-line Army would be asked to carry out would be effectively carried out under the voluntary system, that system should be condemned lock, stock, and barrel.

I would like to know what are the requirements of the noble Lords who advocate compulsory service, what force they think necessary, and by what scheme they would put compulsion into operation. An eminent body, consisting for the most part of elderly gentlemen who, until they got past military age, maintained a discreet silence, are rending the skies with their clamour for compulsory service for everybody else. There are exceptions, but a majority of them have never rendered any military service to speak of to their country. They have a great many pious opinions on the subject of compulsory service; but I do not know that they have any definite plan of carrying them out. They attack us for the unfairness of our system; they say that it is not fair to put this burden upon a man which his more fortunate, because less patriotic, brethren do not have to bear. If they consider that grossly unfair, it means that they must train every man who reaches military age, or else the unfairness is even greater under their system than under ours. To decimate the population for the purpose of military service would be to do a thing which is grossly unfair. Does the National Service League seriously propose to take every man who reaches the age of twenty years and train him? The number of such men would be between 400,000 and 500,000 every year. What proposals do they make for training? When we were discussing the question of six month's training, the noble and gallant Field-Marshal Earl Roberts, who is, I believe, president of that league, said that in his opinion, the period of six months was totally inadequate for a force of that kind. Does the National Service League propose to train 50,000 men every year and give more than six months training? How does it propose to train these men? Where is it going to find the country on which to do it? The whole island is hardly big enough for the purpose. What is proposed to be done in regard to barrack accommodation? What is it proposed to do with the force obtained by that means—an Army that will be numbered in millions? Do they really propose to train this large number of men simply on the abstract principle that everybody ought to be trained?

And if they say they do not want to train the whole manhood of the nation and give them the kind of training which the president of the National Service League thinks essential to make them an efficient military force, what do they propose to do? I suppose they would either adopt the method advocated by the noble Earl—the ballot; or take a very high standard so as to get the pick of the men who reached the age of twenty every year. Suppose you took one man in eight. His seven more fortunate, because more weakly, brethren would get off; and you would be putting on the most finely-developed and the cream of the population a disability which we do not propose in our wildest moments to impose on the Territorial Force; and yet we are told by members of the National Service League that our requirements are grossly unfair. If you had a compulsory short service Army in this country you would still want a certain number of men for service abroad; but there is no question about it that the flow of men into the long service Army would be considerably curtailed by it. You would reduce the number of recruits from 35,000 to perhaps half that number; what will that mean? It will mean that this short service Army will form your Expeditionary Force when the time comes, because you cannot draw largely on your foreign garrisons for the purposes of a war abroad. How are those men to be trained? Where will the officer who is to command the force in war and his staff obtain the practice necessary? Where will they ever get the chance of handling a division in the field? Possibly they may get it for a fortnight in the year. Are you prepared to train your generals and staff in this way, when, in the opinion of a great many noble Lords in this House, that is not sufficient time in which to train a private or a Field Artilleryman? If, on the other hand, you propose to have an Army on the model of the French or German Army with two years service, that is another matter. We should like to know what the proposals of the National Service League are.

We have had enough of this vague talk about a compulsory system, and we would like to know definitely what the proposals of the National Service League are and how they propose to work them out. In the meantime, and until it is proved that the system which the War Office are putting in force at the present time is inadequate in numbers and unable to fulfil the functions assigned to it, that system holds the field. That has not yet been proved. This scheme has from its inception been brought officially by the Army Council before the Committee of Imperial Defence, and it was only after that Committee had sanctioned the scheme as one which, in their opinion, satisfied all likely requirements, that it was proceeded with.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, it was not my intention to have said a word in this debate. I have so frequently expressed my opinions, and I am so well aware of the fact that my opinions are not likely to carry much weight here or elsewhere, that I should have conceived it unnecessary to speak at all, except for this reason, that I am afraid I am bound to include myself amongst that band of elderly Gentlemen alluded to by the noble Lord opposite. So far as I am concerned, my withers are comparatively unwrung. I quite admit that I might have done a good deal more, but I did serve for a good many years in one branch of the Auxiliary Forces—I am not sure that I did not serve for as many years as the noble Lord's age amounts to; but, at the same time, I fully admit that, in a military sense, I am a thoroughly inefficient person, and I attribute it to the voluntary system.

I regret that I was totally unaware that the noble Lord was going to take this line this afternoon. I regret all the more that persons who are more competent to speak with authority than myself are not present. I suppose I ought to take the keen curiosity displayed by the noble Lord opposite as a compliment to the association to which I belong, but I cannot help remarking that, considering the airy, the confident, the optimistic, I might almost say the doctrinaire, views laid down by the noble Lord from time to time, he shows an astonishing ignorance with regard to the views entertained by a certain section of his countrymen, among whom are certainly not the least distinguished of Englishmen. I will endeavour to explain, as shortly as I can, what the views of these people are who are represented by the National Service League. Briefly speaking, our view is this, that it ought to be the duty of every young man to be trained for the purposes of national defence.

When I hear the noble Lord ask what are you going to do with the millions of men you are going to get under this system, I really can hardly believe my own ears. How many young men does the noble Lord suppose reach the military age in this country every year? If I am not mistaken, the number amounts to a little more than 300,000. Yet the noble Lord actually comes here and asks, what are you going to do with your half-million of men every year who become liable for military service? I cannot resist another opportunity of exposing the ignorance of the noble Lord. Does he really suppose that every young man in every civilised country, when he arrives at the military age, is taken by the Government and made to perform military service? Even I, amateur as I am, know that the exemptions in every civilised country amount to something like 50 per cent. If there are 300,000 who arrive at the military age in this country every year, not more than 150,000 would, therefore, be available for military service. The noble Lord asks what we are to do with them when we get them. We should propose to do very much the same with them as the noble Lord hopes to do with regard to his Territorial Force. But we know very well that he will not succeed. We should succeed because we should have it in our power to enforce efficiency.

The essential difference between the plan recommended by the National Service League and the plan which finds so much favour with the noble Lord opposite is that our preparation for war would take place before the war had started, whereas in his case serious preparation for war is not going to take place until war has broken out—provided that the enemies of this country are kind enough to allow the serious preparation to take place at all. That is the essential difference between us, and I hope I have, at all events, made that point clear to the noble Lord. With regard to the period of training which we advocate, I admit that we cannot say exactly what that period should be, but we suggest a period of from three to six months preparatory training, followed by short courses such as is the system in Switzerland.

There is only one other point with which I think it necessary to deal, and that is the statement made by the noble Lord with regard to the Regular Army. The noble Lord appears to be under the impression that if you have a universal system for home defence, therefore your Regular Army is going to disappear altogether. Why in the name of common sense should anything of the sort take place at all? Can anybody—I do not care who he is—give me any sort of reason why you should not continue to obtain exactly the same number of recruits for the Regular Army supposing this system were adopted, as you obtain at the present time? There is no reason why you should not, and there is every reason to suppose that the career of a professional soldier would be just as attractive under a universal system for home defence as it is at the present moment. I am the last person in the world to set myself up as a military authority. Strange though it may appear to the noble Lord, I am a person of modest disposition, but there are certain things which I think are apparent to the meanest intelligence, and to me it has been apparent for a long time that, in spite of the assurances of the noble Lord, the voluntary system is no longer equal to our requirements; and it is for that reason that I, at all events, am more strongly in favour of universal service for home defence than I am of any proposal which is before the electors of this country at the present moment.

Lord Newton.

LORD ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH: My Lords, the noble Lord the Under-Secretary of State for War dwelt on the virtues of the new Territorial scheme, and urged that we ought to allow time to elapse in order to see how far it will be a success. But he did not mention in his speech the length of time for which the men have undertaken to serve in the Territorial Force. I have the honour to belong to a battalion in the south of England, which up to 31st March last numbered some 860 strong. In the new scheme the battalion was reduced to about 630, which is a fair reduction; but, as far as I know, hardly a single man has signed on for more than one year. I do not know whether it will be a case of *exeunt omnes* at the end of the year, but it seems to be the same story wherever one turns. In very few cases have the men joined for more than a year. If that is the case, what is to happen at the end of the year? A great deal of your new force will come to an end unless you can adopt some means to induce the men to stay on for a longer period. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary said it was very difficult to induce men who engage for a short period of military service to continue their service for a longer term. That appears to me to rather add to the difficulty of the Territorial Force. I am not one of those who wish to indulge in carping criticism on this most important subject.

If you could produce an adequate force capable of meeting its requirements at a critical moment and which would get over the dangers that beset us, no one would be more pleased than myself; but I think it is most important that the full truth of these things should be stated, especially as we hear that a still further reduction of the Regular Force is contempated to the extent of several thousands of men. These are extremely important questions, of which the Government of the day is bound to give a clear and explicit explanation. I fear that part of the difficulty is that the Socialists, who are averse to all military defence of the Empire, have had too much influence over the Government. No doubt that is a difficulty whch might happen not only in the case of this Government but of others, but I would emphasise what seems to me to be the most serious point in this new departure, and express the hope that there may be a still fuller explanation of the very great difficulties which confront us.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, after the somewhat challenging speech of the noble Lord the Under-Secretary, I do not think anybody can be surprised at the two speeches which we have just heard; but, although I always feel that we are the richer for the exhortations of my noble friend who introduced this question, I am not sure that a weekly renewal of the contentions on either side in the present state of our forces will lead us to any very profitable result. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary has a tendency, if I may venture to say so, to overstate his case in defending himself against finality in the present position; and I do not think he can be surprised that the overstatement of his case which he made this afternoon produced the sort of protests which came from Lord Newton and Lord Zouche. I do not propose to pursue the question.

I simply ask the noble Lord to consider this point. The present state of affairs causes anxiety to all those who desire to see our forces kept at full strength. We know that not merely are the numbers of our Regular Army less, but the same is the case in the Special Reserve and the Territorial Army; moreover the recruits coming in have been less and less during the past year in all these forces. We admit that it would be unfair to judge the scheme of the Secretary of State by its present results, seeing that it is manifestly incomplete. The noble Lord, having that fact before him, has told the House that, although we have only about two-thirds of the men we had formerly, yet the new force is more capable than the old force, and can be used more effectively because it is so much better organised. The noble Lord behind me spoke of his county. Let me speak of mine.

We have done our best for the Territorial Army in the county of Surrey. We had 3,200 Volunteers this day last year, we have about half that number at this moment. There are no more Artillery ready now than before; there are no more officers, and there is no more organisation or equipment ready; yet the noble Lord says that we now possess a more effective military weapon than we had twelve months ago. I only raise that point to protest against an over-statement of the case which causes increased anxiety to those who really desire to see our forces effective, because it seems to show that the emergency created by recent changes is not fully appreciated. None of these statements by the noble Lord would induce us to believe that a part is greater than the whole, and that you can get more out of a pint bottle than you can get out of a quart. That is my strong feeling.

May I say one word in reply to what fell from the noble Earl with regard to compulsory service? My noble friend has always assumed that the unwisdom of successive Secretaries of State has led them to reject a scheme for compulsory service, because they feared the effect on their own Party, and he stated that again to-night. I feel this subject very deeply. I do not believe that the question of compulsory service was ever more carefully considered in this country than during the South African War, and if the Government of that day or any Secretary of State who has desired further to strengthen our forces, has declined to submit that subject to the consideration of Parliament it has been, not because of their fear of the effect on their electoral strength, but because of their fear of its effect on the national strength. I do not know anything in military matters which could do more harm than to take such a step and have to recede from it; and, unless any Government is thoroughly convinced that the people of this country are prepared to support them and that they are alive to the necessity of compulsory military training, to set it up in order to see it foregone after the next general election would be, in my opinion, a very great national danger. You would leave the country weaker than it was before; and I have only to remind your Lordships of the fact that all the additions made to the Regular Army under the stress of the war have been swept away, and even the additions made by Lord Lansdowne before the war have been in jeopardy during the last few weeks.

Many people believe that the total forces of the country have been reduced below the level of safety, and I would ask the noble Lord the Under-Secretary whether he will be good enough to grant a Return, dated 1st October, which would be before your Lordships in the autumn session, showing at that date the state of the Army, the Special Reserve, and the Territorial Force. As regards the Army, we should then see whether, in the nine months which had elapsed, we had made up any of the shortage which was apparent in the Return laid before the House in February; as regards the Special Reserve, the Militia would all have been out for training and we should be able to see what portion of the Militia had transferred and taken service in the Special Reserve, and also what recruits had come in; and, as regards the Territorial Army, although the noble Lord said we could not for two years see the whole effect of what had been done, still we should see where we stood as the result of this year's operations, and should know to what extent we have to depend on the recruiting of next year to fill up the gaps. My feeling is that so long as you have a shortage of numbers and until you have had that increased training and organisation which have been promised by the Government, you must not believe that by a mere change of name you have obtained, under the new system, something which is different from the old.

Lord SAYE and SELE: My Lords, I had not intended to speak upon this subject, but I rise to appeal to noble Lords opposite to give the Territorial Army a close time. I am perfectly certain that there is more harm done by these numerous discussions regarding the Territorial Army than is imagined. If some of your Lordships would go back to your counties and look after recruiting, you would do a great deal more good than by putting questions in this House. I hold no brief for the Territorial Army, but I am confident that it has come to stay. Mr. Haldane has at this moment more of the confidence of the Army and the Territorial Force than any Secretary of State has had since I joined in 1879. There has been a great deal said about the numbers in the Volunteers. Anybody who has been in camp with the old Volunteers knows that the old Volunteer Force was full of rubbish and wasters, and a great deal of this has been scrapped by Mr. Haldane in his Territorial scheme. I would, therefore, appeal to noble Lords on the Opposition side to give the Territorial Army a close time, and to forget about it for six months and let Mr. Haldane work out the scheme in his own way.

Viscount HARDINGE: My Lords, I did not intend to take part in this discussion, nor do I wish to prolong it; but there is one point to which I wish to refer. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary quoted the noble and gallant Field-Marshal Earl Roberts as having said that the men could not be trained in six months. If the noble Lord will refer to the Field-Marshal's speech, he will find that his reference was to the Territorial Artillery and not to the Territorial Force.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (The Earl of Crewe): My Lords, like most other noble Lords who have spoken, I did not intend to take any part in this debate; but as it has reached somewhat larger dimensions than might have been expected, perhaps I may be allowed to say one or two words.

I confess that I find myself in very considerable agreement with the noble Lord behind me who deprecated this discussion. My noble friend Lord Wemyss said he himself would have taken this notice off the Paper but for some unknown noble friend of his who urged him to go on. I do not know who that was, but I cannot find myself in agreement with the noble Lord. I do not think that these discussions are of very great value, because what you are doing is this—you are rooting up the plant which was planted last year, with a very considerable degree of agreement, it must be remembered, from different sides of your Lordships' House, in order to see how it is getting on.

Consider for a moment the character of some of the complaints that have been made. Lord Zouche drew attention to the fact that a large number of men had only engaged for one year—I believe the figure is between 40 and 50 per cent.—and he went on to assume from that that all these men would not re-engage. That seems to me a most gratuitous assumption. It seems to me exceedingly likely that these men engaged for one year in order to see what the new force was like; and to assume that they will all so much dislike it that they will desire to return at once to civil life seems to me, as I say, a most gratuitous assumption.

LORD ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH: I did not mean to express to the House the complete assumption on my part that they would not remain on after the year; but I wished to draw attention to the fact, which had not been previously alluded to, that they had only signed on for a year. I hope they will sign on again.

***THE EARL OF CREWE:** I am glad to have the noble Lord's explanation. Then the noble Lord said we were entirely in the hands of the Socialists, which was a bad thing for increasing the Army. The noble Lord surely forgets that a very large number of Socialists are in favour of universal service; they are in favour of what is known as a Citizen Army, with no professional soldiers at all. I do not know whether that would meet the views of noble Lords opposite, but it is a view largely held by Socialists.

It does seem to me to be a little unfair to forget the very frequent complaints which we used to have of the Auxiliary Forces before the Territorial Army was formed. We might almost imagine, from some of the criticisms that are levelled against it to-day, that we never had in former times debates in this House about the Auxiliary Forces. I very well remember a debate—I think it was when the late Government was in power—when the Duke of Bedford used about the Volunteers, or about a great many of them, a word used by my noble friend Lord Saye and Sele a moment ago, when he described them as "rubbish"; and I think it is only fair, when one is criticising this new force, to remember that the former forces were the subject of some pretty sharp criticism.

The noble Lord opposite, Lord Newton, was somewhat severe upon my noble friend behind me (Lord Lucas). The noble Lord opposite reminds me of a very early friend of my youth—I forget whether it was Balbus or the less sympathetic figure of Caius—who was perpetually asserting that it was all over with the Army. I am certain that the noble Lord is descended from one of those ancient Romans. I was very glad that my noble friend behind me went into this question of compulsory military service, or, as it is sometimes called compulsory military training, because I agree with him that we have not had from anybody, even from the most distinguished advocates of that project anything like a coherent scheme in connection with it. I do not, of course, allude to my noble friend Lord Wemyss, because we know that what he desires is the Militia ballot, which is a totally different thing. What I have always wanted to discover, but never have been able to discover, is, supposing an invading force reaches these shores, and we have a scheme of compulsory military training, who will be the people who will actually be put into the field to meet it? Is it to be the conscripts of the year, or are you going, in addition, to have a Territorial Army? From what the noble Lord said just now, I gather that it is to be the conscripts of the year who are to form the home

Army. Then you are going to have in addition a Territorial Army, with a far longer service.

LORD NEWTON: There would be a Reserve as in the case of any other Army, and in the event of invasion the Reserves of the Territorial Army would be called out.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Yes; but has any scheme of organisation for a force of that kind ever been thought out or put into anything like a concrete form? I am totally unable to understand how, considering what the daily life of the citizens of this island is, anything of the kind is to be done. Conscription I understand, and in that case, of course, it is your conscripts who form your First Line, filled up from Reserves; but how your six months trained young men are to form your First Line, stiffened only by others from the Reserves who have been doing a week or two's training from time to time, is a matter which passes my comprehension.

The noble Lord also said that he could not see why the institution of compulsory service for home defence should have any effect upon the Regular Army who have to serve abroad. One can only go to a great extent on the experience of foreign nations. There is no country in Europe, so far as I know, where it has not been found that it is an exceedingly difficult thing to get men who have been conscripts at home to volunteer for foreign service; and the noble Lord must know that there is a very large body of military opinion in this country which has the greatest dread of the effect upon the great force which we have to maintain in India and abroad on foreign service generally of anything like a system of compulsory home service. The only other point that I think I have to mention is that of the Return for which the noble Viscount asked. I understand from my noble friend behind me that there will be no objection, and that he will see that the Return is given.

*LORD BELHAVEN AND STENTON: My Lords, I only rise to answer one question put by the noble Earl the Leader of the House. He asked whether, with a system of compulsory service, it was intended in case of an invasion to defend the country with the conscripts of the year. The proposal is to adopt the Swiss principle, and at all events the First Line would consist of those of the last four years.

LORD HAVERSHAM: My Lords, our record in Berkshire is a very different one from that mentioned by the noble Viscount opposite. In that county the whole of the officers in the Yeomanry and Infantry Volunteers have joined the new Territorial Force. Of the Berkshire Yeomanry, 365 have joined out of 450 on the establishment, and of the Infantry Volunteers 715 out of 998 on the establishment. We have to find a new force of Horse Artillery. We have succeeded in obtaining the services of an officer who has served both in Horse and Field Artillery, and we have three subaltern officers under him. Of the men, we have already recruited 30 per cent., and soon hope to have 50 per cent. of the battery recruited. Mr. Sutton, the great seed merchant, and Mr. Palmer, the well-known biscuit manufacturer, are on our Association and are lending every assistance, with other large employers, in recruiting. Mr. Haldane stated in the House of Commons the other day that for the first time since the introduction of the Cardwell reforms an equal number—seventy-four—of Infantry battalions will be at home and abroad, and an equal number of Cavalry regiments. The Army Reserve is now at its highest figure, and 25,000 men have joined the Special Reserve. What the cause of alarm can be, therefore, I cannot conceive.

THE SCOTTISH CROFTERS.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN rose to call attention to the recent Report of the Congested Districts Board of Scotland in regard to the large and increasing arrears in the payment of instalments due by settlers who had purchased holdings from the Board; also, to move for a Return of the correspondence or other basis upon which the Board had founded a comparison (*see* page ix. of the Report) between the position as to payment of rent and annuities due upon loans, of annuitants who had purchased from the Board, and of crofters who held from the proprietor and who had been aided by the Board to acquire their present holdings.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, it will be in your Lordships' recollection that in the year 1907, and also in the present session of Parliament, the Secretary for Scotland introduced measures by which he sought to "crofterise" the whole of Scotland, by which I mean to extend throughout the whole of Scotland the peculiar laws and customs with regard to the tenure of land, which prevail in the crofting districts, although the circumstances are entirely different. The one fact which was brought forward in support of those Bills was the extraordinary success of the Crofting Acts in Scotland. One is very glad, indeed, to get hold of some facts which one can examine and test, and in this Report of the Congested Districts Board some facts are adduced which, I think, are well worthy of your Lordships' attention. The Congested Districts Board, as your Lordships know, is a Board which is entrusted with certain funds by Parliament with which land can be purchased and resold to settlers, and out of which grants can also be made to persons who are intending to take up crofts. The Secretary for Scotland is Chairman of this Board, and, therefore, what is stated in this Report comes with some special authority.

Let us examine by the light of this Report how far this transcendent success has been attained in Scotland. First of all let us take the question of land which has been purchased and re-sold to settlers. This is what the Report says—

> "In a scheme of State-aided purchase of holdings it is manifestly of the highest importance that settlers should make punctual payment of the sums due from them. We regret to say that in the case of several estates the settlers, with some exceptions, are considerably in arrear, and we have thought it our duty to intimate that unless there is an immediate improvement in this respect steps will have to be taken to enforce payment or to foreclose."

Exactly the same remark was made in the Report which preceded this. Apparently no practical result has followed. The arrears are steadily accumulating, and I do not know whether the Board will consider it sufficient to have delivered themselves of this wise dictum and take no practical steps to enforce this payment. Then they go on to say—

> "The result of our action since last year has not been satisfactory. The net result is that the payments in arrear have not decreased during the year in several estates purchased by the Board."

They then instance the estate of Syre, which was bought in the year 1902, and on which arrears immediately began. Those arrears on 1st March, 1907, reached the sum of £346, and on 1st March, 1908, £437. Therefore, there is a steady increase in the arrears. Exactly the same thing is to be found in the case of Barra. Here is another estate to which they allude. They say—

> "In Kilmuir we purchased from the Baird Trustees arrears amounting to £4,463 19s. 7d. In circumstances explained in our Eighth Report, we cancelled £3,437 16s. 4d. of this, and agreed that the balance of £1,026 3s. 3d. should be paid in instalments. At 1st March, 1907, the amounts of rents unpaid, including the first instalment of Baird arrears, was £2,215 5s. 6d. At 1st March, 1908, the amounts unpaid, including the second instalment of Baird arrears, were £2,656 4s. 5d."

So, therefore, on this estate likewise the arrears are constantly mounting up; and if I were inclined to detain your Lordships I might point out that on other estates the same thing is going on. I want to know, that being so, where is this extraordinary success of the crofting system on which the Secretary for Scotland founds his Bill? It seems to me that the experience is most unfortunate. These tenants are not paying their instalments, and I leave it to your Lordships to judge, so far as purchase and reselling land to the tenants is concerned, how far this crofting system is a success.

Leaving that subject, I turn to another. It is a favourite doctrine—I would almost call it a fad—of the Secretary for Scotland that rents are better paid to private individuals than they are to the State. That is entirely the plan on which his two Bills were founded. He said that the State should not purchase, but that what ought to be done was that private proprietors ought to get rid of their large tenants, cut up their farms, run the risk of getting their rent, and that his Board of Commissioners should regulate the rent and so on; in other words, that the nation was to have the whole regulation and the proprietors were to run all the risk. It is apparently because of this theory that he has introduced into this Report the comparison between the crofters who hold from the proprietor and who have been aided by the Board, and those who have bought from the State. He proceeds to uphold that theory, or rather to institute that comparison, by a statement which it is almost impossible to understand. On page 9 of the Report he takes nine cases involving a rental of about £900 a year, which have been furnished to him by persons whom he calls the landowners concerned, and of whom we know nothing further; and he argues from that that payments are made more regularly to private proprietors than they are to the State. In the first place, I am sorry to have to state, with regard to this comparison, that it is incomplete. In the second place it is defective and misleading.

It is incomplete, for this reason, that if your Lordships will look on page 5 you will find that he says there are 666 settlers who come under this category. I have taken the trouble to add up the number of settlers from the appendix—it is, I can assure your Lordships, a most difficult Report, more difficult to understand than any one of the Government Bills—I have added up the number of those settlers upon whom he bases his conclusion, and I find that the whole of them put together come to 155. What means, I want to know, has he taken to arrive at this conclusion? Has he sent a circular to every one of the proprietors of this land and asked them to tell him how the matter stands in each case, or has he written a letter to certain selected proprietors and asked them questions with regard to individual holdings? As far as one can see, it would appear that the latter was the case. The Report is, therefore, incomplete, for of the 666 settlers only 155 are dealt with.

Then I come to the case of its being defective. The Report states that the Secretary for Scotland has been informed of the position in respect of rent and annuities due upon loans, with the following result. The figures that follow are entirely limited to rent; there is nothing said about annuities which are due; and on consulting the Appendix I find that in the three cases given—the case of Bay, the case of Aignish in the Lewis, and of Battery Park—there are arrears of annuities not mentioned on page 9 of this Report. I do not say that the amounts of those arrears are large in themselves, but in proportion to the amounts due they are not inconsiderable; and under any circumstances care ought to have been taken to make the figures correspond with the statement.

I say next that it is misleading, and I will tell your Lordships why. The Board have omitted from their Report the most important item, and without which it is impossible to form any real estimate as to the amount due by the settlers—the period at which these settlers' tenure commenced. Everything depends upon that. Take the case of Aignish in the Lewis, one of the cases cited, which shows a state of things so much better than that where purchase is concerned. On Aignish the annual rent is £96. The amount due on 1st March, 1907, was £80, and on 1st March, 1908, £70. But the tenure only commenced at the end of the year 1906, and, therefore, out of two years rent there is actually one year in arrear. I do not know whether the Secretary for Scotland thinks that a state of things of which one ought to be proud, and which compares favourably with the cases of purchase; but I should say, and I think most of your Lordships would say, that when a tenant has been two years in his holding and is one year in arrear, it is not an extraordinary case of punctual payment. Are these cases really a fair sample? That is the important thing.

If the Secretary for Scotland really wished to institute a fair comparison between the system of purchase and the system of paying rent direct to the landlord, what he ought to have done would have been to take the whole of these estates, to have written to all the proprietors, and to have asked them to send in to him a statement showing how the payment of their rent stood. Let me take the two cases of Aignish and Battery Park. Can those two cases be fairly said to represent Major Matheson's estate in the Lewis? They are a mere drop in the bucket, and even in those cases there is not much to boast of. But when you come to the Lewis, what is the state of things there? The Lewis is a part of the country in which the crofter system, which the Secretary for Scotland is so anxious to spread, and the cottar system have been allowed to run free for 100 years. The Lewis shows, more than any other part of Scotland, what is the result of the crofter system when coupled with the cottar system.

What is the result? At this moment the Lewis, which in 1880 had a population of 9,000, has now a population of 28,000. The average crofter rental at the present time is £1 18s. 6d., and the average arrears for each crofter is £7—between three and four years. The rates in the Lewis run from 15s. to 18s. in the £, and those rates fall, the very great proportion of them, at least, on the proprietors. What is the case with reference to Major Matheson? The rates he was called upon to pay in 1898 amounted to £4,000, and in the year 1908 he is called upon to pay £7,000. Of course, he has found it absolutely impossible to pay such a sum. This is the result of the crofter system run mad. In the case of the Lewis, I do not understand how the Secretary for Scotland came to put in merely these two cases of Aignish and Battery Park. The Secretary for Scotland knows perfectly well that petitions, I might almost say without end, have been addressed to the Government, pointing out the present condition of the Lewis, which is entirely owing to the cottar system, and calling for some remedy. It seems to me it is a warning and an example to the Government and to all those who are in favour of extending the crofter system.

But I leave the Lewis and take other large estates. Take Lady Cathcart's estate. I know that on that estate arrears are nearer three years than two, and, if you take Lord Macdonald's estate or the McLeod's, I will answer for it that an examination of their estate books would show that the arrears are at least as large in proportion as any of those which are due to the Government on account of land which has been re-sold to the settlers. What reason is there to suppose that rents are likely to be better paid to a private individual than to the State? Is not the probability all the other way? Have your Lordships ever heard of a person who declined to make good to the State an obligation which, when it was due to a private proprietor, he was perfectly prepared to meet? It seems to me that to uphold this theory is to go contrary to all probability, and, moreover, it is not borne out by the facts. If the Secretary for Scotland wishes to prove to us that this crofter system is a success and is a system which ought to be extended over the whole of Scotland, he must produce something very different from the figures and the assertions in this Report. I believe that if he persists in endeavouring to extend the crofter and the cottar system over the whole of Scotland he will be doing Scotland a very great injury; while with regard to the western Highlands I most sincerely believe he will be doing his very best to reduce that part of Scotland to the condition that prevailed in Ireland in the days of the famine.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return of the correspondence or other basis upon which the Congested Districts Board of Scotland has founded a comparison (*see* page IX. of the Report) between the position as to payment of rent and annuities due upon loans, of annuitants who have purchased from the Board, and of crofters who hold from the proprietor and who have been aided by the Board to acquire their present holdings."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

LORD HERSCHELL: My Lords, with your Lordships' leave I will say a few words first of all on the question of arrears in general. These arrears are not, as the noble Earl who has just sat down stated, of recent growth. They have been growing continuously and with perfect regularity for a considerable number of years, not only under the present Government but also under the late Government. This, of course, I do not mention as in any manner of means a mitigation of the gravity of the situation. His Majesty's Government fully realise the seriousness of the present condition of affairs with regard to these arrears of rent, and they are quite alive to the fact that the arrears should be paid. After all, these settlements were instituted in response to a demand which it was felt could not be disregarded; and it is absolutely essential that those who have benefited by this settlement should have due regard to the obligations which they have thereby incurred. There may be, and there no doubt are, certain hard cases, as for example, the case of a woman whose husband has died; and these, naturally, will receive fair consideration. This question of arrears of rent is, in the opinion of the Secretary for Scotland, most serious, and he is giving it his close attention at the present time with a view to determining what steps he should take.

I now come to the question of the comparison which the noble Earl has raised on page 9 of the Report of the Congested Districts Board. This, of course, does not purport, nor does it say that it purports, to be a full comparison. In the first place, it simply says: "in order to institute some comparison." The reason why these particular estates were selected was this. The Board decided to write to the proprietors of those estates with whom they had come in contact, owing to loans having been made to them, to ask them to furnish, if they were willing to do so, particulars of the rents for publication in abstract form. All the proprietors were perfectly willing that the Board should receive the information confidentially, but they did not desire that the rents which they received should be made public property.

Others, and these are the ones which we have on page 9, were willing to furnish this information, but on the distinct understanding, as stated here, that they were to be published in the abstract form. After all it would be a very difficult matter for the Board to apply to every proprietor, and proprietors to whose tenants no advances had been made, and to ask them for information as to the mount of rent which they received. As regards the omission of the amounts due as interest and principal for building loans, etc., it is true these were omitted. It was for this reason, that they were considered, taking them all round, to be of so small an amount that they were hardly worth taking into account. For instance, in the case of Northton there were arrears amounting to 12s. 6d.; in the case of Bourblock and Tarbert they amounted to £4 18s. 0d.; in the case of Stornaway to £44 4s. 0d.; and in the case of Bay to about £21. In the aggregate they were not very important sums in the opinion of the Congested Districts Board, and therefore they were omitted.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: What I pointed out was that the annuities due upon loans were omitted.

Lord HERSCHELL: That is perfectly true.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: Very well. Then it is an incorrect statement. The statement purports to put the position in respect to loans and to annuities due upon loans.

Lord HERSCHELL: I confess it should not have been in those words. The reason why the Returns referred to were left out is that they do not materially affect the case owing to the smallness of the amount. As regards the noble Earl's Motion for the correspondence to be produced, of course he will see that these details in the Report have been given merely on the understanding that was given and accepted that they were to be published in their abstract form, and I can assure him that there is nothing in those letters except what appears here put into abstract form. I therefore venture to hope that the noble Earl will not press his Motion for the correspondence in question to be produced, seeing that, after all, we only have it through the courtesy of the proprietors of these particular states.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: I sympathise very much with the noble Earl who brought forward this question, as to the tenor of the paragraphs in this report. I must say I think they are unfortunate. There is an attempt running all through them to bolster up the idea that purchase is a bad thing and that leasing is therefore a better one. The whole facts given here are comparatively speaking small, and they will not bear the inferences which are sought to be drawn from them. That is the first point I would make. Even if it were true that purchase instalments had been less well paid than the annual instalments, there is another point which I think vitiates the comparison which is understood to be drawn. The case of those estates mentioned in page 9 of the Report, which are the cases of small holders, are cases, I think I am safe in saying, in which the landowner has selected the tenant, has taken the whole responsibility on himself for the repayment of the Government loan, and is acting with the tenant. Even if the comparison in these cases was favourable to that system it would not in any way support the contention which seems to be drawn in the body of the Report that compulsory hiring would be a more satisfactory thing than purchase. There could really be no inference of that kind drawn, because I believe in every case the landlord had selected the best tenant he could find and had taken the whole obligation upon himself. That is a wholly different thing from cases in which the tenants have been dumped down, as it were, upon the landlord and not chosen by him.

I should like to say in justice to those two settlements, Barra and Syre, for which, to a large extent, I am responsible, that it is easy to make too much of the fact that there is a certain amount of arrears outstanding. The real comparison is to compare the amount of arrears outstanding with what has been paid and the total sum which ought to have been received. These facts are given upon page 9 of Appendix XI. of the Report. In the case of Syre the amount payable up to Martinmas, after every settler had fulfilled every obligation he had made, was £2,628 13s. 10d., and of that amount practically £2,100 has been received. When you consider that there are a considerable number of settlers, that some of them have been personally unfortunate, that in some cases the men who made the bargains have died, and their widows left to struggle with the new holdings, I think upon the whole, although not a thing to be proud of, it is not so bad a Return as might very easily have happened in what is a new experiment with men who have great difficulties to contend with. Take the case of Barra. In that case the total amount payable up to the date of the Report for principal and interest would have been £1,107 3s. The amount actually paid was £711 13s. 9d., so that there are arrears of nearly £400 on a total payment of £1,100. That is not satisfactory. But I venture to say that the difference between the two arises largely from the fact that the holdings in Barra are of a much smaller area, are further removed from being what is called self-supporting, and that the settlers had, therefore, very great difficulties to contend with. I do not think it is reasonable to make anything of the fact that those who have come under an obligation to purchase would like to be tenants, because the explanation is very obvious. In Scotland rates are divided between owner and occupier, and as the rates go up the owner has an increased obligation, and these men see that when they are only tenants they pay less than half the rates (the tenant's share), and when they are owners they are put under obligation for the whole. That is to my mind, having regard to the Scottish and Celtic nature, quite sufficient to account for the desire to become tenants rather than purchasers. I think that it is unfortunate that on that page of the Report the wording should have been put in precisely as it is, because I think it is intended, as I think on insufficient grounds, to bolster up the argument in favour of hiring rather than purchase.

The real fact of the matter is this. I am afraid that in the West Highlands, certainly in the islands of Scotland, these schemes, benevolent as they are, are doomed to failure. After all, they were only experiments. I am responsible for the experiments in the cases of Barra and of Syre. They were undertaken some five or six years ago with the apprehension that they would fail, but it was thought desirable that object lessons at not very great expense should be given, and that the experiment should be made. Some of these people will succeed, some will not. What I am afraid of is that, wherever you increase, as you are increasing, the standard of comfort desired, by education and by, to some extent, improving the position of the settlers, you will find them not, I am afraid, getting more contented, but less contented, than they were before.

They will struggle for further improvement. The younger generation is better educated and sees that the men who go away to the towns and cities of this country, or to the wider domain of Canada, get on better than those who remain at home, and therefore you are not going to stimulate their desire to stay at home, but, on the other hand, stimulate their desire to go after those who have gone before them. I am afraid from economic grounds it is evitable. In many of these cases I believe that if you gave them land for nothing they could not make a living, having regard to the prices they could obtain for produce. But I think upon the whole, although there is something to be desired, the state of matters so far as arrears are concerned has been rather exaggerated for the purposes of this discussion. I think if the facts are carefully and dispassionately considered it will be seen that, upon the whole, the majority of those concerned have tolerably fairly met their obligations. Those who have failed have failed to some extent owing to some especially difficult circumstances, such as the death of the breadwinner. But I sympathise with my noble friend who brought the question forward that in a Report which ought to have been a mere record of facts there is the intention to argue in favour of one system against another.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): The noble Earl has hung upon his theme a sort of vindication of his own action in regard to the Scottish Small Holders Bill. That Bill has been killed, and ought to have been allowed to rest undisturbed, but its ghost seems to be flitting about, and I cannot help thinking that the noble Earl feels somewhat uneasy in regard to the undoubted dissatisfaction which exists because we have not been able to agree in reference to a Bill of this kind. The Report is criticised because it is supposed to favour hiring as against purchase. I know perfectly well that the noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, said his scheme for Scotland was a purchase system; but is there any Member of your Lordships' House who knows Scotland who is prepared to say that he wants a small holders' system for Scotland resting upon purchase? I am sure the noble Lord, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, would not say so, because he knows his own country so well. It cannot be done, and it is quite unnecessary to bolster up the opposite system. The noble Earl himself brought in this very session a Bill based upon compulsory hiring. For my part, it does not disturb me whether there has been any indirect advocacy of the compulsory hiring system in the Blue-book or not, because the compulsory hiring will surely come, and the noble Lords here do not say anything to the contrary. The system of small holdings by purchase in Scotland is dead and buried, and will never be revived. The noble Lord referred to the disclosures in this Blue-book as some argument against what he called the "crofterisation" of Scotland under the proposed Bill which is now defunct.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: What I said was that it seemed to me that these figures proved that these crofters had not been a success.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: And the noble Earl also referred to the Bill which is no longer in existence as an attempt to "crofterise" Scotland.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Was it not?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I am going to deal with it. The noble Earl said that the Bill would reproduce in Scotland the condition of affairs existing in Ireland. What does the "crofterisation" of Scotland mean? Does it mean that you are going to translate to Scotland the climate, the race, and the lamentable poverty which exists in Ireland? Nothing of the kind. The only meaning is that the tenant crofters shall be extended to other counties. If you think it is more to the interest of the landlord that the tenure as in the English Bill should be adopted than that in the Bill which the noble Earl called "crofterisation" I am quite prepared to accept it. The landlord will find it a great deal better under what you call the "crofterisation" system than under the other. I feel it is a lamentable thing that we should not try to put our hands to settling this thing, which is most vital to Scotland, instead of going back over the old ground of the defunct Bill. I am sure the noble Earl will not think I am making these observations in any sense personally adverse to himself; only it seemed to me that he was seeking to justify to himself what I think was a great mistake, viz., the destruction of that Bill.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I quite realise, as does the noble and learned Lord upon the Woolsack, the great difficulty of applying to Scotland or to any part of the United Kingdom, a wholesale system of small holdings founded upon purchase. We are it is true endeavouring to introduce such a state of things into Ireland, but we have been driven to do so, in spite of the great difficulties, financial and other, which stand in the way, on account of the failure of the particular kind of hiring system, which, as some of us think in an ill-advised moment, was introduced into that part of the United Kingdom. Noble Lords who sit on this side of the House do not object to compulsory hiring merely because it is compulsory hiring, but we object very strongly indeed to the particular kind of compulsory hiring which found a place in the Scottish Bill. I may remind the House of the difference between the system proposed in the Scottish Bill and the system proposed in the English Small Holdings Bill, which this House accepted. In the case of the English Bill the local authorities intervene. The proprietor lets his land to the local authority, which becomes responsible for the conduct of the transaction and stands between the occupier of the land and the owner. What we object to is any system under which the owner of the soil is compelled, in opposition to his own better judgment, and whether he likes it or not, to let his land directly to small holders and to stand the whole risk and responsibility of the failure of a very hazardous experiment. That is why we looked askance at the proposals contained in the Scottish Bill, and why we protested against it as being likely to introduce into another part of the United Kingdom many of the undoubted evils which have prevailed in Ireland, evils from which there is no means of escape except by recourse to that expensive and difficult system of wholesale purchase to which the noble and learned Lord referred.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: After what the noble Lord opposite has said, I shall not persist with my Motion with regard to the production of the correspondence. With regard to what the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack said, I can assure him he entirely misunderstood me. What I said was this. I merely stated facts in regard to those Bills which were for the "crofterization" of Scotland, founded chiefly upon the fact that this crofters system as recently administered had not been a success. With regard to the hiring of land direct from tenants, I pointed out that in my opinion the statements that were made in that Report do not justify the inferences which appeared to be drawn. I had not in my mind the least idea in reference to the Bills lately before the House, and if it gives the noble and learned Lord any satisfaction I can assure him my mind is perfectly easy on the subject. The last thing I thought of was the raising of a debate with regard to the system on which land should be acquired in Scotland. My object was simply to point out that in my opinion this Report did not point to any success on the part of the crofters system.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

TRAINING OF MERCANTILE MARINE OFFICERS.

*LORD BRASSEY, in rising—"To call attention to the inadequate means of educational training available for officers of the Mercantile Marine, and to urge that some provision should be made for the education of cadets of the Royal Naval Reserve during the period of apprenticeship,"—said: The point on which I wish to insist is this. Whilst the Admiralty have bestowed, and rightly bestowed, the utmost care on the education of officers for the permanent service of the Navy, and Parliament has been lavish in appropriations, the early education of officers enrolled for the Reserve has been neglected. The

Admiralty have relied unduly on the inadequate means of instruction obtainable outside the Royal service. The Admiralty have shown their sense of the importance of providing a Reserve of officers for the Navy by enrolling them in large numbers. Their names fill many pages of the Navy List. We look to our Reserve of officers, not only in war, but in the ordinary conditions of peace service.

In the school-ship stage, it does not seem necessary to call for assistance from the State. For cadets aspiring to the more responsible positions in the mercantile marine, and it is from these that the Naval Reserve is recruited, two school-ships have been established by private effort, the "Conway" in the Mersey, and the "Worcester" in the Thames. Those ships should be able to turn out midshipmen every year in numbers sufficient for the requirements of the Naval Reserve. When we pass from the school-ship to the important period of apprenticeship at sea, the need is urgent for some assistance from the State. For those entered as cadets and midshipmenin the Naval Reserve sea-going training-ships, such as that formerly maintained by the P. and O. Company, are necessary. The P. and O. ship has long since disappeared. To-day we have one ship, and only one ship, the "Port Jackson," sailing under the flag of Messrs Devitt & Moore, in which the education begun in the school ships is systematically carried forward. Another ship of a similar character is reported to be fitting out by the powerful combine over which Mr. Ismay presides.

It is obvious that two sea-going ships will not adequately provide for the educational training of the full number of young officers required for the Naval Reserve. The majority of those who are enrolled as officers for the Naval Reserve have to go to sea as apprentices under conditions far from favourable to education. They go to sea as apprentices in the mercantile marine. Under the pressure of severe competition, our merchant ships are worked, and necessarily worked, with the strictest regard to economy. The apprentices do the duties of ordinary seamen. At sea it is good that the apprentice should take his part in working the ship. If his whole time in harbour is given to chipping paint and similar occupations, his naval education cannot be carried up to the standard required for efficiency in the Royal Navy. Steps should be taken to afford greater equality of opportunity. Adequately to extend the facilities for the education of officers of the Reserve, State-aid should be given to a limited extent, and under conditions which would insure that public money was well applied. As to the conditions, it should be insisted upon that competent naval instructors should be carried. For training in seamanship the ships should be fully rigged. To maintain an effective supervision over the progress of education and professional training, every boy should be examined on the completion of each voyage by an inspecting officer of the Admiralty. The incompetent would be weeded out, and any defects in the system of education would be discovered and remedied. At the completion of four years service at sea, the cadets would pass the Board of Trade examination. Some further tests might perhaps be insisted upon.

Assuming that the policy of grants for the training of Reserve cadets were approved, the charge to the State would be inconsiderable, compared with the vast total of our Navy Estimates. The number of Reserve cadets would be determined with reference to the establishment of officers of the Reserve, as from time to time fixed by Order in Council. The scale of payment to be made by the Admiralty would be best considered by a small committee, or by conference between the Reserves office and the shipowners. Let it be assumed that the amount for each cadet need not exceed £25 a year. Assuming forty cadets to be carried, the annual grant for each ship would not exceed £1,000. Four or five ships would supply the full number of young officers required for the Reserve. With some encouragement from the Admiralty, ships would be promptly fitted out by the leading shipowners of this country, and if that were done we should be following, where we ought to have led, the example set to us by Germany. It is not going too far to say that a real blot on our naval administration would be removed. I may briefly refer to the instruction in engineering, which has become necessary for every officer trained for the sea service. It can be provided for the Naval Reserve at small expense. Midshipmen of the Naval Reserve should go through a six months' course at approved schools of engineering. The necessary cost should be covered by a grant, under suitable conditions. The expenditure I have ventured to recommend would be inconsiderable, whilst the results would be more than commensurate. The officers of the Reserve would be more efficient. In the mercantile marine the standard of education generally would be raised, and the bonds of discipline strengthened. With the general question of technical education for our seamen, I do not propose on the present occasion to deal. An inquiry was held a few years ago by the Royal Geographical Society, the results of which were given in a paper prepared by their able Secretary, Sir Clements Markham. There are some admirable schools, but they are all too few. A strong case was made for more liberal appropriations from the large sums voted by Parliament for technical education. And now I have only to express my acknowledgments to Lieutenant Bosanquet, of the Marine Society, and to Captain Barker, of the "Worcester," for the aid they have given in preparing the brief statement I have ventured to submit to your Lordships.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, the speech of the noble Lord would rather give the idea that the officers of the mercantile marine are slightly deficient in education. I do not think that that can be held for one moment. Most young officers now go in for passing for the extra-masters certificate. We find young men of twenty-four or twenty-five who have passed for that certificate, and I do not think that any man who has passed the very special examination that he is required to pass to obtain that certificate can be said to have anything deficient in his education. In his Motion the noble Lord mentions cadets for the Naval Reserve. I do not know what he means by that. I have never heard of such a thing before. But if the noble Lord means cadets for the merchant service, which I presume he does, we know that at the present time there are two very good school ships and other nautical establishments which give a very excellent education, and a turn-out of a quite sufficient number of officers for the merchant service. As a matter of fact there are, at the present moment, hundreds of captains and officers, fully qualified and able men, out of employment, and I do not think there is ground for any complaint of a shortage of officers or need of more training ships leading to the greater overstocking of our mercantile marine.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, the noble Lord seems to consider that there is a great lack of opportunity for members of the merchant marine to acquire knowledge. I do not think that is the case at all. I have made some inquiry into this matter, and I find that there are schools in nearly every big port in this country where persons wishing to embrace the calling of the sea can study all matters connected with it. In addition to this there are two ships, the "Conway" and the "Worcester," which render very valuable service in this respect. Owing to the new regulations brought in by Lord Selborne, an officer serving in the Navy is bound to acquire a knowledge of engineering. That has not been the case so far in the merchant service. It seems to me quite proper that officers of the merchant service should if possible acquire some knowledge of engineering. The "Conway" people inform me that they propose placing in the course of instruction on that ship a course of engineering. The noble Lord referred to a new ship fitting out by the White Star Company. I have no particulars to hand about that, but I understand that this ship was going to carry about sixty cadets, with instructors who will be competent to teach them all branches of marine knowledge. The question now is as to how is the Navy served with regard to the Royal Naval Reserve. The facts of the matter are simply these. Generally, every year we have in the Navy about seventy-five to eighty vacancies for officers of the Royal Naval Reserve; for those positions we generally have

400 to 500 applicants, and we are able, therefore, to take the pick of those men, and from the reports that are to hand the efficiency of the officers of the Royal Naval Reserve is beyond doubt. I was talking the other day to an Admiral of the Coast Defences, and he informed me that these men were everything a captain of a ship could desire. Therefore, from the point of view of the Navy, it does not seem necessary that we should spend any more money as suggested by the noble Lord. We are able to get a sufficiency of candidates desirous of joining the Naval Reserve, and, therefore, much as I sympathise with the objects of my noble friend's speech, I think no case has been made out for spending any extra money on this matter.

CRAN MEASURES BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, this is a very small measure, but I think it is a useful Bill and a Bill that will give a great deal of satisfaction to a very deserving and gallant class of men—the sailors on the east coast. The object of the Bill is to legalise and regulate the use of the cran measure in the fresh herring trade in England and in Wales. An application for its adoption must be made by a local authority to the Board of Agriculture and the regulations under the Bill will be issued by the Board. It is an adoptive Bill and the local authority is the county council or the borough council. The word "cran" is a measure which really is a basket which contains 37½ imperial gallons, although the measure that would really be used in the herring trade would be what is called a quarter cran, equalling a little over 9 gallons. These measures have long been in use in Scotland, and they were legalised by the Herring Fisheries Bill of 1889. Persons interested in the herring trade on the east coast—and I need hardly remind the House what an important trade that is—hoped that this measure might also be legalised in England as well as in Scotland. Up to five years ago herrings on the east coast were sold by what is called "long hundred," which meant 132. That led to waste of time and labour and a certain amount of confusion, and there were frequent disputes as to the countings of fish, and so in 1903 quarter-cran baskets were introduced from Scotland and proved a great benefit. They began to be used at Lowestoft, Yarmouth, Hartlepool, Grimsby, and Scarborough, but it was found after the introduction of these baskets that the buyers refused, and I think naturally refused, to accept the baskets that were not officially stamped. They had no guarantee that they contained the measure they were supposed to contain, and therefore the East Suffolk County Council and the Lowestoft Town Council both passed resolutions urging the legalisation of the cran measure for use in England. That happened in 1904, and they suggested that it might be carried out on the lines of the Scottish Act of 1889. The first clause of the Bill follows the provision of that Act. The Bill has the support of the East Coast herring traders *en bloc*, and has I believe, the unanimous support of the National Sea Fisheries Protection Association. There is one other point to which I need draw attention. Subsection 3 of Clause 1 states—

> "Subject to the provisions of this Act cran and quarter cran measures so made and marked as aforesaid shall be the only legal measures for use in buying, selling, delivering, or receiving fresh herrings."

Attention was called to that, but I have to point out that it is provided that nothing in this section shall prevent the sale of herrings by weight, number, or bulk. I believe that this Bill would give a great deal of satisfaction to a most deserving and gallant body of men, and hope your Lordships will be pleased to accord it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

*LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, on behalf of the herring trade, I beg to thank the noble Earl for having introduced this Bill, and also the officials of the Department who have taken the greatest trouble about the measure, and shown the greatest courtesy to the trade; when the matter was discussed by the executive of the National Sea Fisheries Association, the noble Earl was kind enough to allow one of the most important Members of his Department to be present at the discussion, and to promise that this Bill should be introduced. The draft Bill was afterwards sent to the Association, and was thoroughly approved. It is an adoptive measure, but at the same time, it will be, I think, adopted generally throughout the parts of the country affected. Our only regret is that it should have been brought in so late, although that is no fault of the noble Earl or of his Department. If the Bill cannot pass before the adjournment, it will be impossible for it to come into operation this year, as the Resolutions must be passed, and the permission of the Department obtained. If the noble Earl could see his way to pass the Bill—and members of our Parliamentary Committee will give him every assistance—before the end of this week and allow it to become law, it would be a great benefit, and be very much appreciated by the members of the great herring trade throughout the country. It would then give us about six weeks to pass the necessary Resolutions and bring it into action before the herring trade really begins.

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

SHORTAGE OF INFANTRY UNITS.

*VISCOUNT HARDINGE rose "to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War, whether in view of the assurance given by the Secretary of State to the effect that no further reduction of the infantry of the line, either by the destruction of units or by the reduction of the strength or establishment of existing units, is in contemplation, he can now state what is the shortage below establishment of the infantry units on the British establishment, what measures are being taken to make good that shortage, and whether it is proposed, when the shortage has been made good, to increase the present establishment of 720 rank and file."

The noble Viscount said: I am sure my noble friend who represents the War Office in this House will understand that I am not making reference to anything connected with the Territorial Army and will understand the object therefore of the Question which appears in my name. With regard to the Special Reserve, to which I have the honour to belong, and as to the future of which I am therefore deeply anxious, perhaps the noble Lord will not mind my saying that his responses to some of my questions the other day were not altogether reassuring, more especially with reference to what he stated, that His Majesty's Government hoped to supply the new short rifle before the next training. I think it would have been far more satisfactory if he had stated that it was the intention of His Majesty's Government that the Special Reserve should be armed with the new rifle almost at once, for I think it must be patent to anyone who has any knowledge of military matters, that now that the Special Reserve are to be the real Reserve of the Regular Army it is absolutely essential that they should not only be taught the mechanism of this weapon but actually shoot with it. There is another point to which I wish to draw the noble Lord's attention. Referring the other day to the shortage in the Special Reserve, he threw out a hint implying, though perhaps unintentionally so, that he attributed the shortage in the 3rd Battalion of the Bedfordshire Regiment to the lack of encouragement given by the colonel of the regiment, my noble friend the Duke of Bedford. That was what we were led to believe; whilst as regards another battalion, the commanding officer, the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, had, by the enthusiasm he had shown, been able to get many more men to join the Special Reserve. If the noble Lord did mean that it was an unfortunate remark to make, because the two battalions are on entirely different lines. The 3rd Battalion is simply for drafting purposes, whilst the 4th

Battalion is to work as a unit by itself. I trust, therefore, that in answer to my Question the noble Lord will be able to make the statement that he did not intend to imply that which would be most uncalled for and unfair to the Duke of Bedford.

LORD LUCAS: In answer, first of all, to the Question which the noble Lord has on the Paper, the figures on 1st July were as follows: The establishment of non-commissioned officers and men of the Infantry of the Regular Army was 85,901, but the strength on that date was 83,802; that is a deficit of 2,099. At the present moment we are to some extent suffering shortage owing to the Indian drafts. The strength of the Infantry suffers greatly owing to drafts going out all through the winter and the spring, and the Infantry is at its lowest then and afterwards recruits up until the drafts begin again. We hope to see that deficit very considerably reduced in a few months time. As to the second point of the Question, we do not propose to take any special steps. Recruiting is good this year, and we hope that this deficit will be wiped off before long. As to the last part of the Question I can only refer the noble Lord to the Answer that was given by the Secretary of State in the other House. It was to the effect that when the shortage had been made good he would consider the question of increasing the establishment of the Home Battalions from the present number 720. As to the rifles for the Special Reserve, what I intended to convey was that it was decided that the Special Reserve shall be armed with the short rifle and that it was hoped that this rifle would be in the hands of the whole of the Special Reserve in time for next year's training.

VISCOUNT HARDINGE: There was one point I omitted as regards the filling-up of the lower ranks of the Special Reserve, on which I think the noble Lord could give us further information.

LORD LUCAS: Officers?

VISCOUNT HARDINGE: Yes.

Viscount Hardinge.

LORD LUCAS: What is going to be done is this. The new system for providing the persons for the Special Reserve will be in full force by June of next year. As your Lordships know, the officers of the Special Reserve, if they do not choose to pass any form of examination before they go in, will be required to do a year's attachment with a unit of the Regular Army. There are two examinations they may pass, both of which exempt them for a certain time. The first examination for Certificate A will take place in the middle of December this year, and the first examination for Certificate B about the middle of June next year. Any officer who joins the Special Reserve before the middle of December who has not had a chance of going in for either certificate will be exempted from eight months of his course. He will only have to do four months attachment, and he can do that any time either winter or summer, and if he wishes to do so he can, at the time the Special Reserve is training, leave his course and go out with the Reserve. After the middle of December, when he will have had a chance of doing so, if he has passed for Certificate A he will only have to do four months attachment. If he does not pass for Certificate A he will have to do eight months attachment under the same conditions. After the middle of June of next year, after the scheme is in working order, and any officer who joins will have had a chance of getting both certificates, if he has not got those two certificates he will have to do a full year. As regards the other Question, I am sorry if anything I said about these two battalions of the Bedfordshire Regiment, commanded by the noble Duke and the noble Marquess, should be considered an imputation. I brought the case forward simply to show how impossible it was to make any prophecies. Here were two battalions in neighbouring counties; one had transferred 70 per cent. to the Special Reserve and one had transferred 40 per cent. When there were such startling variations in two neighbouring counties and two neighbouring battalions of the same regiment, I said it was quite impossible to attempt to forecast, as some speakers were doing, what the strength of the Special Reserve was going to be.

BEE PEST (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, I understand this Bill is required because the disease of foul breed has spread rapidly and caused great loss. I understand from the noble Earl opposite, the Earl of Donoughmore, that there will be no opposition to the Second Reading of this Bill, although some Amendments may be moved at a later stage. At this late hour, therefore, unless further information is asked for, I will content myself merely with moving the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Lord Denman.*)

***EARL OF DONOUGHMORE**: I do not wish to offer any opposition, but should like to thank the noble Lord on behalf of the Government for the trouble he has taken in bringing this Bill forward. I may have to draw attention to a number of detailed points in Committee, but in no case will I do so in any spirit of hostility to the Bill.

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Wednesday next.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: This Bill and the Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill stand together, and I may say one word with regard to both of them. It is desirable that the polling districts for Parliamentary and county council elections should be identical, but various small anomalies have crept in which these Bills would redress. In the case of the county council elections there is this anomaly—that by some mistake in the wording of the original Act once a polling district has been created it cannot be altered, although changes take place in population and other respects, and this not only has the effect of leaving polling districts unequal but results in a divergence between the Parliamentary and the county council polling districts. Then as to the other measure. By the wording of the original Act, where the polling district is within one Petty Sessional Division the jurisdiction shall belong to the magistrate in Petty Sessions, whereas if a polling district happens to be in more than one Petty Sessional Division there is at once an appeal to another body. I am sure you will feel that in both Parliamentary and county council elections the jurisdiction should be the same. Both these Bills have passed your Lordships' House on five previous occasions.

Moved, that the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY COUNCILS) BILL.

Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [H.L.]

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

Amendment reported (according to order); a further Amendment made, and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 22nd July, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—As amended, considered.

Ordered, that Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords]. Read a second time and committed.

Rhymney and Aber Valley Gas and Water Bill [Lords].—Ordered, that Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill to sit and proceed forthwith—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Falkirk and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed without Amendment.

Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Friday.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Ordered, that Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on unopposed Bills have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]. Ordered that it be an instruction to the Committee on the Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords], to insert a clause for providing that the district council shall not from the system of sewerage referred to in the order permit any crude sewage to be discharged into the Bay of Dublin, except between the time of high water and five hours after high water, provided that in case of heavy rain or other emergency the storm water may be discharged at any period of the tide.—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

Keighley Corporation Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Post Office Savings Bank Bill, without Amendment; Padiham Urban District Council Bill; Criccieth Water and Improvement Bill; South-West Suburban Water Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to Amendments to:—Finchley Urban District Council Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to:—Pontypridd Water Bill [Lords]; Aire and Calder Navigation Bill [Lords]; Bognor Gas Light and Coke Company Bill [Lords]; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to prohibit the importation of the Plumage and Skins of Wild Birds." [Importation of Plumage Prohibition Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Education, under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1907, to enable the councils of the administrative counties of Cornwall, Merioneth, and the West Riding of Yorkshire and the county borough of Swansea, to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts." [Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [Lords].

House of Lords (Manuscripts).—Tha they communicate Copy of the Manuscripts of the House of Lords, Volume IV (New Series), as desired by this House in their Message of yesterday.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [Lords]. —Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 338.]

PETITIONS.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Droylsden, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Bristol; Ledbury; Peckham Rye; Sandbach Heath; Sheffield (two); and Whellock; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Eastwood, Garvock; Hamilton; Inch; Leith; Mearns; and New Cumnock; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4071 to 4073 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 566 (Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, Annual Report for 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Seventy-sixth Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, with Appendices, for the year ending 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1894 (PARISH COUNCIL ELECTIONS 1907).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th August, 1907; *Mr. Sinclair*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 247.]

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Return ordered, "for the year ending the 20th day of November, 1907: (1) From each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the number of such banks; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, excluding the Surplus Fund; the balance in the hands of the Treasurer; the total amount of the separate Surplus Fund in the hands of the Commissioners; the other assets, including the estimated value of the Bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the rate of interest paid to depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts, the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries; the rate per cent. per annum on the capital of the Bank for the expenses of management; the average cost of each transaction; the total amount of Government Stock standing to the credit of depositors; and the total number and amount of annuities in course of payment, including in such Return a summary of all such Savings Banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vict. c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Bank, showing for England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, and the United Kingdom the number of such

Banks, the number and amount of depositors' balances on the 20th day of November previous to date of notice to close; the number and amount of accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the officers of such Banks; and showing in separate columns the particulars relating to such Savings Banks as have been closed during the year; and (2) showing the total number of depositors in Trustee Savings Banks the total number of deposits; the total number of withdrawals; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; and the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 270, of Session 1907)."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

POOR RELIEF (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy ordered, "of Statement of the amount expended by Boards of Guardians for Poor Relief during the half-year ended Ladyday, 1908; and similar Statement for the half-year ended Michaelmas, 1908 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 309, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, ETC., 1907–8.

Return ordered, "of the amount received during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1908, in respect of each administrative county and county borough in England and Wales, for Local Taxation Licence Duties, and penalties and forfeitures recovered in respect of such duties, and for other duties and payments which are directed to be dealt with in the same manner as the Local Taxation Licence Duties (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 298, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT, 1907–8.

Return ordered, "showing in respect of the financial year ended the 31st day of March, 1908, the distribution of the moneys paid into the Local Taxation Account in pursuance of the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1888, the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, the Finance Act, 1894, and other Acts, as amended by the Finance Act, 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 317, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

LONDON (EQUALISATION OF RATES) ACT, 1894 (ACCOUNTS UNDER SECTION 1 (7) OF THE ACT).

Return ordered, "showing, according to the accounts for the twelve months preceding the 31st day of March, 1908, furnished to the Local Government Board under Section 1 (7) of the London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894:—(1) The amounts paid during the year out of the Equalisation Fund under the Act to the Corporation of the City of London and each of the Councils of Metropolitan Boroughs to whom payments out of that fund were made; (2) The amount of the expenses incurred during the year by each of these authorities: (*a*) Under the Public Health (London) Act, 1891 (including expenses of scavenging streets); (*b*) in respect of lighting; and (*c*) in respect of streets (other than the expenses of scavenging); and (3) the amount expended during the year by each such authority out of the sums received by them under the Act (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 318, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Reduction in Hours of Spinners of American Cotton.

MR. GOULDING (Worcester): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if the 108½ hours reduction of time to be worked by spinners of American cotton in seven weeks will be shown in the monthly Unemployment Returns as issued by the Board of Trade; and, if not, can he state what is the percentage of lessened employment in the trades affected represented by the reduction in question.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). Neither short time nor overtime is taken into account in the monthly Returns as to the proportion of trade unionists unemployed. The spinners of American cotton directly affected by the arrangement with regard to the working of short time have had their ordinary weekly hours reduced by about 28 per cent. I am making inquiries as to the number of persons affected by the reduction.

Pay of Saltcoats Postmen.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state what reduction has been made in the salary of postmen employed at the post office, Saltcoats, Ayrshire, in consequence of the new gradation of wages according to the volume of work and the cost of living; and whether any such reduction will affect those at present in the postal service at Saltcoats or will only apply to new entrants.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee the maximum of the scale of pay of the postmen at Saltcoats, who are in Class 4, is 23s. a week. Existing officers are in no way affected. They will all go to their old maximum. The new scale applies to new entrants only.

The Provincial Homes Investment Company.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the judgment given by Judge Parry in the Manchester County Court on 16th Ju in reference to the action against the Provincial Homes Investment Company, Limited; and, if so, what action he proposes to take to put a stop to such companies.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) My attention has been called to the judgment given by Judge Parry in the Manchester County Court on 16th July in an action brought against the Provincial Homes Investment Company, Limited. The question of these house-purchase companies is at the present time engaging my attention, but the matter requires further consideration before I can tell my hon. friend what action I propose to take with regard to them.

Fatal Accidents caused by Motor Omnibuses.

MR. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that two fatal motor-bus accidents have taken place in the Mile End Road since Friday; and whether he can instruct the police to avoid the continuance of this danger by more carefully controlling the motor-bus traffic.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone*). A fatal accident occurred in the Mile End Road on the 17th instant, when, owing to the skidding of his bicycle, a man was thrown beneath the wheels of a motor omnibus. In this case the coroner's jury returned a verdict of accidental death and entirely exonerated the driver. On the 18th instant a man fell beneath the wheels of a motor omnibus in the Mile End Road and was killed. The coroner's inquest has yet to be held. The police are paying special attention to omnibus traffic in the East End, but I am advised that no police precautions could have averted these accidents.

Reduction of British Garrisons Overseas

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): To ask the Secretary of State for War what circumstances have occurred since Monday, 29th June, involving a substantial reduction of British garrisons overseas to the extent of four battalions of infantry and one regiment of cavalry.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*). The hon. Member's Question is not understood. The decision to reduce the South African garrison by one regiment of cavalry and four battalions of infantry was fully explained in the Memorandum on Army Estimates presented to the House in February.

Chinese Labourers Repatriated.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the total number of Chinese indentured labourers repatriated from the Transvaal up to 30th June of this year; and what is estimated to be the number that will remain after 30th June, 1909.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely*). The number repatriated up to 30th June of this year must be about 40,000, and under the repatriation arrangements made by the Transvaal Government, about 5,000 may be expected to remain for repatriation about 30th June, 1909, but it is not possible to give exact figures without consulting the Transvaal Government.

East African Protectorate Rules.

Sir C. HILL (Shrewsbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the rules printed on page 28 of the recent correspondence relating to affairs in the East African Protectorate [Cd. 4122] are the rules referred to on page 1 of that Paper.; and, if not, whether a copy of those rules can be placed in the Library of the House.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) The rules printed on page 28 of Cd. 4122 are the rules referred to on page 1 of that Paper.

African Protectorate—Ordinances.

Sir C. HILL: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a copy of the complete Ordinances relating to the East Africa, Uganda, Nyasaland, and Somaliland Protectorates up to 30th June, 1908, can be placed in the Library of the House.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) I will inquire, and, if (as I gather from the hon. Member's Question) the sets now in the Library of the House are incomplete, I will have them completed.

Recruiting of Native Labour for East African Protectorate.

Viscount HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state on what grounds the Report of the Board appointed on 24th March to consider the terms under which labour should be recruited by the Government and to inquire into the conditions of the labour supply, has not been published with the other correspondence relating to affairs in the East African Protectorate; and whether he will present the Paper to Parliament as soon as possible, seeing that it has a direct bearing on the Papers already presented.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) The Report in question was not included in the Papers recently presented to Parliament because it was only received on 12th June, and, as stated in the last paragraph of Lord Crewe's despatch of that date, his Lordship wished to take time to consider the questions connected with the employment of native labourers. It will be included among other Papers which will be presented to Parliament as soon as possible.

Government Audit Work.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury why the authorities of the Exchequer and Audit Department refuse to state whether the nominated members of the old Colonial Audit Branch of the Exchequer and Audit Department had to undergo any educational test before being admitted to the branch.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that the present system of auditing the Irish Public Accounts in London causes duplication of work and waste of public money, and that Ireland loses £10,000 per annum by having this Irish work done in London, he will further consider the advisability of having this Irish work done in Ireland.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, with reference to the recent amalgamation of the old Colonial Audit Branch with the main establishment of the Exchequer and Audit Department, he will say if up to that time there was any case in which three men or more were simultaneously granted certificates under Clause VII. of the Order in Council of 4th June, 1870 the effect of which was to introduce them into a department on a permanent footing, but with higher emoluments than existing officials of the same rank and service who were employed on the same duties, and who entered the Civil Service by open competition.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I have nothing to add to the replies which have been given to the hon. Member on these three Questions.

Compulsory Retirement of Miss Bradley from the Post Office.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether the compulsory retirement of Miss Bradley some months ago was persisted in because of the recommendation of a Post Office female medical officer of minor qualifications, notwithstanding the certificate of a specialist, Sir William Gowers, to the effect that Miss Bradley's ailment was amenable to treatment and that she would probably become quite well again by carrying out his prescription; whether Miss Bradley pressed for an independent medical examination by a doctor to be nominated by the Post Office; and, if so, why her request was not acceded to; and, seeing that Miss Bradley's sick leave during the last five years was not abnormal and that she is now quite well again, will he take steps to reinstate her in her former employment, as is usually done in the case of male Civil servants similarly situated.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have nothing to add to the information which I gave to my hon. friend by letter upon this subject in April last. I must express my great regret that a depreciatory opinion should be expressed in this public manner of a lady medical officer whose high medical skill and attainments are no less obvious to those who know her than her natural kindliness to those members of the staff who become her patients.

Illegal Trawling in Scotch Waters.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that the last Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland shows that last year twenty-six cases of illegal trawling off the coast of Scotland were detected by fishermen, will he state the name of each vessel thus detected, the waters in which she was engaged, and the result of the prosecution in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I may refer my hon. friend for detailed information as to the cases of illegal trawling detected by fishermen to Appendix L., No. 11, pp. 221–36 of the Board's Report.

Disorderly Seamen on Steamer "Clam."

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the alleged insubordination of certain Chinese seamen on board of the British steamer "Clam" at the port of South Shields on 8th July, when three Chinese firemen of this vessel were charged with assaulting the serang; whether he is aware that on a previous voyage sixteen Chinese seamen were sent to prison from this same steamer; and whether he will order inquiries to be made as to the causes of the frequent outbreaks on this vessel.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) My attention has been called to the prosecution and conviction at South Shields of three Chinese firemen belonging to the ss. "Clam" for assaulting the serang, and I am also informed that seventeen Chinamen who were members of the crew of this steamship were sentenced to one month's imprisonment at Dartmouth in April last. I understand from the owners that previously to these two cases no trouble was experienced with the crew of the vessel. I am not advised that an investigation is necessary upon the facts before me.

Expenditure on Tobacco per Head in England and Germany.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the annual average expenditure on tobacco among the working classes of London and Berlin earning various weekly incomes.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I regret that I am unable to give the hon. Member the information he desires.

Tube Railways—Fire Precautions.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the risk of suffocation of passengers in the tube railways of London should the wooden sleepers by any accident become ignited, will he communicate with the various companies on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Board of Trade propose to await the Report of the inquiry of Colonel Yorke and Mr. Trotter into the recent fire on the City and South London Railway before considering what action, if any, is necessary with regard to this and kindred matters.

Census of Production Act Returns.

MR. W. BENN (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether, in view of the complicated nature of some of the questions issued to manufacturers under the Census of Production Act, and the practical impossibility of answering them correctly, any modifications in the forms issued under that Act are possible.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The general form of the questions issued to manufacturers is, to some extent, determined by the provisions of the Act itself. The forms for particular trades have been in every case prepared after consultation either with special advisory committees or with important firms engaged in the trade. Where, however, any difficulty arises my Department will always be prepared to consider the special circumstances of the case. I shall be glad to afford my hon. friend any further information and assistance in my power if he will call at the Board of Trade.

The Imprisoned Suffragists.

MR. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the fact that Miss Florence Haig and Miss Joachim were sentenced on 1st July last for an offence committed for political reasons, he will advise their transfer from the second to the first division for the remainder of their term of three months imprisonment; and whether his attention has been called to the legal decision of 1891, quoted in Pitt Cobbett's "Leading Cases on International Law," page 36.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I see no sufficient reason for interference on behalf of these ladies, who can bring their terms of imprisonment to an end at any moment, and, as I have already said, I think it would be unconstitutional for me to advise the use of the Royal prerogative for this purpose. The decision quoted by the hon. Member related to offences "of a political character" within the meaning of the Extradition Act of 1870, and has no bearing upon the prison treatment of persons sentenced in respect of offences committed in this country.

Sale of Estate of Sir Arthur Wallace.

MR. C. MACVEIGH (Donegal, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the tenants on the estate of Sir Arthur Wallace, situated at Drumbologue, East Donegal, signed purchase agreements in March last and lodged them with the Estates Commissioners; whether he is aware that they and their landlord now desire that the sale of the Drumbologue and Ramelton portion of the estate should be treated as one transaction, the title being the same and all the proofs furnished in the Ramelton part, the sale of which is about to be completed, apply to both; and whether seeing that the Drumbologue tenants live in a poor congested district and the saving of expense to them and the advantage they will have in the immediate reduction of their annual payments, he will direct the Commissioners to deal with the two portions of the estate as one.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I refer to my Answer to the hon. Member's previous Question of 13th July. The Estates Commissioners cannot, in fairness to other vendors and purchasers, deal with the agreements referred to in the first part of the Question out of the proper order of priority.

Grant for Mrs. Sheehy of Raheen.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether Mrs. Margaret Sheehy, of Raheen, Croagh, in the county of Limerick, evicted tenant, has yet obtained a grant from the Estates Commissioners to help her to work the evicted farm in which she has been reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have decided not to make any grant in this case, as they are of opinion that Mrs. Sheehy already possesses sufficient live stock.

Grant for James Reardon of Rathkeale.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether James Reardon, of Blossom Hill, Rathkeale, in the county of Limerick, has yet got a grant to help him to work the holding in which he has been reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) This case is in the hands of the Estates Commissioners' inspector, and until they have received his Report they cannot say whether or not they will make any grant in the case.

Evicted Tenants—Cases of Mrs. O'Shaughnessy and Mrs. Hayes.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any action recently to have Mrs. O'Shaughnessy and Mrs. Hayes, both of Aughanish Island, in the county of Limerick, evicted tenants on the property of Lane Joynt, reinstated; and if he can say what objections they have to put the Evicted Tenants Act into operation in these cases, seeing that the land is in the landlord's hands.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As the hon. Member has already been informed, the Estates Commissioners' offer for the two evicted farms in this case was refused. The owner, however, has now, at the Commissioners' request, instituted formal proceedings for the sale of the entire estate to them, and, if they acquire the property, they will deal with the question of reinstating the evicted tenants named.

Reinstatement of Mrs. Mary Eagan.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain the cause of delay in the reinstatement of Mrs. Mary Eagan, in her former holding at Caherduggan, on the Nason estate, County Cork, seeing that the landlord has accepted the offer of purchase made by the Estates Commissioners; and when do the Commissioners expect to be in a position to complete the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I refer to my Answer to the hon. Member's previous Question of 11th February. The owner has since instituted proceedings for the sale to the Estates Commissioners of the evicted farms in question, and as soon as the Commissioners receive possession the evicted tenants will be restored.

Case of Daniel Dorgan.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have had the case of Daniel Dorgan, an evicted tenant on the Madden estate, Mallow, County Cork, under their consideration; and if his reinstatement has been decided upon.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into the application of the evicted tenant in this case, and have decided to take it into consideration in connection with the allotment of any untenanted land which they may acquire in the locality.

Territorial Army Quartermaster Sergeants.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the recent order with regard to quartermaster-sergeants who have joined the Territorial Army has yet been reconsidered; and whether those men are to be allowed to retain the rank they formerly enjoyed in the Volunteers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This question is still under consideration, but will, I hope, be settled very shortly.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty China and Earthenware Contracts.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will give the number of the manufacturers on the Admiralty list for the supply of china and earthenware; are the tenders for these goods called for annually, and, if so, when, or are they ordered for each warship on fitting out; what firms on the list were asked to tender for the last yearly purchase or the last first class battleship completed; which of these firms actually tendered; had one particular manufacturer's sample moulds to be worked to; and is there any reason to believe that the special sample used restricted competition.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): There are about fifteen or sixteen firms who quote for the bulk of the articles of this nature. The articles of china and earthenware in the naval service differ considerably in quality for various services, and are divided into four groups. The contracts for three of the groups are made as a rule once in four or five years. For the fourth group, the contract is made annually, as the requirements are large. For three of the groups, all the firms on the list were asked to tender. For one of the groups of special quality, only five firms were invited to tender. Generally speaking, the usual large proportion of firms have responded to the invitations to tender. One of the five firms stated that they were unable to quote to Admiralty patterns. Otherwise, no suggestion of restriction of competition has been made. The Admiralty exhibits patterns, but firms make their own moulds to correspond therewith. One of the reasons for making contracts over a period of years is to enable firms to recoup themselves for any outlay on moulds. The patterns of one firm may be as good as those of another, but uniformity of pattern in this instance is necessary for the naval service to prevent odd sizes and descriptions of officers' table-ware in use. Replacements have to be made over the world, and the keeping of separate stocks of various patterns is not economical or convenient in the circumstances stated. There should be no difficulty in making the Admiralty pattern.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Nelson was very fond of porcelain and had a special penchant for Wedgwood?

[No Answer was returned.]

Naval Officers and Company Directorships.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can give the House an assurance that the King's Regulations will be altered so as to forbid any officer or man in the British Navy engaging in business.

MR. McKENNA: No, Sir.

MR. H. C. LEA: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that at Somerset House the registered address of the Chairman of the firm of J. H. Andrew & Co. (Ltd.) is given as "H.M. Battleship King Edward VII., the Channel Fleet"?

MR. McKENNA: My hon. friend asked me that Question the other day, and I think I have replied to it.

MR. H. C. LEA: Is the House to assume that the Board of Admiralty consider it is conducive to the best interests of the taxpayers of the country that naval officers should engage in business?

MR. McKENNA: My hon. friend asked me whether I proposed to make any change in the King's Regulations so as to forbid any officer or man in the British Navy engaging in business. The Board of Admiralty do not propose to make any change.

MR. H. C. LEA: Are we to assume that the Board of Admiralty consider it conducive to the best interests of the Navy that officers on full pay should engage in business?

MR. McKENNA: The hon. Gentleman's Question was as to any officer or man. That Question I have answered.

MR. H. C. LEA: I will alter my Question to make it refer to any officer on full pay.

MR. McKENNA: When my hon. friend has altered his Question, I may give him an altered Answer.

Cadet Examination Papers.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the unsuitable character of some of the papers set for boys under thirteen years of age who are nominated for cadetships at Osborne; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. McKENNA: The papers set to the boys selected for the qualifying examination for entry to Osborne are prepared by the Oxford and Cambridge Examinations Board. In the opinion of the Admiralty, there is nothing to warrant the suggestion that they are of an unsuitable character.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) asked if one question put to a boy was not to describe the character and appearance of the lady who would make the best wife for a man.

MR. McKENNA was understood to reply that that was not a question set for boys nominated for cadetships. It was a question set for an essay as to what would be the proper line of conduct at an interview.

Woolwich Common.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the War Office intend to enclose for their exclusive use about twenty acres of Woolwich Common, which is in the parish of Charlton, in addition to the two acres which he proposes to take for the Royal Army Medical Corps officers' quarters.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): It is intended to fence in a piece of land adjoining the Royal Military Academy and containing about eighteen acres. This land is required for the training of the increased number of cadets at the Royal Military Academy and for affording the necessary facilities for the drill and recreation of the Cadets.

MR. CROOKS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the extreme local feeling there is about this, and is it not likely to lead to a breach of the law if it is put into operation?

MR. HALDANE: I do not think so. The land was purchased by the War Office, and we have always done our utmost to make ourselves agreeable to the public.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Is not this common land? Have the rights of the commoners been considered?

MR. HALDANE: The commoners have no rights at all. All that was very carefully considered when we bought the land.

MR. CROOKS: Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to receive a deputation of the borough council, seeing that there are rights of which the War Office does not appear to be aware?

MR. HALDANE: If the borough council will come provided with funds to make good to the War Office any loss they may sustain, I am always prepared to consider a good pecuniary bargain.

MR. CROOKS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the public have had undisputed rights over this land for 104 years?

MR. HALDANE: I am advised that the War Office has a perfect title to the land.

Shoeburyness Ranges.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what purchase price was paid for 1,760 acres of foreshore at Shoeburyness, purchased in 1906; what was this foreshore assessed at for rating purposes before the purchase; who was the owner of the land; and who at the War Office was responsible for concluding the bargain at this price.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War what the annual cost to this country is in respect of the supply of water to the barracks at Standerton; how long this charge is to continue; will it continue if there are no troops there; who is responsible for making this contract; and what notice has been taken of his action.

MR. HALDANE: I must refer my hon. friend to the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee which will shortly be in the hands of hon. Members, and as regards Question 64 also to the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee in 1907.

MR. WEDGWOOD: May I ask whether the names of the persons from whom this land was bought appears in the evidence? Is the action of the War Office on this scandal as reported in the evidence defended?

MR. HALDANE: If the hon. Gentleman had heard my Answer two days ago, he would have known that this occurred before I came into office. But I have looked into the matter and I find that the action taken was most reasonable, and it resulted in a saving of many thousands of pounds to the War Office, as not a shadow of a title could be set out for the Woods and Forests Department.

MR. WEDGWOOD: But the property was purchased not from the Woods and Forests Department but from a private owner.

MR. HALDANE: Yes, and as far as I can see the private owner had a perfect right which the Woods and Forests Department refused to contest. We were advised that if it had been contested we should have been landed into an expensive law suit and probably have been defeated.

MR. WEDGWOOD: The right hon. Gentleman has not stated what the foreshore was assessed at for rating purposes before the purchase?

MR. HALDANE: I daresay it was something very small, but then what use can be made of land of that kind? We, however, had to get more land for artillery practice, and it was well worth our while paying the comparatively small sum that was asked for it.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. It is now a quarter to four.

Government Purchases and Indian Industries.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether any, and, if so, what, results proceeded from the appointment of a committee by the Government of India in 1906 to ascertain by local inquiry in what manner greater encouragement might be given to Indian industries in the purchase of Government stores.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The question is at present under consideration by the Secretary of State.

Jasdan and Limbdi States.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information regarding the succession to the Limbdi and Jasdan State and estate in Kathiwar, the action in regard to which of the Government of India has given rise to complaint on the part of claimants.

MR. BUCHANAN: As regards the Jasdan succession I have nothing to add to the very full Answer I gave on the subject on the 8th instant. As regards the Limbdi succession, the late Thakore died, leaving no heir, either direct or adopted. In these circumstances the Government of India, on a full consideration of the claims of all the candidates to the Gadi, have selected Dolat Sinji to succeed. It is open to any of the claimants to memorialise the Secretary of State against the decision in accordance with the rules governing petitions in such matters. Any memorial that may be received will, of course, receive the fullest consideration.

*MR. REES: Has none been received?

MR. BUCHANAN: I believe not.

Kankinara Bomb Outrage.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the India Office has any fresh information concerning the three Europeans who were the victims of the recent bomb outrage at Kankinara; and whether the perpetrator has been arrested.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has received no further official information since 30th June, when I answered a question on this subject.

Trinidad Dock and Engineering Company.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is yet in a position to report as to the proceedings *re* the appointment of a Government director in connection with the Trinidad Dock and Engineering Company, Limited, at a salary of £250 per annum; and, if so, can he state what action the Government intend to take with a view to complying with the wishes of the Finance Committee and the petition signed by about 6,000 residents of Port-of-Spain against the said appointment.

The UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Secretary of State is addressing a despatch to the officer administering the Government of Trinidad on the subject of the representations of the unofficial members of the legislative council with regard to the appointment referred to. Until the despatch has reached the colony, and been published there he would prefer not to anticipate it by any statement in this House.

Mr. SUMMERBELL: When was the despatch sent?

Colonel SEELY: It will very soon reach the colony where, of course, it will have to be considered.

Dinizulu's Salary.

Mr RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any agreement has now been reached between His Majesty s Government and the Natal Ministry regarding the payment of Dinizulu's salary.

Colonel SEELY: No, Sir. I regret that no agreement has so far been arrived at. I made the position of His Majesty s Government clear in answer to a Question yesterday, and correspondence will very shortly be laid.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD: May we assume that, agreement or no agreement, Dinizulu will get his salary?

Colonel SEELY: Yes, Sir; the view of the Government is that one side or the other is honourably bound to pay this money, and, in view of the poverty of the prisoner, His Majesty s Government have decided to pay the money forthwith. The question of the allocation of the sum has yet to be decided.

Liquor Traffic in Southern Nigeria.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps the Government are taking as to the inquiry into the liquor traffic in Southern Nigeria, suggested by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the deputation from the Native Races Committee on 7th July.

Colonel SEELY: The Secretary of State is in communication with the Committee as to the inquiry, and in a letter, dated the 18th instant, has invited their suggestions as to the manner in which it should be carried out.

Mr. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Will any attempt be made to discover and publish the names of those who profit by this trade?

Colonel SEELY asked for notice of the Question.

Federated Malay States—Revenue Statistics.

Mr. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the revenue during the last financial year for which the Colonial Office had Reports from land, tin mines, gambling farms, and opium, respectively, in each of the Federated Malay States.

Colonel SEELY: The latest figures available are those for 1906. They are:—Land: Perak, $467,268; Selangor, $324,910.56; Negri Sembilan, $168,250; Pahang, $78,330. Tin: Perak, $5,433,709; Selangor, $3,357,033; Negri Sembilan,

$969,193; Pahang, $276,672. Opium: Perak, $1,538,089; Selangor, $944,516; Negri Sembilan, $372,282. I cannot specify the opium revenue in Pahang as the opium farm is let in conjunction with other farms. For the same reason, as I am explaining in answer to my hon. friend's other Questions. I cannot give the amount of the revenue derived from gaming in any of the States.

MR. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Federated Malay States have no public debt, have large accumulated reserve funds, and have sufficient revenue from other sources than gaming licences to meet current expenditure.

COLONEL SEELY: My hon. friend's information is correct.

Children in Gaming and Opium Dens.

MR. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that children of the age of from eleven to sixteen years frequent the gaming and opium-dens in Kuala Lumpur and Ipoh; and if he will take steps to have the regulations against the admission of children more rigorously carried out.

COLONEL SEELY: I have no reason to suppose that the regulations are being infringed; but if my hon. friend will supply me with any evidence to show that this is the case, inquiries will be addressed to the High Commissioner.

Suppression of Licensed Gambling in the Malay States.

MR. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if, in view of the desire amongst the better-class Chinese, and the ruin caused to numbers of their poorer fellow-countrymen, he will consider the question of refusing to sanction the continuance of the licensed gambling system after the present leases expire.

COLONEL SEELY: I understand my hon. friend's Question to refer to the system in force in the Federated Malay States. I do not think that I can usefully add anything to the full statement made in this House by my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade on 3rd December, 1906. While desirous of ultimately putting an end to the system, the Secretary of State agrees with his predecessor that precipitate action would do more harm than good.

MR. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what curtailment has been made in the area in which gambling licences are issued in the Federated Malay States, in accordance with the statement made by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House last year; and to what extent has the revenue been effected.

COLONEL SEELY: In so far as Perak and Pahang are concerned, my information extends only to the end of last year. Up to that time no action was possible as the term of the existing farms had not expired. In Selangor the Prohibition of Gaming Enactment was put into force from 1st January last throughout the State, except in some of the larger towns and villages. In the Negri Sembilan the Enactment was put into force in the Coast and Tampin districts on 1st January, 1907, the result being a decrease of 35 per cent. in the public gaming-houses in the State. I am unable to state the effect on the Revenue as the gaming farms are not let separately but in conjunction with other farms.

Perak and Selangor Gambling Farms.

MR. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what rent per month was obtained for the gambling farm in the State of Perak for the three years term ending 1906, and for the restricted area for the three years term ending 1909.

I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what rent per month was obtained for the gambling farm in the State of Selangor for the two years term ending 1907, and for the more restricted area for the term ending 1909.

COLONEL SEELY: I regret that I am unable to give figures in reply to these Questions, as the gaming farms are leased in conjunction with other farms and not by themselves.

Imports of Spirits into Southern Nigeria.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state what percentage of the value of the total imports into Southern Nigeria during each of the years 1900–1906 is represented by imports of spirits.

COLONEL SEELY: It has not been possible to make the calculations asked for by my hon. friend within the time available.

British Indians in Natal.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any further information as to the progress of the two Natal Bills, one of which will deprive lawfully resident British-Indians of the right to acquire new trading licences, and the other of which proposes to dispossess established traders of their business licences within the next ten years; and whether he will reassure this House and our Indian fellow-subjects, who are anxiously watching these proceedings, by an expression of his intention to recommend the disallowance of the said measures should they be submitted for Imperial sanction.

COLONEL SEELY: As I stated in reply to a Question yesterday with regard to one of these Bills, the Secretary of State is in communication with the Natal Government. I would add that his representations cover the other Bill also, but I am not at present in a position to make a further statement.

British Indians in Southern Rhodesia.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the passing of the Asiatic Registration Ordinance of Southern Rhodesia, whereunder respectable British-Indian traders and others over eight years of age are as a class to be compelled to take out certificates of registration for their identification; whether the total Indian population in this vast territory is about 400; and whether he will recommend to the Rhodesian Government the inadvisability of such differential legislation.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State is well aware of the objections which may be urged against the Bill, and he is in communication with the High Commissioner, who has been instructed not to assent pending further consideration, and the Bill is not, therefore, in operation.

British Indians in the Transvaal.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government of the Transvaal have passed a new Gold Law; whether his attention has been drawn to Sections 127 and 128 thereof, which deprive coloured persons of their right to acquire mining rights and to reside or trade within the areas of Johannesburg, Boksburg, and Krugersdorp, save in locations specially set apart; whether the term coloured person includes British-Indians lawfully resident within the Colony; whether any provision is made for compensation of such British-Indian merchants and others who are to be thus deprived of their existing rights; and whether he will make friendly representations to the Government of the Transvaal with a view to the elimination or modification of the disabilities above referred to.

COLONEL SEELY: The attention of the Secretary of State was drawn some time ago to the Bill, and more particularly to the clauses referred to, and he is already in communication with the Transvaal Government on the subject. Pending a reply from the Colonial Government whose attention has again been called to the question I am not in a position to make a statement as to the effect of the Bill.

Dinizulu's Trial.

*MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is now seven months since Dinizulu was subjected to a secret examination for offences which have never been specifically made known to him; whether he has been kept in prison during the whole time and bail refused to him; whether already more than 100 witnesses have been called against him; and whether in view of the fact that he is a British subject towards whom the Imperial Government has contracted special obligations, the Secretary of State will represent to the Natal Government the desirability of either putting him upon his trial or setting him at liberty.

COLONEL SEELY: The facts with regard to this examination as far as they are known to His Majesty's Government and their views on them have been fully published, and I need hardly repeat that they greatly regret the protraction of the proceedings. It is, however, only right to remember that the circumstances and position of the prisoner necessarily put special difficulties in the way of the production of native evidence. I have every reason to hope that the prolonged examination is now coming to a close.

*MR. MACKARNESS: Is it the view of the Natal Government, although they have examined 100 witnesses, that they have not yet sufficient evidence to frame an indictment?

COLONEL SEELY: I cannot state what the view of the Natal Government is.

MR. FLYNN: Has a single witness yet been called for the defence?

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir. The arrangement is that all the witnesses for the prosecution are called first at the preliminary inquiry, and no witnesses for the defence are called until the prosecution is closed.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: How many of the 100 witnesses called for the prosecution have been flogged into giving evidence against Dinizulu?

COLONEL SEELY: I think there is no evidence that any of these 100 witnesses have been subjected to pressure of that kind.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Has the hon. Gentleman seen the statement of Miss Colenso?

COLONEL SEELY: Yes, I have seen the statement, and I have given the answer that I have given.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): Can the hon. Gentleman say whether the charge has been formulated yet?

COLONEL SEELY: I regret to say that the charges are not definite, but that is due to the law under which the prosecution is undertaken. It is only fair to the Natal Government to say that this law was handed on to them by us when we gave them self-government.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Has the prisoner had opportunities of obtaining evidence for his defence?

COLONEL SEELY: Not yet.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.): Is there no limit to the time the accused can be kept in prison pending trial?

COLONEL SEELY: In theory, there is no limit to the time during which a prisoner can be kept in confinement during the preliminary examination. But His Majesty's Government are confident that the Government of Natal will see that it would be nothing less than a public scandal if this native chief were to be detained indefinitely in custody on undefined charges.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): On what ground does the hon. Gentleman say that no facilities have been afforded by the Government of Natal to Dinizulu for securing evidence?

COLONEL SEELY: The situation is this: Witnesses for the defence of Dinizulu cannot be obtained from Zululand in the view of the Natal Government—which I should be the last to criticise—so long as martial law continues. The Act of Indemnity which is necessary to conclude martial law was passed yesterday in the Natal House of Commons, and when that is assented to in this House it will be possible to get witnesses for the defence from Zululand.

Mr. BELLOC: May I ask——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. Any further Questions must be put down.

Expenditure on Wales.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is estimated to be the total expenditure out of the Exchequer, or out of taxes raised by the authority of Parliament, upon purely Welsh purposes in the year 1908–9.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs): Materials are not available to enable an estimate to be made of the proportion of the expenditure by Government Departments in England and Wales which is attributable to Welsh purposes.

*Mr. REES: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman arrange that the materials shall be available?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am afraid it would be rather difficult.

Unemployed Grant.

Mr. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer when the Supplementary Estimates will be taken, and when thereafter a grant will be made to meet the requirements of the Glasgow distress committee.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Supplementary Estimates will be taken before the rising of the House for the autumn recess. When the Vote for expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act becomes available, applications can be made by the Local Government Boards to the Treasury for issues therefrom as required.

Stud Tramway System in the Mile End Road.

Sir JOHN BENN (Devonport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the accidents in the Mile End Road, London, consequent on the installation by the London County Council of a route of electric tramways on the stud system; whether this line was inspected by his Department, and is he aware that the London County Council propose to extend this system to other parts of London; and whether the Board of Trade can take steps to protect the metropolis from the dangers of such extension.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Churchill, Dundee): I am aware that some accidents have occurred on the tramway in question which was inspected on behalf of the Board of Trade before being opened experimentally for traffic. I have no knowledge of any intention on the part of the London County Council to extend the use of the stud system to other parts of London, and no such extension could be carried out without the consent of the Board of Trade.

Board of Trade Labour Gazette.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state who is responsible for the article appearing in the Board of Trade *Labour Gazette* for July, entitled Cost of Living in German Towns, which article purports to be a *resume* of Paper Cd. 4032.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Board of Trade are, of course, responsible for articles appearing in their *Labour Gazette.*

Mr. FELL: Does the right hon. Gentleman consider this a fair *resume* of the Report? Has it not been coloured in order to support the case of free trade?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am sorry to hear that suggestion. I certainly do not think those in charge had any intention of that kind.

Tenement Dwellings in London and Berlin.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the average cubical space of two, three, and four-room tenement dwellings in London and Berlin such as are commonly used by the working classes in those cities and referred to in Paper Cd. 4032.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am not able with the information in my possession to add to the general statement on page XL. of the Report.

Fenton (Staffs) Vaccination Case.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the death of John Gallimore, 44, Hulse Street, Fenton, Staffordshire, which occurred on 19th December, 1906, was certified to be due to vaccination; whether the case has recently been inquired into by a medical inspector of the Local Government Board; whether a copy of the Report drawn up by the latter is available for the information of the House; and whether the conclusions arrived at by the medical inspector were the same as those of the public vaccinator (who performed the operation, and who attended the deceased during his fatal illness and gave the certificate), namely, that vaccination was the cause of death.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I am aware of this case which has recently been investigated by one of the medical inspectors of the Local Government Board. Owing to the death of the public vaccinator, the evidence which the inspector was able to obtain was incomplete, but it went to show that the lymph used was not in fault. Further it appeared that the arm had been improperly treated by the mother, and that the sanitary conditions of the dwellings were very bad. The inspector thought it probable that these circumstances must be held responsible for the infection of the arm, to which the fatal termintion of the case was attributable. The inspector's report is a confidential document, and is only made for the information of the board.

*MR. LUPTON: If the infection of the arm was due to the insanitary condition of the dwelling will instructions be given to the public vaccinator only to vaccinate those babes who are in and will be kept in houses the sanitation of which is perfect?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will bear my hon. friend's suggestion in mind.

MR. LUPTON: May I ask why, since the vaccine stuff is supplied by the right hon. Gentleman, there is all this secrecy with regard to these reports? Is it because they are likely to have an adverse effect on the public mind?

MR. JOHN BURNS: My hon. friend seems to ignore the fact that the child's arm had also been improperly treated by the mother. He must bear that in mind.

MR. LUPTON: Then will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to ensure that mothers shall be properly instructed how to treat arms under these circumstances?

MR. JOHN BURNS: For many years I have been doing my best in that direction.

Inter-Departmental Committee on Compulsory Attendance at School.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education, whether the reference to the Inter-Departmental Committee on compulsory attendance at school includes rural as well as urban districts; and, if so, which of the members of the Committee have been appointed on account of their experience of rural education and agriculture.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. I have no doubt that ample evidence on the rural aspects of the subject will be laid before the Committee, and I feel certain that a Committee which includes Lord Clifford of Chudleigh is competent to sift and consider such evidence.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of having on the Committee more than one Member cognisant with rural education and agriculture?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I cannot regard the Members of this Committee as being representatives of one particular section. They will hear evidence from all persons concerned in this question, and will no doubt give a sensible judgment upon it.

Kenmare Train Service.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he has made representations to the Great Southern and Western Railway Company with reference to the change of time in the departure of the evening train for Headford Junction to Kenmare; and whether, in view of the fact that this change is resented by the people of Kenmare and surrounding districts, who are compelled to contribute heavily out of their rates to this particualr service, he will arrange that the old time-table shall be adhered to.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Department are informed by the Great Southern and Western Railway Company that their object in fixing a later hour for the departure of the night train form Headford Junction to Kenmare was to have a connection with the 5.30 p.m. train from Rosslare, which gives a service from a number of stations in Ireland as well as from places on the other side of the Channel. The Company further state that on the Kenmare Branch four trains are run each way daily; that these trains are arranged to give as good connections as possible; and that the service is ample having regard to the extent of the traffic, which is very small. The Department have no power to require the former time-table to be reverted to.

MR. BOLAND: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that thas line has a baronial guarantee which is provided out of the rates?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: That may be, but the Department have no power to compel the Company to change the service.

MR. BOLAND: What has been the extent of the tourist traffic in whose interest the change has been made?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I cannot say off-hand.

Londonderry Flax Industry.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether the flax seed supplied by the Department to farmers in County Londonderry as prizes for success in growing flax last season has proved to be of a description suitable only for oil production and feeding purposes, quite unsuited for cultivation in Ireland, and of little commercial value; whether the object of giving these prizes was to encourage the growth of flax fibre suitable for linen manufacture; whether, in the circumstances, the Department will consider the advisability of compensating the farmers concerned for the loss which they are now certain to sustain; whether the flax seed in question was bought from firms of repute and with a guarantee of its suitability; and, if so, what action the Department proposes to take against these firms, and will their names be published.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: All the flax seed supplied this year by the Department to farmers in Londonderry and elsewhere in Ulster for prizes under the scheme for encouraging the cultivation of flax was procured from firms of repute who had hitherto supplied satisfactory seed to the Department. Portion of the seed, purchased as Riga Child, from a certain firm this year has unfortunately proved to be an unsuitable variety for Irish purposes, and this firm has been notified that the Department hold them responsible for any loss which may have been incurred. The Department are at present in communication with the farmers concerned as well as with the firm in question, and they do not consider it advisable to make any further statement pending the conclusion of this correspondence.

Fuge Estate, Templemary, Cork.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any action recently with a view to acquiring the untenanted land on the Fuge estate, Templemary, County Cork; and whether, having regard to the fact that six tenants evicted from the estate are eligible for reinstatement under the Act of 1907, and that the greater part of the land is now used as a rough grazing ranch, the Commissioners will take immediate steps to acquire it.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners are about to take steps for the compulsory acquirement, under the Evicted Tenants Act, of some 536 acres of land on the estate in question.

Beardesley Evans Estate, Charleville.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are now aware of the fact that on the Beardesley Evans estate, Charleville, County Cork, the Messrs. Kincaid, receivers under the Court, gave instructions to their solicitor to proceed against a tenant for the recovery of all rent due, including the running half-gale, contrary to the invariable practice of the estate, as the half-gale in question accrued in times of great scarcity over fifty years ago; and whether, in view of the anxiety of the tenant to purchase on reasonable terms and the fact that the nominal owner receives little or no benefit from the property, the Commissioners will now communicate with the Land Judge with a view to the purchase of this estate.

MR. BIRRELL: The estate in question is not for sale in the Land Judge's Court, and consequently the provisions of Section 7 of the Act of 1903 do not apply to the case. The Estates Commissioners cannot, therefore, make an offer for purchase to the Land Judge.

MR. FLYNN: Seeing that the Estates Commissioners are of opinion that this sale is desirable, cannot they approach the Land Judges under the section referred to?

MR. BIRRELL: I believe not.

Irish Evicted Tenants.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many evicted tenants or descendants of evicted tenants have applied to be reinstated or to be given new holdings under the Acts of 1903 and 1907; and how many have been reinstated or given new farms.

MR. BIRRELL: The number of applications received by the Estates Commissioners up to 31st May last was 10,199. The number of applicants reinstated or provided with new farms is 1,627.

Sligo Cattle-Drives.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Mr. R. A. Duke has had cattle driven off his lands in County Sligo six times since February last; how many persons have been punished in connection with these outrages; and what steps have been taken to put a stop to this state of lawlessness which exists in County Sligo.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that Mr. Duke's cattle have been driven off his lands on five occasions since February last. No persons have been made amenable in these cases. A police hut has been established in the locality with the object of preventing the driving of cattle from grazing farms, and the forces of the neighbouring police stations have been strengthened. An additional force of thirty police has been appointed to County Sligo under proclamation.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: In view of the fact that the erection of police huts and the bringing in of extra police has proved absolutely useless, will the right hon. Gentleman try and devise other means of putting down these outrages?

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Try martial law.

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Were these cases of cattle-driving reported?

Mr. BIRRELL: I cannot say.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that in the months of May and June there were twenty-eight cattle-drives in the County of Sligo in which 919 cattle, exclusive of horses and sheep, were driven, and that no person has been made amenable to justice for any of these outrages; and why none of these drives have been included as outrages on Constabulary Outrage Form No. 38.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed by the police authorities that during the months of May and June thirty-three cattle-drives were reported from County Sligo, the number of cattle driven being 941. In two cases persons were arrested and bound to keep the peace. One of the cases was recorded as a serious offence. I have already explained in what circumstances cases of cattle-driving are recorded as serious offences, namely, when malicious injury is inflicted, or when acts calculated to cause terror are committed or personal violence is threatened. Practically all the Sligo cases of cattle-driving took place secretly at night, and there was no evidence that an indictable offence had been committed.

Kinvarra Outrage.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that three houses in the police sub-district of Kinvarra, County Galway, were fired into on the night of Sunday 12th instant, and that in one of the houses a woman, who was in delicate health, was so terrified by the shots that she now lies in a dangerous condition; whether any arrests have been made in connection with these outrages; and what steps the police are taking to deal with the matter.

Mr. BIRRELL: The police authorities have reported that on the night of 12th instant, three houses were fired into in the Kilcoglan police district, near Kinvarra. The wife of one of the occupiers has suffered considerably in health as a result of the occurrence, but is now on the road to recovery. The inmates of the houses were in bed asleep, and consequently could not identify the offenders. No arrests have yet been made, but the police are using all possible efforts to discover the guilty persons.

Mr. REDDY (King's County, Birr): Were not these shots fired on 12th July?

[No Answer was returned.]

Judge Ross on Terrorism in Westmeath.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the persons who have for years been renting the grazing farms of Ardglass, County Westmeath, have been so terrorised by the agitation against the letting of grazing lands that they have been afraid to renew their lettings; that when the owner endeavoured to graze his own stock on the land his cattle were driven off the farm on several occasions, the gates were smashed, and walls pulled down, and that, although the police were present when these illegal acts were being committed and reported to the authorities no action was taken and no person proceeded against, and that as a last resort the receiver of the estate had to apply to the Court to attach fifteen persons who formed part of the crowd, and whom the police were able to identify; whether he is aware also that thirteen of these were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment by Mr. Justice Ross; and whether the Government will take steps to ensure that the same justice shall be meted out to those who drive cattle off ordinary farms as is meted out to those who committ this offence on farms which are under the care of the Land Judges or the Court of Chancery.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed that the three persons who had held the Ardglass farms on grazing tenancies did not renew their tenancies this year. One of these persons was the agent of the estate. In May last a receiver was appointed over the property by Mr. Justice Ross, and the lands were stocked with cattle. Three policemen have since been quartered in the herd's house on the farm with the object of protecting the cattle. The owner's cattle have not been driven off, but on 20th May, the police came upon a party of men in the act of throwing down part of a boundary wall on the farm. It was dusk at the time, and the police were unable to distinguish the men who were actually committing the damage, but they succeeded in taking the names of a number of the persons. The Government were advised that the evidence available was not sufficient to sustain a prosecution for malicious injury or for unlawful assembly. Mr. Justice Ross has since sentenced thirteen of these persons to imprisonment for contempt of Court. One man has undergone two months' imprisonment upon the prosecution of the police in connection with this estate, and proceedings have been instituted and are pending against twelve men for intimidating the agent and his servants on 12th May and 10th June. Ten of these persons are identical with those sentenced by Mr. Justice Ross.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the remarks of Mr. Justice Ross, one of the Judges of the High Court of Justice in Ireland, made when sentencing certain persons for cattle-driving at Ardglass, County Westmeath, when he delivered it as his opinion that binding over to keep the peace in cattle-driving cases was an imposture, and that it was his duty to inform the Government that their refusal to deal with these cases was regarded as proof that the offenders were acting with the approval of the authorities, and that their leniency was looked on as imbecility, cowardice, and connivance; and whether, in view of the knowledge which Mr. Justice Ross has of agrarian questions, and in view of the steady increase of cattle-driving and other forms of lawlessness in Ireland, the Government will adopt the views and carry out the suggestions of Mr. Justice Ross in the matter of dealing with this form of crime.

Mr. BIRRELL: So far as the newspaper reports have enabled me acquaint myself with the views and suggestions of Mr. Justice Ross, I can only say that the Government are not prepared to adopt those views or to carry out those suggestions.

Mr. MOORE asked if the attention of the right hon. Gentleman had been drawn to similar language used by Mr. Justice Kenny at Galway Assizes.

Mr. BIRRELL said he had already answered a Question on the subject.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Is it not the fact that not only Mr. Justice Ross but other Judges have charged juries in the same direction, and that the view of every one of the Judges is——

***Mr. SPEAKER**: The hon. Member is now making a speech.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: But the right hon. Gentleman has not answered my Question on the Paper.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: The Question has been answered, and whether it has been satisfactory to him or not, the hon. Member is not in order in making a series of statements in the form of further Questions.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mr. Justice Ross acquired his special knowledge on agrarian matters by being legal agent to the Duke of Abercorn and by acting as Crown Counsel in the coercion prosecutions?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am not disposed to hear any words said as to Judge Ross's judicial character.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: The right hon. Gentleman has stated he is not prepared to adopt the Judge's suggestions. Is there any precedent for a

Judge making suggestions from the Bench to a Cabinet Minister or to the Executive Government on a question of policy?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that Question was put down and struck out.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: If so, I forgot it.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of Mr. Justice Ross in the Land Judge's Court, on Friday, 10th July, in reference to the refusal of a person to give up possession of land under the control of the Court, that the case was typical of the general lawlessness prevailing in the country in respect of agrarian matters; that even in cases where persons have no right or claim of any kind they hold the land in defiance of everybody and get the assistance of what is called local feeling, which means a riot; and that, although the police are present, the authorities with their usual ineptitude do nothing, and this state of affairs is getting worse; and what steps he intends to take to put a stop to this condition of lawlessness.

Mr. BIRRELL: I have seen a newspaper report of the remarks of Mr. Justice Ross in the case referred to. The facts of the case are that two brothers named Richard and Edward Kennedy held a farm in the Queen's County as joint tenants. A dispute arose between them as to the working of the farm and litigation in the Land Judge's Court ensued, with the result that Mr. Justice Ross appointed a receiver over the farm and Edward Kennedy was left in possession. On 26th May last, Mr. Pattison, the receiver, called at Stradbally police station, stating that he was going to the Kennedys' farm to remove some old hay, and would like a constable to go with him as he expected that Edward Kennedy would object to the removal of the hay, and he could then report accordingly to Mr. Justice Ross. A constable was sent to the farm with Mr. Pattison. The latter told Edward Kennedy the object of his visit, and Kennedy expressed his objection to the removal of the hay, whereupon Mr. Pattison at once withdrew. He made no demand for the possession of the farm. The constable has reported that no violence or threats of any kind were used, and that there was not the slightest semblance of a riot on the occasion. In the circumstances the ineptitude of the police authorities appears to have been inevitable.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware this expression "ineptitude" was used by the Judge from the Bench?

[No Answer was returned.]

Imprisonment for Contempt of Court.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the fact that Mr. Justice Ross on Tuesday last sentenced sixteen persons to various terms of imprisonment on charges of contempt of Court arising out of the transaction, and in passing sentence admitted that the offences were themselves trivial, and that he had thought of leaving the matter to the authorities to do their duty under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, but that, under the circumstances, he had come to the conclusion that it was better for him to act himself; and whether, having regard to the fact that a Resolution was passed by this House on 10th March, by 181 votes to sixty-six, declaring that the jurisdiction of the Judges in dealing with contempt is practically arbitrary and unlimited and, especially in view of recent exercises of that jurisdiction in Ireland, calls for the action of Parliament with a view to its definition and duration, and that a measure with that object had been introduced by the Government and has passed the Committee stage, and that there are precedents for the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown in the remission and reduction of sentences for contempt of Court, he will consider the cases of these men with a view to recommending to the Lord-Lieutenant the remission of these sentences.

MR. BIRRELL: I am aware that Mr. Justice Ross has committed a number of persons to prison for contempt of Court by trespassing upon lands under the control of the Court and knocking down a wall. In one case the term of imprisonment imposed was six weeks, and in the remaining cases it was one month. In the debate in March last, my right hon. friend the Attorney-General for Ireland stated that he was not aware of any precedent during the last fifty years for the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown in such cases. I do not propose to make any recommendation to the Lord-Lieutenant in the matter.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL inquired whether in England a sentence of twelve months for contempt of Court was not remitted, and if the precedent thus set could not be followed in Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL: In any case where such a sentence has been passed I would be prepared to consider it.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of Mr. Justice Ross, on Tuesday last in the Land Judge's Court, when, in sentencing fifteen men to imprisonment for a constructive comtempt of Court in tresspassing on lands in the possession of a receiver under the Court, the learned Judge said that the authorities were by neglect to perform their duty turning the Land Court into a Court for the suppression of agrarian crime, and announced the neglect of all proper precaution and the leniency of the Government in leading the offenders to believe that they were acting with the approval of the authorities, and recommending the putting in force of provisions which he named of The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887; and what steps, if any, does the Government propose to take in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: My attention has been called to the remarks attributed in the newspapers to Mr. Justice Ross. The Government do not propose to take any steps in the matter.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Have not the Executive control over Judges who made such charges?

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot bandy words with the Judges.

Attack on a Process Server at Kanturk.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received information of an attack upon a civil bill officer at Kanturk, West Cork, by masked and armed men; and whether the assailants were arrested.

MR. BIRRELL: A process server has alleged that on 15th July two disguised men stopped him on the road near Kanturk and took two writs from his pocket and tore them up; and that they then fired two revolver shots in the air and decamped. The police have no evidence on the subject beyond the process server's allegations, and it is a significant fact that, though the process server passed the police station immediately afterwards, he made no complaint to the police.

Dangers of Process Servers in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the fact that process servers have refused to serve writs for rent in the South and West of Ireland, alleging that their lives would be in danger if they tried to effect service; whether he is aware that Mr. Justice Boyd has made orders substituting service by posting a copy of the writ on the nearest constabulary station; and whether he will take measures to prevent the law being paralysed by the violence of people who refuse to pay their debts.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that a few cases have come to their notice in which process servers have refused to serve writs for rent, but it is not the case that process servers generally in the south and West of Ireland have so refused. I understand that in the cases specially referred to, Mr. Justice Boyd directed service by posting the writs outside the nearest police station. The police invariably afford all necessary protection to process servers when application is made to them in sufficient time.

MR. LONSDALE: Do the process servers allege that their lives are endangered when they try to effect service of writs?

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot say if any process server has made such an allegation.

Intimidation in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of Lord Justice Fitzgibbon at the Cork Assizes on 16th July; whether the learned Judge called attention to a number of cases of intimidatory attacks upon people in dwelling-houses, for which no person had been brought to trial; and what steps he intends to take in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: I have seen a newspaper report of the remarks attributed to Lord Justice Fitzgibbon. In calling attention to four cases of intimidatory attacks upon dwelling-houses in which offenders have not been brought to justice, the learned Judge is stated to have said that in cases of the kind they found that the police were making inquiries and endeavouring to trace the culprit but could not get evidence. It is obvious that in the absence of evidence, the Government can take no action in these cases. I may mention that the learned Judge also called attention to the fact that there had been a decrease in the number of persons under police protection, and a decrease in the number of derelict evicted farms, and stated that in respect of these matters there was no reason to suppose that Cork was in anything but a satisfactory condition.

MR. MOORE: May I ask whether the difficulty of procuring evidence is due to the fact that witnesses know they will not receive adequate protection from the law?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir, it is not due to that.

Irish University Bill.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he proposes to issue to Members of the House prior to the discussion on Report stage of the Irish Universities Bill, as amended in Committee, revised copies of the draft Charters of the Universities and Constituent Colleges embodying the changes consequent on the Committee's Amendments to the Bill.

MR. BIRRELL: The amended draft Charters were laid on the Table on Monday last. I understand that copies have been circulated this afternoon.

Alleged Boycotting in Westmeath.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a man named Joseph Carolan, of Ballinalack, county Westmeath, is at present most seriously boycotted, and local shopkeepers are intimidated to such an extent that they refuse to supply him with goods; and what steps, if any, he proposes to take.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General informs me that the local police have no reason to believe that Joseph Carolan is boycotted, or that local shopkeepers have refused to supply him with goods.

Reynell *v.* Taafe.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the Crown to take up the case of Mr. William Cox Reynell, Ballyhug, *v.* Mr. Michael Taafe, Grange Hall, for abusive language and assault on the 24th June, under the circumstances that certain parties were engaged in a criminal conspiracy by subscribing towards a cattle-driving fund; whether the case has been brought under the notice of the Law Officers of the Crown; and, if not, what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: As I have already informed the hon. Member for Mid Armagh, this matter has been brought to the notice of my right hon. friend the Attorney-General, who will consider whether the facts are such as to warrant a prosecution. The Attorney-General is at present prosecuting at Assizes, but will deal with the matter upon his return

Contempt of Courts Bill.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether in view of the recent statement of Mr. Justice Ross regarding the ineptitude of the authorities in Dublin Castle in reference to the crime of cattle-driving, boycotting, and other forms of intimidation, it is his intention to proceed further with the Contempt of Courts Bill; and whether he is aware that, if passed, such a measure would seriously interfere with the powers at present possessed by Mr. Justice Ross in dealing with offenders against the law.

MR. BIRRELL: As regards the remarks of Mr. Justice Ross, I would refer to the answer which I have now given to the Question of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh. It is intended to proceed with the Contempt of Courts Bill. That measure limits the imprisonment which can be imposed for contempt of Court to a term of three months, and limits the fine to one of £500, and it also gives to the person fined or imprisoned a right of appeal. To this extent the measure interferes with the powers for dealing with contempt of Court at present possessed by Mr. Justice Ross.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Was this Bill introduced solely because of the language of Mr. Justice Ross?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir. Everybody knows that the whole subject of contempt of Court has long been before Parliament.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Is it not the fact that this Bill is practically identical with that passed by the late Lord Selborne in the House of Lords in 1883?

MR. BIRRELL: Certainly.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Was not the Bill introduced shortly after the hon. Member for North Westmeath was sent to gaol by Judge Ross?

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. Ginnell, M.P.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to a k the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the hon. Member for Westmeath, North, has recently resumed his campaign in favour of cattle-driving in Ireland; whether he is aware that recently at Ballinalack the hon. Member recommended that there should be no slackening in the movement so long as there was a hazel in the hedges; and whether His Majesty's Government intend to permit hon. Members of this House and other persons to incite the people to drive cattle without taking any action.

MR. BIRRELL: I was not aware of the fact suggested in the first part of the Question. I understand, however, that at a recent meeting at Ballinalack the hon. Member for North Westmeath used some such language as is attributed to him in the Question. I am told that more than half of the persons present at the meeting were women and children. The Government do not propose to take any notice of this particular speech.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: May I ask whether hon. Members of this House are to be permitted to go over to Ireland and stir up the people in this way?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: What about the 12th July?

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: May I ask what bearing has the fact that half the crowd were women and children, on the question?

MR. BIRRELL: It has a bearing as to the effect of the inflammatory language used.

Cork College Governing Body.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Mr. E. Fitzgerald who recently seconded a motion which conveyed to the Cork County Committee of Technical Instruction a strong objection to impart technical instruction to British soldiers, under the auspices of any sub-committee, under any pretext whatever, and who later stated that he did not confine himself to the Navy and Auxiliary Forces only, but intended to preclude Reserves, Militia, and everybody else in the employment of the British Government from the benefits of technical instruction, is the same Mr. E. Fitzgerald who has been nominated by the Crown as one of the first governing body of the constituent college at Cork of the proposed new Roman Catholic University in Dublin; and, if so, is it his intention to remove his name from the list.

MR. BIRRELL: I understand that the Mr. E. Fitzgerald who seconded the motion in question is the gentleman of that name who has been nominated to the governing body of Cork College. The motion was not adopted as it did not comply with standing orders. I gather that Mr. Fitzgerald objected to the application of the rates to the education of military and naval people. He is reported to have said that it was the duty of the Government to provide such education and that, outside any question of patriotism, he thought it would be unfair to the ratepayers to apply the rates to any such purpose. The fact that Mr. Fitzgerald holds this opinion affords no reason why he should be removed from the governing body of Cork College.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Are the other members of the governing body of the same class?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not know of what class Mr. Fitzgerald is.

Agitation against Land Grabbing.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a speech recently delivered by a Mr. P. McKenna, of Longwood, in which he stated that the people were as determined as ever never to cease agitating till every grazier and grabber was driven out of the country; whether he is aware that at the same meeting a Mr. McGuire stated that the Ancient Order of Hibernians were not at that particular meeting as Fenians because there were no Fenians in Ireland, but the Ancient Order of Hibernians were as good as ever the Fenians were; and whether he intends to take any action in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: My attention had not been called to this matter, but I have now been referred to a newspaper report of the speeches in question. There is no evidence that the speeches are correctly reported, but in any event, the Government do not intend to take any action in the matter.

Crime in Roscommon.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the statement of Mr. Justice Kenny, when addressing the grand jury at the Roscommon recent Assizes, to the effect that the county of Roscommon was in a state of extreme lawlessness at the present time, that he found four cases of incendiary fires and four of threatening letter writing, in which only one person had been made amenable, that the outrage known as cattle-driving was prevalent in the county, and that a condition of matters existed that caused anxiety to those charged with the peace of the county; and what action, if any, he proposes to take.

MR. BIRRELL: I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the Answer which I gave to the similar Question put by the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh on Monday last.

Crime in Westmeath.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the statement made by the right hon. Mr. Justice Gibson that it appeared to him that the state of the county of Westmeath was far from satisfactory, that he understood there were two districts in the county where boycotting existed, but this was not disclosed in the police reports; and if he can state whether there is any uniform system to guide the police in the presentation of their reports to the Judges of Assizes; and, if not, will he take steps to have this done.

MR. BIRRELL: My attention has been drawn to Mr. Justice Gibson's remarks as reported in the Press. The instructions to county inspectors require them to furnish to each Judge of Assize the Returns, in the prescribed forms, of both serious and minor offences committed in the county since the last Assizes, and the county inspector is also instructed to attend before the Judge and afford him any information or explanation that he may require. In 1904, the existing forms of Return were submitted to the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland with the view of ascertaining whether such Returns would meet the approval of His Majesty's Judges. The Lord Chief Justice expressed approval of these forms, and they have since been consistently used.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): When vacancies on the Bench are filled up will the right hon. Gentleman take care that the men are appointed for their professional capacity and not for political rewards?

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon Gentleman aware that this practice of furnishing reports to Judges is utterly unknown in England?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

New Irish Universities.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now able to inform the House as to the titles to be given to the new Universities to be established in Ireland and to the new college in Dublin.

MR. BIRRELL: I am not yet able to say what the names of the new Universities will be.

MR. MOORE: Can the right hon. Gentleman state the cause of the delay, as we are now approaching the Third Reading?

MR. BIRRELL: I certainly would prefer that the senates of the new bodies should be consulted.

Irish Land Stock.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return on this day's Paper with reference to issues of Irish Land Stock.*

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): I have written to the hon. Member suggesting a few alterations in the form of the Return. If he will put on the Paper the amended notice which I have sent him I shall have much pleasure in granting the Return.

English Land Valuation Bill.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will introduce the Land Valuation Bill for England before the recess, so that it may be printed and distributed to Members.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): No, Sir. The Land Valuation Bill will be introduced when the House resumes after the recess.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Sixth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table and to be printed.

HOME WORK.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 246.]

SWEATED INDUSTRIES BILL.

Reported, without Amendment, from the Select Committee on Home Work.

Report to lie upon the Table.

CRIMINAL APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 337.]

---

* Return of Irish Land Stock Issues under the Irish Land Act, 1903, giving date of issue; amount; price; cash products; deficit; and annual charge on Ireland for 68½ years on deficit at 2¾ per cent.

PREVENTION OF CRIME BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee C.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 248.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 248.]

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 336.]

IMPORTATION OF PLUMAGE PROHIBITION BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 339.]

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Order for Committee read.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The Motion that you, Sir, now leave the Chair opens the whole subject of India and its condition. In the scope of a single speech or a single evening it is impossible to cover more than a part of the ground, and I shall, therefore, have to ask the indulgence of the House for the omission of many matters. There is undoubtedly a good deal that is disquieting in the political feeling in parts of India at the present moment, on which I shall have something to say later on. But there is a bright side of the picture also, and the bright side occupies by far the greater part of the canvas. On the financial and economic side I think we can give a good account of the state of India at the present moment. After all, this is primarily and pre-eminently a financial Resolution and a financial debate. In accordance with the obligation put upon us by statute, we lay the accounts for the revenue and expenditure of India on the Table of the House. The accounts submitted embrace three years—the accounts for the year ended March, 1907, the revised Estimates for the year ended March, 1908, and the Budget Estimates of the current year. With regard to the closed account of 1907, we have a realised surplus of £1,500,000. With regard to the revised Estimates for the year ended March this year, we have a revised estimated surplus of £235,000. I am glad to say that is on the upward move. Our latest news from India leads us to anticipate with a good deal of confidence that that surplus will be more than doubled, and that we shall have about half a million of surplus on the year just ended. With regard to the current year, the Estimate is the Budget Estimate, and subject to all the possible circumstances that may arise, and to the various causes, climatic, political, and other which may bring about some change in the course of the year. We estimate we shall have a surplus of £500,000. These figures as a whole are satisfactory, and they are still more satisfactory if we take a somewhat wider view and recollect that they follow upon continuous surpluses for a considerable number of years past. Therefore if the House will allow me I will deal with the accounts not merely of the last year or two, but of the last five or six years. We have to acknowledge in fairness to the Government of India that they have been able to show these continuous surpluses after bearing the full weight of considerable reductions of taxation and of considerable increases of expenditure. In the two years I am more particularly dealing with, 1907–8 and the current year, we have also to bear the financial burden put upon us by the reduction in land revenue and expenditure on relief works caused by the unfortunate famine that prevails in Northern India. Notwithstanding these strains upon the financial situation, India has been able to show a series of very satisfactory surpluses. I will say a few words on the reductions in taxation and increases in expenditure of recent years. In dealing with the former it is only fair that we should extend our view somewhat beyond the two or three years, as the large reduction of expenditure began five years ago, in the year 1903–4, with the first step taken towards the reduction of the salt duty. I should like to compare the state of our finance in the year before that reduction and now. The House is probably aware of what has taken place with regard to the salt duty. There have been three biennial reductions of the salt duty. In 1903–4 we reduced it from 2½ rupees to 2 rupees per maund; in 1905–6 to 1½ rupees per maund; in 1907–8 to 1 rupee per maund. The financial result has been that we have to bear a reduction of our surplus by loss of revenue occasioned by the reduction of the tax by something like three and a quarter millions sterling. That is not all. In the same period there have been other reductions of taxation. There have been remissions of certain land cesses in northern India and other parts of India; and there has also been the raising of the lower limit of income-tax. These various reductions, along with the reduction of the salt duty, will bring the reduction of the surplus to the figure of about four millions sterling. The House will no doubt ask what has been the effect of the reduction of the salt duty. Has the consumer benefited? I think I can give a satisfactory reply. If you take the year before the reduction of the salt duty, 1902–3, the amount of salt which paid duty was, roughly speaking, 36,000,000 maunds. The amount of salt which we estimate will be consumed this year is no less than 47,000,000 maunds, so that you have in seven years an increase in the consumption of salt of more than 25 per cent., a considerably greater rate of increase than that of the population. On the financial side also this reduction stands us in good stead. We have not to face the full deficit of £3,250,000, but only a deficit of about £2,750,000. Everyone is glad to find that this policy of reducing the salt duty has benefited the people we wanted to benefit, that it has benefited both man and beast, cattle as well as human beings, and given them a larger supply of that which is absolutely necessary to their existence and at cheaper prices than before. At present, and in years to come, we have to face a progressive diminution of our opium revenue. This policy has met with general acceptance from a large body of Members of this House. It will probably cost us this year a loss of about £200,000, which will continue for three years certain, and if China fulfils its part of the arrangement it will go on for ten years, and then we shall cease to have the opium revenue at all as a source of revenue. How do we stand with regard to increases of expenditure during the same period? There have been considerable increases of expenditure. We have been able to find money for these increases and yet show a surplus. The House will remember, four or five years ago, the production of the Police Commission's Report, which contained a somewhat disquieting account of the state of the police service in India. The reform of that service has been taken in hand and largely put through. I believe it has had very beneficial effects, but it has cost a good deal of money. Already, as compared with the year 1903–4, we find we have to spend on the police service an increased sum within the year of £1,400,000. We have also increased our expenditure on education. No doubt some hon. Members do not think we have increased it enough. In proportion to what we were spending before we have increased it by 100 per cent. We have spent double what we did five years ago on this service. We have also largely increased the expenditure on sanitary and medical services, civil works, and various minor services. Anyhow, the total for the police and other services comes to an extra sum of something like £4,000,000 a year. Then there is an increase of our military expenditure. On that subject, of course, the large increase was beginning at the period that we have taken as the starting point. The Kitchener programme was not then introduced, but the military expenditure had begun to rise; but, if you take the figure roughly from me, we have had to meet an increase in those five years of £2,000,000 per annum, owing to the large reorganisation of the military services of India. I have no desire to open any discussion on the merits of the Kitchener scheme. I think there is no doubt among military authorities that Lord Kitchener has largely increased the efficiency of the Army of India. We have also had, I think, clear proof of that in the recent compaigns on the frontier. Whatever opinions hon. Members may have as to the policy of these campaigns, and there are very different views on

Mr. Buchanan.

the subject, everyone will acknowledge that the force was organised and despatched, and did its work with exceedingly great promptitude and energy. The Mohmand Campaign, from start to finish, was completed in three weeks. In the early days, when an expedition of this sort was contemplated, it was put off to the cold weather, and it often took as many months as we have taken weeks. The officers in charge, as every fair-minded man will acknowledge, acting as they did under the instructions of a higher authority, also did their work expeditiously and efficiently; and at the conclusion of the business, the political officers showed equal skill and discretion in what I believe to be the satisfactory arrangements which they made with the frontier tribes, both the Zakka Khel and the Mohmands. I do not think there is the slightest doubt among military authorities of the general good results of the Kitchener re-organisation. To return to the question of finance, with which I am more particularly dealing, hon. Members, if they look at the Memorandum, will see that there has been a decrease since 1906-7 of about £1,000,000 in our military expenditure, and particularly in what is denominated special military expenditure. Since that year, I am happy to be able to announce, we have passed the maximum in regard to the increased expenditure entailed upon us by these reforms. The expenditure is decreasing slowly, and I think it will continue; but in order to be quite fair to the House I ought to state that the decrease in this year, and in the coming year, is not so much due to substantial alterations or cutting down of the programme of Lord Kitchener, as to the spreading over a longer period the execution of the works. I do not mean public works only, but works of organisation. I think we may fairly look forward in the course of the years to come to a slow, but fairly steady, decrease of military expenditure. Hon. Members will see that when added to the other items I have mentioned, we have had to meet an increased expenditure in the past five years of something like £6,000,000 per annum. Yet we have been able, without increasing taxation, to show a surplus every year. There is one point which ought to be noted, that whatever the military expenditure of India has been she has always paid her way from year to year. She has never borrowed a rupee for military works or for any other military purpose, and that I think, shows a good example to this country. As hon. Members are aware, India is the only part of the British Empire that has never received a single sixpence in aid of her military expenditure or her military works; so far from receiving a single sixpence, she has been made continually to pay to the last sixpence, and very often, I am sorry to say, the Home Government, have been in this respect somewhat of a stepmother to her. I pass to the subject of the famine and its effect on the finances of the year. Of course, the famine has had a considerable effect on the finances of the 1907–8 and the current year. Perhaps the House will take without any explanation from me the figures according to the most recent calculations we have been able to make at the India Office. The figures differ slightly from those given in the Memorandum. In the first place, there is a direct extra expenditure on relief works; in the second place, there is a diminution of revenue, owing to the suspension of land revenue in famine districts. If you will take it from me, according to the best estimate we can make, the amount in the two years that the famine will cost us from these two sources is £3,146,000. There is also a further way in which the famine affects our financial resources, though not so much in regard to the revenue and expenditure of the year. The House is aware that we distribute very large Government advances to the cultivators to tide them over the period of distress, and these sums have, of course, to be met out of the cash balance of the Government of India. That has thrown upon us during last year and in the current year the obligation to find a sum of no less than £2,700,000 in round figures. In all, therefore, the strain upon the resources of the Government of India caused by the famine amounts to the sum of £5,800,000. The House would like to know how far we have been able successfully to fight the present famine, and how far we have been able to profit by the experience of our predecessors, and to improve and extend the methods they adopted. There are hon. Members who themselves have taken part in the practical work of famine relief, and, of course, they know a great deal more about the subject than I can ever profess to know or adequately explain. I think they will agree with me that each generation of civilians desire not to take credit to themselves, but to profit by the experience of their predecessors, and we will give all honour to those who are at the present moment engaged in devoting their time and labour to this famine work in Northern India. There are two respects, I think, in which we have improved upon and developed the action of our predecessors. The House knows that all the famines of the past twenty-five years have been succeeded by Commissions of Inquiry, and the Famine Commission Reports of 1880, 1898, and 1901, the last by Sir Antony Macdonell, have all been most valuable documents, full of most admirable suggestions, and I think, each suceeding Commission has not been slow to learn lessons from it predecessor. One respect in which we have profited by this experience is this, namely, that we have very much more largely than in previous famines, suspended the revenue, and suspended it at a much earlier stage. This famine is most severe in the United Provinces and Central India—but particularly in the United Provinces. At the earliest moment the famine was apprehended, Sir John Hewett set to work at once, and instructed his officials to suspend the land revenue at the earliest moment, and this was done on a very large scale indeed. He also, in consequence of the accumulated experience of the past, issued Government loans to the authorities on a much larger scale, and also at the earliest possible moment. That has had a most admirable effect. There is only one figure I will give to the House—it is this. In the famine of 1896–7, which was also very severe in the United Provinces, the amount of the loans issued was £125,000, whereas in the famine from the year ended 31st March last, in the United Provinces, no less a sum than £1,000,000 has been issued for these loans. And the great merit of that action and of the suspension of the revenue was that they were promptly taken, and taken at the right moment, when they put the cultivators in good heart to meet the troubled times ahead of them. All this, as hon. Gentlemen who have had experience are aware, is of the very highest importance. It is of importance also in another respect. These loans are spent mainly in the purchase of seed, the sinking of wells, embankments, and irrigation expedients. It is clear what the result will be. The cultivator will have in his pocket the power to purchase seed, and he will be in a much more secure position than if he had not the power of purchasing that seed. The result of all that is set out in some detail in the Report we have had from the United Provinces. They have been able to sow a much larger area of cultivated ground than could possibly have been anticipated, or than has ever been sown in famine circumstances before. Officers in the United Provinces have made close calculations of the amount of land that would normally be sowed in the famine districts. I will give only a couple of examples. In two districts of the United Provinces, instead of being able to sow only half the normal area, in consequence of these loans they have been able to sow three-quarters of it. In two other districts they have been able to sow three times more than was anticipated, and in other districts double as much as anticipated. It is clear, therefore, there will be a much larger area, for spring crops, secured than otherwise would have been done. All this gives an increased amount of labour, it gives fairly high wages for the labourers in ploughing and watering, and that increased demand for labour results in a less expenditure on relief works. The results of what has been done may be summed up in a few words. First and foremost, these loans have put heart into the cultivators at the most important moment. Secondly, they ensure as full an area as possible being cultivated for cold weather crops. Thirdly, employment is given to a large number of people at high rates of wages in irrigating and harvesting those crops, thus keeping them off relief works. Fourthly, they add permanently to the irrigated area. Fifthly, they keep open the ordinary courses of credit usually available. But there is something more. In consequence of what has been done we have had much less of what is one of the most painful experiences of famine, namely, that of a man giving up at the earliest moment, and taking to wandering, with his family, aimlessly through the country, contracting disease and perishing by the way. There has been much less of that sort of experience, and the recent report of Sir John Hewett states that there is much less disease and mortality—less smallpox, less fever, and less cholera. But on the whole there has been much less sickness in the United Provinces, and there has been no rise in mortality equal to what we have seen in previous famines. Sir John Hewett says that in a large number of the districts of the United Provinces the death rate was, in April, well below the normal. Still I do not want to exaggerate the good side of the situation. We received a telegram last night from India stating the exact position in which things were at the present moment. It states that in the United Provinces, relief is still being given in thirty-seven districts; there are 300,000 persons on relief works and 500,000 on gratuitous relief. There is little wandering and little emaciation or signs of distress, and the physical condition of the people is well maintained, though the mortality in some districts is above the normal on account of smallpox and cholera, which were rapidly abating. The monsoon has so far given good rain to the greater part of the country, and the rainfall over India as a whole from 1st June up to date is exactly normal. Reports received from the Lieutenant-Governor on tour in the United Provinces show that there is at present the prospect of an excellent harvest over an abnormally large area. The prospects of India generally are distinctly favourable though more rain is wanted in the North-West Frontier provinces and part of Madras. There is still, however, time even in those areas for sufficient rain to fall to secure a good harvest, and in the country, as a whole, the conditions are, up to date, satisfactory. On the whole, the Report is a good one, and it does not keep back from the knowledge of the House the two sides of the question. It must be a source of gratification for the House to find that the long-continued efforts and the accumulated experience due to those efforts are having their effect in reducing the inevitable suffering and misery that follow in the wake of scarcity and famine. If we compare the state of things to-day with the condition of affairs thirty or fifty years ago, or still more before British rule began, we cannot fail to recognise that there is no sphere in which British rule has done more to alleviate the condition of the poorest of the peoples of Hindustan than the long-continued efforts for the prevention of famine and the alleviation of its miseries when they arise. I should like to go back to a more pleasing topic, again a financial one. There is the question of the debt. I think that India can show up very well in comparison with other countries in respect of its position as to non-productive debt. The total debt-charge of India for the non-productive debt amounts to no more than £1,420,000, or just about 3 per cent. of its net revenue. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer could imagine that, in this country, he could have in the future a debt-charge amounting to not more than 3 per cent. of his net revenue he would sleep more comfortably at night and would anticipate certain charges that may possibly come upon his revenue with a lighter heart. Anyhow it is satisfactory that there is this light debt charge and that it is diminishing and not increasing. There is also the ordinary test of the yield of the commercial departments of the State and the general state of trade in India. Of both we can give good reports. The commercial departments of the State in India are of great importance, much more important from a revenue point of view than in this country. The railways in the main belong to the State, and they now, after paying all expenses and interest on capital, yield to the Indian Exchequer a net revenue of £2,500,000 per annum as compared with £250,000 five years ago. The irrigation works yield us £750,000 per annum, as opposed to less than £200,000 per annum five years ago. There is no sphere of work in which the Indian Government has engaged which is more satisfactory to contemplate than that of the railway and irrigation work. Hon. Members will have read with interest the report on railway work by Sir James Mackay's Committee, which we laid before the House at Whitsuntide, and which shows what our policy in the past has been and what the policy in the future is to be. Everyone will anticipate from the fact that we have adopted the main recommendations of that Report a satisfactory result to our revenue, which in the future will not be worse, but better than at the present time. I have given notice of a Bill for renewing our power of borrowing money for railway, irrigation, and other general purposes, but I have not yet had the opportunity of introducing it. It is a measure, however, that will generally commend itself to the approbation of the House and from it we may expect very excellent results will ensue. Everyone will recognise also that there is no part of our work which reflects more credit on us than the admirable irrigation work, large and small, which has been carried out in recent years. It has been a help to our revenue, tending also to mitigate the conditions of the poorest people in the time of their distress. We intend to go on as we have done only more so in the future in pursuit of that policy. The Customs duties are increasing year after year. We have an increase in the yield of the Customs duties for the five years of £1,030,000 per annum, which is due to the great increase of imports, and that increase may be attributed to the prosperity that was widespread before the present scarcity began, and to the state of inland trade. The figures in connection with exports and imports are probably fairly familiar to Members of the House of Commons for the use they often make of them in other contests, and they are exceedingly satisfactory. The imports of merchandise on private account in the five years have risen from £52,500,000 to £91,000,000—an £increase in imports of 70 per cent. In exports the increase has been from £86,000,000 to £115,500,000, while the volume of trade has risen from £138,500,000 to £206,500,000. The increases have been in all the important articles—such as food and drink, metals, manufactured goods, and cotton. Drink is not the largest of these items by any means in the total of £11,500,000 for articles of food and drink; the largest item is sugar, which yields us £6,000,000 out of the £11,500,000. In the course of the five years metals and manufactured goods have risen from £9,500,000 to £20,000,000, and the value of imported cotton from £20,250,000 to £32,000,000. In exports cotton has gone up in value from £16,000,000 to £24,000,000, but jute beats cotton, of which for the sake of Dundee I am glad, having risen in value from £13,000,000 to £24,000,000, while wheat and tea follow on very well. Perhaps I ought to add that in the past six months there has been some setback, owing partly to the famine, partly owing to the crisis in the United States, and India has suffered as other communities have done. There were difficulties in regard to our Bills which we endeavoured to meet and supplement, I think with success. Any hon. Members will see a good deal about that both in the financial statement and in the Memorandum. I think the account one can give of the economic condition of India is a fairly satisfactory one as judged by any ordinary test. I have endeavoured to take criteria which will test the prosperity as far as possible not only in the upper ranges of wealth, but in the lower ranges as well, and the vast body of population is an agricultural, and a poor population. I have dwelt upon famine and one or two other drawbacks to the situation. There is also plague. Plague has undoubtedly been a terrible calamity in India during the past ten or eleven years. A few days ago several questions were put to me on this subject by hon. Members, and I gave to the House the figures for the current year. They were of a fairly satisfactory character. I am told that some gentlemen who asked me these questions rather demurred to my statement as to the first six months of the present year, and they asked how the figures compared with the first six months of last year month by month. Last year was, of course, an exceptionally bad year—the worst we have had. The mortality in the first six months of 1907 reached 1,061,000; in the six months of the present year the mortality was 110,000 and all through you will find a tenfold decrease in the bad months as well as a great deal more than tenfold in what are called the good months, like June and July. In the telegram which I read a minute or two ago the Viceroy gives us the latest figures, and the total number of deaths in the week ended 11th July in the whole of India amounted only to 435. The House should not, of course, be too hopeful. Although the figures for the first six months are the lowest since 1900, there have been decreases before, and we have been disappointed in their continuation. The large decrease in 1906 was followed by the appalling figures of 1907. We must, therefore, possess our souls in patience, and hope that we are passing by the worst of this dreadful plague. But the Government of India have to battle not only with plague, pestilence, and famine, with battle and murder, but with sedition and privy conspiracy as well. There is, unfortunately, a seditious spirit abroad in some parts of India. It shows itself in the Press and in a general spirit of suspicion and distrust, and, in some cases, of violence and outrage. The last development of it has been the discovery in Calcutta of an organised conspiracy for the production and use of bombs and other murderous instruments of destruction. We do not know, I am sorry to say, how far the ramifications of this conspiracy go. But it is a new and most unpleasing discovery. It is needless to enlarge upon it. It would be useless to exaggerate it or to minimise its importance. But I am convinced that such methods are utterly repugnant to the ideas of Indians and Europeans alike in India; and we are having, and we have already had, from day to day and from week to week assurances upon this subject—hon. Members will have seen one in the newspapers to-day—assurances of the united support of all sections of the population in stamping out this hateful form of political disease. That we shall do by any and every means at our command. We have already strengthened our powers for this purpose by passing the Explosives Act and the Press Act. Until the present moment no need has arisen for putting the latter of these Acts into operation. We can look at the fact with satisfaction, because it shows so far as it goes—it is but a short time—the deterrent results of this legislation we have passed. [AN HON. MEMBER: No."] I think so far as it goes it does. We cannot be surprised that there is anxiety among Europeans in India, particularly in the outlying districts; but it is anxiety that has bravely been borne. We sitting here on these benches can, and I think ought to, give our tribute of respect to all in India, high and low, non-officials as well as officials, women as well as men and more than men, who possess their souls in fortitude and patience and show no signs of feeble panic or alarm. They trust in us and we shall not fail them. But there are other signs of political discontent and unrest, not outside the pale like the bomb of the anarchist, but serious in their character, and for which it is difficult to devise a remedy. We have got to recognise that a new spirit has come over the political outlook of large numbers of educated Indians. This class may be numbered, not by millions, but by tens or hundreds of thousands; but it is an influential class; and our rule, to be a complete and stable success, should be able to attract that class to our side. Some are frankly hostile to the maintenance of our rule, some are hostile, but not frankly so. The majority, I believe, recognise the advantages obtained and to be obtained under our rule. They know the disasters which would befall them were our rule removed; but many of them, at any rate, are not cordial. Can we bring them really to our side? Can we adapt British rule and British administration to the new ideas that are growing up in India? We may not be able to satisfy all their ideals. But to those who loyally accept the conditions of our rule we want to offer an active and real interest and responsibility in the concerns of their own people. That is the problem that is before us. It is not a simple or a single problem, and we cannot have a simple or a single solution of it. But if we can convince those most interested of the sincerity of our desire to solve it we shall have the assistance of all the moderate sections of the community. I know there are those—and they are gentlemen whose opinion is entitled to every respect—who maintain that, if we were to go back on the partition of Bengal, all would be well, not only in Bengal, but throughout

India. I cannot share that view. At any rate, whatever our opinion on that transaction may be, what is most obligatory upon us at the present moment is, in Bengal and elsewhere, and particularly in Bengal, to endeavour to improve the work of administration under existing arrangements, to oil its wheels and to remove the soreness which, undoubtedly, was largely caused by the way in which the division of the province was originally carried out. The Secretary of State for India has shown generally what his aims and intentions are as regards political reforms. His object and that of the Government is to go forward fearlessly on the lines of constitutional progress in such a way as to meet, as far as possible, possible, in the words used by Lord Minto, the Viceroy, the other day, the political aspirations of honest reformers. We should like to be able on this fiftieth anniversary of the assumption of the Government of India by the Crown to take a real step forward. It is not merely constitutional but administrative reform in all its grades that we have in view. We hope to do a great deal in the way of administrative improvement by simplifying and shortening its procedure, by limiting excessive official interference, quite as much in the interest of the official as of the non-official class; and as a guiding principle in all that we do, to endeavour to associate Indians more and more with the practical work of government. It would be unwise and indeed impossible for me to go more into detail where no detailed scheme has yet been decided upon by us. The House is aware of the position generally in which the question of reform now stands. We are most anxious for speedy progress; but we want to take with us the maximum of consent and of hearty consent, both here and in India. The opinions of the Local Governments and the other authorities in India on the last proposals submitted to them by the Government of India have all been sent in; but we await the final recommendations upon them of the Government of India. Then there is the Report of the Decentralisation Commission presided over by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury. I think few members of the House realise the time and labour which he and his colleagues devoted to that work. It was a large and important work, and they did not spare themselves. They held eighty sittings and travelled 30,000 miles in the execution of their work; and I believe they have still to extract the essence from something like seven or eight large volumes of evidence laid before them. We anticipate great results from their recommendations. But it is manifest that with the labours they are performing now day after day and week after week it will be two or three months before their Report can be produced, and it is clear that it must be nearly the end of the year before definite decisions can be arrived at by the Secretary of State and the Government which can be announced to Parliament. But the Secretary of State hopes that such a statement will be possible before the autumn session comes to an end. One word of caution before I conclude. These reforms cannot be a panacea for all Indian troubles. Legislation and the machinery of government are not everything. But we believe that these reforms, if carried through, will do something to meet the legitimate desires now unsatisfied of an important class of the community; and it is in that confident hope that we are proceeding with them. But there is another, and humbler, day to day method by which we hope to surmount some of our troubles as our predecessors had surmounted similar difficulties in the past. We can say for ourselves, without flattery, that as a nation we are not daunted by theoretical difficulties which may be presented to us by clever men in an apparently insoluble form. We take things as they come; and we endeavour to find a practical solution for each particular emergency as it arises. The method is not ours. It is as old as Solomon, who told us to ponder the path at our feet and to let our eyes look right on. That has served us in good stead in the past; it will serve us well in the future. After all, the millions of Indian cultivators are the bulk of the Indian people, and if we give them a just rule, if we secure them peace, and—so far as enlightened government can do it—secure them prosperity, we shall do a good work in our generation. I sometimes read with regret disparaging things said of those who are carrying on the work of administration in India. We all have friends engaged in that work; and we know the good they have done and are doing. I am perfectly certain that the younger men of the Indian Civil Service just like their predecessors, in the heroic days, thirty, forty, or fifty years ago, dream dreams and see visions of the grandeur of the work in which they are engaged. Indeed, no one can be associated with the government of India in whatever capacity—as I am here, as we all are, sitting on these benches—without feeling something of the inspiration that it is given to us to help on, in however humble a way, a great achievement and a noble work.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for Committee on East India Revenue Accounts)."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

*EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.) said that while they must all regret the almost irreparable loss which the House had sustained by the removal of Lord Morley to another place, he was sure they would join in congratulating the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down on the ability with which he had discharged the task which he thought had not devolved for some fifteen years on any one holding his office in this House, and which was not rendered more easy by the fact that he was so recently transferred from another position. They would also echo the eulogium which he passed on the skill and success with which the recent expedition on the Indian frontier was organised and carried through —a success all the more remarkable because of the very stringent stipulation laid down by the Government with regard to the speedy evacuation of the territory concerned. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the policy of punitive expeditions was a subject on which people differed in opinion. He did not suppose there was any school of responsible politicians who would seriously contend that the Indian Government could sit with its hands folded and allow outrages to be committed by raiders from beyond our territory within our own borders. If there was any question on the subject of punitive expeditions, it was not whether they should take place, but whether they should or should not be followed by annexation. He thought the attitude of the majority of the frontier tribes during the recent expedition was strong corroborative evidence in favour of maintaining that policy of abstention from intervention in tribal affairs beyond our frontier which was laid down by Lord George Hamilton in his despatch, and which has been adhered to by the present Secretary of State. Perhaps the most disquieting feature of the expedition, and one to which the hon. Gentleman did not allude, was the participation in the operations of a certain number of raiders from Afghan territory, and it was satisfactory to know that in the later stages of the campaign the Ameer of Afghanistan seemed to have taken some steps to control those incursions into our territory, and, perhaps, he might take that opportunity, though it was not a subject which it was desirable to discuss at length, of expressing a hope that the Ameer would before long be able to give us a fresh proof of his goodwill by the announcing his acceptance of the recent Anglo-Russian agreement, which many on that side of the House thought it necessary to criticise in some of its details, but which, so far as regarded Afghanistan itself, had no other object in view than to make it easy for the two coterminous Powers to fulfil their treaty engagements with respect to the integrity and independence of that country.

So far as the purely financial aspect of the present Budget was concerned, he did not imagine that the Government would meet with any serious criticism. The surplus at their disposal, though larger undoubtedly than was anticipated—(and in view of the partial recrudescence of famine in the provinces, it was surprising that there should be any surplus at all)—was not sufficiently large to admit of a further reduction of taxation, and he was not sure that a reduction of taxation had the first claim on an Indian finance Minister. The allocation of the surplus to grants in aid of sanitary administration had met with general approval. Nor when they turned from the purely financial aspect of the question to those larger questions of public policy to which the right hon. Gentleman made passing and eloquent reference in his concluding remarks—the extension of primary education, the enlargement of the legislative councils, the decentralisation of provincial administration—were they in regard to any of these larger questions of policy in a much more favourable position usefully to discuss them than they were last year, for the reason, as the right hon. Gentleman had himself said, that neither the House nor the Government themselves were in possession of the results of the inquiries set on foot in India. Therefore, upon none of those questions did he think that any long and minute discussion was called for. He was not disposed to blame the Government for the delay which had taken place in this matter, because questions of this kind were far too important to be hastily decided, and they had a somewhat unpleasant reminder of the need of proceeding cautiously in these matters, in the fact that in this very year somewhat ominously in which the Secretary of State had announced his intention to take steps in the direction of broadening the basis of the legislative system, the Government of India should have had to go to the legislative council in order to ask an increase of their executive authority.

The right hon. Gentleman had said little in regard to the Press Act. He thought the Government was to be congratulated upon taking a step long overdue, and which, if report spoke truly, was unsuccessfully pressed upon the Secretary of State by the Government of India last year. The repeal of Lord Lytton's Press Act had been universally regarded by British opinion in India as a mistake, and although he thought the Unionist Government had to bear a fair share of the blame for not having dealt with the matter themselves in the past, still, in view of the importance of keeping the treatment of Indian questions free so far as possible of the suspicion of party bias, he could not regret himself that it should have fallen to a Liberal Government to redress a mistake for which a Liberal Government was in the first instance responsible. If there was any criticism to be made on the recent Press Act it was that it erred on the side of leniency, and that the definition of sedition was exclusively confined to sedition tending to actual acts of violence. Another criticism which might be made was that the mode of procedure, which involved in every case the direct interposition of the local Government before the magistrates could act, might in times of emergency be found to be somewhat cumbrous and dilatory. At the same time the Government had announced their intention of correcting any defects which experience might reveal in this Act. Lord Minto stated that they intended to supplement it with an Act dealing with the whole question of the supervision of the Press, and it was, at all events, satisfactory to know, as the hon. Gentleman had told them that afternoon, that although no prosecutions had taken place under the Press Act nor the Explosives Act still, they had been effective, and that some of the worst offenders had thought it advisable to close their offices. He hoped the Government would not allow themselves to be deterred from taking any steps necessary in this matter by the very small section of opinion which was constantly proclaiming that we ought to govern India according to Indian ideas, and then turned round and asked us to extend to the native Press a licence which would not be tolerated by any native Government. If we were to allow matters to drift much longer, we should forfeit, and deservedly forfeit, the respect of the best native opinion in India itself, we should fail in our duty to the rising generation whose minds have been poisoned by the perpetual propaganda of sedition, and further, we should fail in our duty to that small but devoted band of our fellow-countrymen upon the maintenance of whose authority depended not merely their personal safety, but the very existence and continuance of British rule in India.

Assertions had frequently been made regarding the growing feeling of estrangement between the white and the coloured races in India. It was some five years since he was in India, but he did not

Earl Percy.

believe that in that interval events had so far changed that so sweeping a generalisation could be justified. This much was certain, that if anything could produce, not only estrangement, but actual antipathy between the white and coloured races, it would be the identification of the idea of justice to native aspirations with the idea of passive toleration of every form of incitement to disloyalty and crime. But there was another reason why he thought the Government were bound to deal sternly with an agitation of that kind, and it was one to which Lord Minto alluded in his speech in the debate in the Legislative Council. Lord Minto said very truly that whatever might be the determining factors in the present state of unrest, there could be no doubt whatever that the main problem which Indian statesmen had to solve was not a political, but an economic problem. It was quite true that the measures which the Indian Government had passed during the last few years had done a great deal to place the finances of India in the satisfactory position which the right hon. Gentleman had described that afternoon. They had, in fact, placed the finances in a position which might well excite the envy of any Western nation. They had reduced taxation to a point which scarcely left any room for criticism, even by the Leaders of the Congress party. They had wiped out the unremunerative debt, they had established over large parts of India means in the shape of loan banks for freeing the agriculturist from dependence upon the local usurer, and they had set up machinery for assisting the agriculturist by means of advances of capital and remissions of land revenue to tide over a time of stress and emergency.

But the fact remained that India was not so much perhaps a poor country as a country whose economic position was necessarily precarious, because it depended almost exclusively upon a single industry, namely, agriculture, which was exposed to vicissitudes of a kind and frequency to which it was not exposed in any other country in the world. So long as that was the case there must be recurring periods of misery with the inevitable accompaniment of discontent, and it was one of the worst features of the agitation which had now gone on for three or four years, that it must inevitably tend to discourage the free inflow of British capital into India, which was absolutely indispensable if alternative Indian industries were to be developed, and which would be more necessary than ever in the coming years if the Government were to carry out successfully the large borrowing operations which they contemplated in connection with their railway programme. Although the economic problem was distinct from and more important than the political, there was, at all events, one question which vitally concerned both, and that was the question of education. In the speech which the Secretary of State made at the Civil Service Dinner the other day, he mentioned as one of the main causes leading to the present unrest in India, the defective ideal which had inspired our educational system. The same view was expressed by one of the Indian Members on the Legislative Council when he said that what was most needed was not a multiplication of existing primary schools, but the reform of the whole system. He believed that everybody was agreed that some reform of the educational system was necessary, but hardly any two were agreed as to the lines on which that reform should proceed. On the one hand, there was a school of thought, represented by some Gentleman in that House, who thought we ought to copy in India all the latest educational ideas of England, that education ought to be free and also compulsory; and, on the other hand, there was a school of thought, according to which the initial blunder lay in ever having introduced into India the English system of education at all. If we had introduced the English system of education in India, he would view its extension with much less misgiving than he did. But the fundamental difficulty of the system in India was that it never bore more than a superficial resemblance to that with which we were familiar, and the conditions under which it was introduced were wholly different from the conditions existing at home, and wholly different from the conditions prevailing in India at the present time. In England, from the outset, in both State and voluntary schools, primary education was associated with religious teaching in one form or another, and to this day the opposition excited by any proposal to banish religious teaching from the schools, was due to the widespread conviction that education divorced from religious teaching was not merely defective in itself but might have an actually subversive effect on character and hardly deserved to be called education at all. In India the conditions were wholly different. There we had grafted on to a system that for centuries had been religious and nothing else, another system which, because it maintained an attitude of strict neutrality to every form of religion, tended to detach the people from ancient traditions or beliefs, and did not attempt to supply any alternative basis of religious or moral training, which could fit them for political or administrative responsibility. That this had given rise to a serious state of things was illustrated in "The Moral and Material Progress of India." The Tikka Sahib of Nabha in the Viceroy's Council said—

> "Primary education is an admitted necessity for the country. I have read with much pleasure Your Excellency's speech in reply to the address of the orthodox Hindu community, in which you stated that you saw no objection to the institution of denominational hostels. I am strongly of opinion that the religions of India ought to be maintained, and this can only be done by a system of denominational education. I am of opinion that even the Chiefs' College at Lahore is unfit for the education of Sikhs of position. In this connection I would beg to point to the deplorable ignorance of the religious systems of the country generally possessed by English officials in India."

He would read one or two extracts from the Reports on "Moral and Material Progress of India." In the United Provinces—

> "The continuous decline in the number of private schools was to be regretted. Five years ago they numbered 6,071, attended by 84,278 pupils; now they numbered only 4,570, with attendance of 69,277."

In the Central Provinces—

> "The education of Mahomedans made slow progress, owing to the importance attached by them to religious education, and, consequently, to the necessity for separate schools."

The influence of the masters, it was stated, was not so strong as it should be, and there were outbreaks of disorder owing to political influences. It did not appear that the influence of masters was as strong as it should be, their interest in the boys not always extending beyond the mere teaching class. From the North-West Frontier Province the report was even more striking. It began with quite a sanguine observation upon "steady progress in every direction," and the statement that—

> "the old private village schools in which instruction goes little further than the teaching of religious books by note are now declining in popular favour and the people are learning to appreciate the more intelligent education offered by the Government schools."

But as one of the results of "intelligent appreciation" it was stated that—

> "Although the attendance of Hindus showed an increase of 24 per cent., that of Mahomedans, who at the 1901 Census were more than 92 per cent. of the population, showed a small decline."

That, he submitted, showed a very serious state of things. It was very difficult to know how the difficulty was to be met, but surely it must be obvious that this had a very direct bearing when they were considering the widespread extension of elementary education. He did not suggest for a moment that the State should abandon its attitude of neutrality towards the various religions, and still less that the State could discover any form of dogma common to all the various beliefs of that great continent; but the inference he drew from those premises was that the State could not hope to play in India the same active propagandist part in regard to primary education as in this country, but ought to direct its efforts to stimulating native denominational schools. The Indian system differed again from the English on the utilitarian side. In England, whatever its defects might be, our system of education was regarded as a preparation for an industrial career. In India almost the only industry was agriculture, but the system did nothing to qualify the people for that calling, and any special aptitude which it imparted found no outlet except in the law or in Government employment. That, he thought, was a real grievance and danger, for it lent colour to the assertions often made by agitators in India that the British Government did little to help the people to participate in the benefits that might follow the development of industrial resources. It was now seven years since a conference at Simla went into all the phases of Indian education, primary, secondary, and technical, and passed an enormous number of resolutions, upon which it was expected prompt action would be taken. Into the details of these he would not enter; they would be more appropriate to the Resolution which would presently be moved, but he mentioned one or two. They dealt with the neglect of the study of the vernacular, recommending that it should be carried on throughout the school course up to the University. They recommended that inspection should be substituted for examinations, and the results of such inspection accepted as passports to the Universities and Government employment; that in secondary schools a modern side should prepare pupils for a commercial career; that relations should be established by the school authorities with chambers of commerce and emyloyers; and, lastly, the subject of technical education was dealt with in a valuable Report by Sir Edward Buck, who suggested the erection of six industrial institutes for the different provinces connected with special local industries, the introduction of a system of apprenticeship in workshops under the supervision of Europeans in connection with technical schools and the training of village schoolmasters in the principles of agriculture. Were we really making substantial progress in any of these directions? The Tikka Sahib of Nabha, in his address at the Viceroy's Council to which he had referred, said—

> "As far as I can see, these primary schools are opened mostly for the benefit of the agricultural population, but I am afraid that the agricultural classes are not fully benefited by them. With a little more expense and forethought it might be possible to adapt these schools to the requirements of the villagers. As a first step the scope of the work of these schools should be defined; and they should be raised to such a position as to enable them to teach something useful to the agriculturists. In the first place, an attempt should be made to instruct the pupils in reading, writing, and arithmetic in their own language, not as it is done now in Urdu, which is a foreign language. The result is that after three or four years study they hardly understand the meaning of the words they read or repeat. Education to be of any real advantage must be given first in the easiest language to learn; and could there be any language easier to learn than one's mother tongue? So primary education in the Punjab ought to be given through the Punjabi only, and in the characters peculiar to that language. When the Government has recognised a knowledge of Punjabi as a desideratum for the British military and cvil officers, it is very strange indeed that the Educational Department should have forced on the poor Punjabis the necessity to forget their own vernacular for the camp language of the Mughal Emperors, which is not a general household language in India. Then, again, books should be specially compiled containing useful information in simple and colloquial language about agriculture, sanitation, manure and cattle. The schoolmaster should be a man who knows something about cattle diseases and practical farming, so that he may be able to attract the attention of the villagers and win their respect by his knowledge of the very subjects which they pride themselves on knowing better than anyone else. It would be far better to have fewer schools doing really useful and practical work than to open many lower primary places of instruction which serve no useful purpose."

So far as he was aware few steps had been taken to carry out the reforms suggested and the whole reforming energy of the Government seemed to have been directed to the Universities. Of course the Government might plead that they had considerably increased expenditure on education, and their financial resources would not allow more liberality. The increase had taken place on a very low scale of expenditure; the total amount was almost insignificant, and he could not accept the financial argument as sufficient excuse. After all, we in this country were embarking on an expenditure of some £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 lightheartedly without making any provision for it, and on an object which, however much the House might sympathise with it, could not be described as remunerative. How could they ask the Indian to believe that his own Government, which in the last three or four years had sacrificed three or four millions of revenue from the salt duty and opium, and which intended to borrow 100 millions in eight years for railways, could not find money enough to spend on the development of technical education, which was of such vital importance if the people of India were to be prepared to take their proper part in the development of industries, and which might legitimately be described as a most remunerative form of expenditure? With regard to the general administration of education, he could not help thinking they would never get any real enthusiasm or progress until that administration was reformed. If he remembered rightly, Lord Curzon had laid great stress on the absurdity of treating educational matters in India as a mere province of the work of the Home Department. There was now a Director-General of Education, but it was still the fact that, not only was there no Member for Education in the Viceroy's Council, but the Director-General, if he wished to bring any educational matter before the Member who represented the Home Department, had to do so through the ordinary machinery of the office. He thought that, if there was not to be a Member on the Council directly representative of and responsible for education, the Director-General ought to be given the same right and privilege of free access to the Viceroy which was proposed to be given to the President of the Railway Board. Leaving education, he would like to say a word on another subject. Lord Morley had alluded, as a contributory cause of the unrest, to the increasing complexity of our administrative system, which allowed less and less personal contact between the population at large and the officials appointed to look after their interests. Personally, he would welcome decentralisation, though it was rather difficult to discuss it in the abstract apart from detailed proposals; but, personally, he believed it to be a good thing if it led to closer correspondence between the individuals and the population among whom they worked, even it if resulted in a slight diminution of efficiency. After all, Oriental populations had been accustomed for centuries to personal rule, and he thought that personal rule, even if comparatively inefficient, was better than administration carried on by the machinnery of Government Departments. But he hoped the Government would not confine their attention to the mere freeing of the provincial Government and individual officials from undue interference from headquarters. He hoped they would see the expediency of diminishing the excessive burden of responsibility now thrown on individuals. He was glad to see that the Government had announced their intention of giving to the local government greater powers of making appointments without referring home every case for approval. If the statement of Sir Bampfylde Fuller was correct, that there were many districts in which a single executive officer was supposed to look after a population of 1,000,000 souls, and an area of 10,000 square miles, he thought there was great force in his contention that there was room not only for an increase of appointments, but for a further subdivision of administrative areas, for which they had a precedent in the separation of the Frontier Province from the Punjab, and which would have the advantage of throwing open a larger number of administrative appointments which natives might fill. He wished to allude briefly to one other question upon which he understood the Government were contemplating, if they had not already sanctioned, a new departure, and on which he felt unable to congratulate them, namely, the policy of the separation of judicial from executive functions in Bengal. Ideally he had no doubt, considering the question purely in the abstract and apart from Indian traditions, everyone would agree that it was not desirable to combine these two functions in the same hands, and that separation would have the incidental advantage of enabling the district officer to pay more attention to his administrative duties. But it was not contended that the existing system had led to any grave abuse, and British official opinion in India had always been strongly against the change on the ground that to take away judicial powers from the executive officer would very seriously impair the respect for his authority. That was still the opinion both of the provincial Governments and of high judicial officers to whom the question had been referred by the Government, and in defiance of their opinion this step had been taken, and taken in the province of Bengal where respect for administrative authority seemed already to have sunk to a somewhat dangerously low point. As he understood it from a perusal of Sir Harvey Adamsons' speech in the Viceroy's Council, the main reason that had influenced the Government in taking this step was the argument that, in a province where the agitators were constantly impugning the judicial impartiality of the district magistrates, their executive authority was likely to be increased rather than impaired by the removal of that suspicion, however groundless it might be. That was no doubt an argument which carried some weight, though, obviously, the validity of it depended on the extent to which the concession the Government contemplated was really likely to meet the demands the agitators were making. As he understood the scheme outlined by Sir Harvey Adamson, it proposed to leave the judicial officer under the control of the Divisional Commissioner and, in those circumstances, those who protested against the combination of the two functions being in the same hands might still contend that the judiciary was subject to the control and influence of the Administration. He did not wish to take the responsibility of saying that the decision of the Government was a wrong one; but he did think they would have done better not to have made the announcement in India or thrown down the scheme for general criticism until they were prepared to announce their decision in the House and to state the grounds on which they had acted. The reform was not an urgent one, it would be very costly, and it might well have been postponed in favour of other reforms, such as that of education, which might not bulk so largely in the speeches of political agitators, but which, he believed, would be of more material advantage to the great body of the population.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs), in moving "That this House, while it recognises that the reforms now under the consideration of the Government of India are suitable and sufficient in respect of questions with which they deal, is of opinion that the educational system in India stands in urgent need of reform," said he agreed with all the noble Lord had said with regard to the separation of the judicial and executive functions, at any rate as to the merits of that question. He joined in the congratulations to his right hon. friend the Under-Secretary, not only as to the statement which he had made, but also that he had been able on this occasion to be present to make it. His right hon. friend was able to repeat what a former Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, had said in this House with regard to the finances of India, and that was that not only were the finances of India in a more satisfactory condition but they were much better administered than the finances of this country. He rejoiced that the right hon. Gentleman had been able to congratulate the House on the speedy termination of the military operations on the frontiers and upon the subsidence of the plague, although he thought the epithet of appalling which the hon. Gentleman had used with regard to the mortality might have been reserved for the deaths from the far greater scourge of malaria. By making a hasty calculation on the spur of the moment, he made out that the mortality from plague had fallen from one-third of 1 per cent. last year to one-thirtieth of 1 per cent. this year, and that it was about one-sixtieth of the mortality from malaria. He advised his right hon. friend not to be in too great a hurry to accept the assurance of the Chinese Government as to the opium traffic, because similar assurances had been given at any time during these twenty-five years, and although everybody would like to see the opium traffic done away with, no one would wish to see it simply transferred from the Indian ryot to the Chinese cultivator, to the detriment of the former, who would have to pay the bill. He confessed he was glad the accident of the ballot had laid upon him the duty of moving this Amendment, because, while he thought there should be no division in this House on any Indian subject, if an Amendment was to be moved, it was well that it should proceed from one who at any rate endeavoured to represent the views of the peoples of India and of his fellow countrymen in India, and who did not mistake the voice of one class, of one people, of one part, of one province, for the voice of the multitudes which inhabit our Indian Empire. It was in exact accordance with his view of the absolute necessity of maintaining the salutary rule that India was outside party politics that this

Motion would, he hoped, be seconded by the hon. Baronet the Member for West Edinburgh, who himself had had no little experience of, and no small reputation in, Indian administration. A terrible responsibility attached to those who dragged India into party strife, which should be confined strictly to our domestic affairs. He must begin by reminding the House that there was no such country as India, and there was no such people as the Indians, and it was no more correct to talk of the people of India than it would be to talk of the people of Europe. Nor, in spite of a general similarity in the standards of administration in India, resulting from British supremacy, was there any more resemblance between different races in India than between different races in Europe. These simple, elementary facts were industriously concealed from the people of Britain by the propagandist agitators of the English branch of the Indian Congress, which maintained in England a newspaper, little known in this country, but a very active agent in the dissemination throughout the vernacular Press in India of everything which could possibly, by any ingenuity, be twisted to the disadvantage of the British administration. It also contained much original news and only the readers of Mr. Cotton's paper realised that the Secretary of State and the hon. Member for Nottingham only differed as one star differeth from another star in glory. These considerations were vital to the true estimation of the reforms now under consideration, and it was feared that, elementary as they were, they were little appreciated in this country. There were, of course, bodies in existence which enlightened, or affected to enlighten, folks at home on Indian affairs. There was, for instance, the so-called Indian Parliamentary Committee. Anyone who said he was interested in India could belong to this body, there was no subscription, and, as there were nearly 200 Members of Parliament on its list, it might appear to be an association of great weight. As a matter of fact, its meetings were generally attended by only a few extreme politicians of the Congress party, and one or two Labour Members, though in the present Parliament two or three had usually been gathered together of a different faith, so that the proceedings of the Camarilla had never been able to claim the lofty attribute of unanimity. Half-a-dozen members attended the meeting held for the purpose of deciding upon a subject for the ballot on this debate. The result of their deliberations was found in the Motions on the Paper which stood in the names of the hon. Members for Brentford and Merthyr Tydvil.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE: That is not so.

*MR. REES said it was the same in spirit. It was sufficient to say that it was hardly imaginable that anything more unpalatable to the peoples of India—who had one, and perhaps only one, thing in common, namely, strong caste distinctions—could be conceived than a Resolution that: "The people of all grades should be associated with the Government of the country." As the hon. Member for East Nottingham truly remarked in a book called "New India"—

> "The basis of internal order in India is a patrician aristocracy of indigenous growth, trained to control and lead the lower orders."

This undemocratic expression was, of course, that of the hon. Member. The one thing they did know about the Indian masses was that they were conservative to the core, and that caste had always prevented the fusion of races into nations. The hon. Member for Brentford was one of a little band who spent in India the fateful period of three weeks, to which some peculiar significance appeared to attach. It was the chosen length for honeymoons, and, if popular novelists might be believed, for experiences in which the staider pleasures of the honeymoon were anticipated. It was therefore a period which seemed expressly suited for a delirious political debauch. However, it was pretty clear that the hon. Member for Brentford should be exempted from the charge of taking his own Amendment seriously. He made it obvious from a speech he delivered earlier in the session that instead of joining the ranks of the peripatetic politicians, who out of the profundity of unacquaintance criticised an administration which they had had no opportunity of understanding, his intention was to give the cause of law and order that peculiarly subtle and effective form of support which consisted of making a transparently unsustainable attack upon an institution the merits of which it was desired to bring out into stronger relief. His own Motion expressed appreciation of the reforms now under the consideration of the Government of India, but called for further reform in the educational system ot that Empire. One reform which the Government of India should adopt was that of making known elementary facts regarding itself in these islands inside and outside the House of Commons. Only those who had been engaged in that difficult, thankless, and unappreciated task had the faintest conception of the extent to which the minds of the people of this country had been poisoned against their fellow-countrymen in India. True, agitators had been busily occupied, but were we not to blame for ignoring the fact that it was not enough to make our rule good, but that we must make those subjected to it and those responsible for it alike feel that it was good? In the Old Kent Road it was an article of faith that the British Indian official starved the Indians, and no one could be surprised that this should be so when hon. Members of this House asked questions, the underlying suggestions of which were that the British Army in India made away with the wounded and ignored flags of truce, and that the Government invented plague, oppressed innocent journalists, strained the law in favour of Europeans and against the natives, indulged in wanton warfare on the frontier, and outraged administrative decency in all directions. It was, of course, true that any Government was fair game in the House of Commons, including apparently the Governments of friendly and independent Powers, but it was not true that the results of those attacks, proceeding from those who did, and from those who did not, know better, were otherwise than deplorable and disastrous. It was the effect in India they had to consider. The Government of India and the India Office should organise, or should encourage the organisation of, the refutation of the calumnies sown broadcast against our administration. What could an audience think when a gentleman, who was entrusted with the charge of a province, a small one it was true, but still a province, informed them that: "The attitude of the English towards the Indians was harsh, and that justice between man and man in India was far from being fairly administered," and concealed the fact of which they were of course entirely unaware, that, with rare exceptions, justice in India was administered to natives by natives? What opinion could such an audience form of the elementary features of our rule in the East when the same gentleman informed it that "coloured races became demoralised when white people came into contact with them," and concealed the fact that he himself continued to take part in what he now regarded as organised oppression, until he had exhausted all possibilities of further promotion? What a lesson in race solidarity, in discipline and good feeling, was afforded by communications from a retired Civil servant, now a Member of that House, to a leading Bengal agitator, who had been dismissed for misconduct from the same Civil Service, urging him to keep on agitating till the Secretary of State yielded in regard to the so-called partition of Bengal—a province five times the size of Scotland, with twice the population of the United Kingdom! What was to be said of the elementary ethics of politics when an ex-Chief Commissioner was quoted in the Press as saying: "We have bred a gang of seditious youths, who have been goaded into bomb-throwing by the infliction of floggings for political offences," and never repudiated those words though it was known that no youths had been so treated? What vain and mischievous aspirations were not encouraged when a Member of Parliament, who was the Leader of of a Party, the hon. Member for Merthyr, before proceeding to India announced that—

> "We hold down the natives in the bondage of subjection, and I may be able to let a light in on the dark places of Indian Government."

Had he known anything of the men he was addressing, he would have realised that a less broad hint would have been all sufficient. He had also said—

> "He would have but a short time, but with the aid of friends he hoped to turn it to good account."

He was determined to dot the i's and cross the t's; and so was led about Bengal with a garland around his neck, a sacrifice at the altar of privilege, wholly unaware, for he was necessarily tongue-tied and blind-folded, that he saw nothing and heard nothing but the case of the classes, the upper classes of Bengal, who were of a very different mind from the masses of the inhabitants of that province. There was, of course, one great difference between the Socialist and Labour "friends of India," and the retired official "friends of India" who "had returned and considered all the oppressions that were done under the sun, and beheld the tears of such as were oppressed and had no comforter, while on the side of their oppressors was power." The one set of "friends" knew what it was doing, and the other probably did not. It was astonishing, however, that their Socialist allies did not ask the ex-Indian officials why they continued so long to be parties to an oppression, the iniquities of which dawned upon them with their retirement. For his part he said it was an abuse on the part of ex-officials to use a mandate obtained from the electorate upon domestic issues for the purpose of vilifying the Government in the service of which they passed their lives, and from which they drew a pension. Some hon. Members without going to India absorbed the spirit of the East with more or less completeness. The hon. Member for East Leeds, for instance, who took an active part in the discussion of Indian questions, had studied the doctrine of reincarnation, and he now knew that his fellow-countrymen though born good like himself, though continuing to be virtuous like himself till they proceeded to the East for their life's work, no sooner arrived in India than they were born again bad, and continued to get worse, till the day of their death. Could it indeed be necessary for our Government in India to pay three-fourths of the cost of the education of every graduate, when this class possessed such supreme political talent as to persuade the Socialists of England that liberty, equality, and fraternity were invented by the Brahmins of Bengal and Poona, and that landlords, lawyers, and journalists, who would like to govern the lower castes and classes without our impartial supervision, occupied the same position in Bengal as the Labour Members of Parliament occupied in England? Surely to the reforms now under consideraton by the Government of India should be added some provision for the systematic refutation of the monumental misrepresentation of which it was itself the apparently helpless and heedless subject. The present was not the occasion for any survey of the history of education in India, but it might be remarked that Oriental ideas on this subject had no resemblance whatever to those which obtained in Great Britain, and in the advanced countries of Europe. Under the Hindus higher instruction was strictly confined to the upper castes and classes, and under the Mahomedans was inseparably connected with mosques and shrines. Early in the nineteenth century, when a knowledge of English became a marketable acquirement, missionaries and philanthropists brought pressure to bear on the Government of India in favour of popular education. Two parties arose, those who contended that the knowledge and science of the Western world should be conveyed to the natives by means of English, and those who held that the vernacular education should be supplemented by the study of the classical languages of the East. The Anglicists won, under the leadership of Lord Macaulay, who so little knew what he was doing that he prophesied that as a result of the adoption of his system there would not be a single idolater —the word, of course, was Macaulay's— among the respectable classes in Bengal after a lapse of thirty years. There were others however who did know what they were doing. Sir Thomas Munro regarded—

> "An unrestricted Press in India as incompatible with the character of British rule."

Lord William Bentinck thought it

> "Essential that the Indian Press should be kept under the most rigid control."

Sir John Malcolm wrote—

> "The Brahmins and civil classes have for ages been the nominal servants and the real masters of the turbulent, bold, and superstitious military tribes, and when we consider what they have lost by the introduction and extension of our dominion, it would be folly to expect that they should not wish to subvert it. We could give to the Brahmins and others of the instructed classes no weapon which they would know better how to use against us than a free Press, which they would use to corrupt out native soldiery."

Macolm knew, Macaulay theorised. He would not willingly raise any subject relating to India to which a party character might be given in the House, but since it was hopeless to expect the self-styled friends of India, the representatives of the classes to whom Malcolm referred, wholly to abstain from dealing with subjects which almost exclusively engaged the attention of the particular organisation they represented, he had put down an Amendment, which would not exclude speeches upon such subjects, but under cover of which at any rate the frontier policy of Afghanistan would be left alone. Enough, and more than enough, had been said on this subject during the last of a course of lectures, which was being delivered by a noble Lord from Ireland in another place, and he sincerely hoped, for his part, that that matter would be left where the noble Viscount, the Secretary of State, left it in that House. Among the many vernacular papers which reached him weekly, in one of the Congress organs it was written—

> "No Minister ever held a stronger position than Mr. Morley holds to-day. He is for the moment more powerful than the most despotic monarch. His methods of administration receive the support alike of Liberal and Conservative Members."

That was the case, and he deeply regretted that the Amendments on the Paper, with two or three exceptions, and the speeches made in support of them, would be published broadcast in the vernacular Press, and would tend to, and would be intended to, obscure and conceal what was the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

The reforms which the Government of India had proposed, and Lord Morley had approved, were now under consideration in India, not only by the Government but by an infinite number of other official and non-official, private and public, associations and individuals. They were well calculated not only to broaden the basis upon which our rule rested, but to enlist the sympathies of the agricultural element, and of the aristocracy of the country, to which all classes were passionately attached, except that which consisted of agitators and anarchists. It was also necessary in a country needing capital above all things to enlist the sympathies of the capitalist. The hon. Member for East Nottingham wrote in "New India"—

> "The lower orders stand in urgent need of an aristocracy above them. The prosperity of every country requires that there should exist within it, not only a proletariat, the great body of the people who devote themselves to labour, but also a class of capitalists, which provides the funds which enable labour to become productive. It is only under the fertilising influence of capital that labour is productive."

He wondered what the hon. Member for Leicester and his friends thought of that, they who regarded capital as "the enemy." The alliance in that House of Gentlemen holding these views with the Labour and Socialist Party was almost as strange as the tie between the representatives of the classes in India and the representatives of the masses in Britain, and both connections showed that agitation, like misery, "acquaints a man with strange bed-fellows." The nature of these proposed reforms had been fully explained in that House, Reports upon them from India had not yet been received, and it did not seem necessary on the present occasion to do more than point out that when any measures such as these, indeed when any legislative measures were under consideration, representatives of every possible class were consulted, and their opinions were carefully weighed. The suggestion that legislation was the outcome of the mere fiat of what the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean would call "a white oligarchy" was entirely unjustified, and the real cause of offence in the minds of the Babus was that others were taken into the confidence of the Government, besides lawyers, journalists and the like classes, who enjoyed such undue influence that the people had commenced to call our rule by the contemptuous name of the pleaders' paradise, or the lawyers' kingdom. There should be plain speaking in and out of Parliament as regarded the so-called moderate and extreme parties in the Congress. Both were now committed directly or indirectly, openly or secretly, to an endeavour to terminate our rule in India. The Congress had shifted its ground, and our educational system should distinguish between friends and foes. Still the Congress was nowhere more strongly denounced and ridiculed than in Bengal journals like the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* and the *Telegraph*, and it found complete acceptance nowhere but in certain circles in England. The so-called moderate agitators, Mr. Gokhale and Mr. Dutt, were now rated by the Socialist Mr. Hyndman for facing both ways. The latter authority fairly said that he had heard Mr. Gokhale in the East End of London deliver a speech as vehement and anti-British as any article in the vernacular Press, and he added that these two gentlemen were extremely anxious to prove to the British public that their cherished private views, which they kept diplomatically to themselves for the present, were held only by a contemptible minority in India, and that organised sedition did not exist. But at the so-called "India House" at Highgate, the whole company, moderate and extremist, cheered the sentiment "loyalty to England means treachery to India." Mr. Gokhale said—

> "We are shut out of all posts of trust and confidence."

Yet Mr. Gokhale well knew there was no single office in Bengal except the lieutenant-governorship, which had not been, and might not again be filled by natives, and his friend Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal more candidly and truthfully said—

> "We govern India now. What use then have we for the English?"

None. It was the British Army they wanted. Babu rule protected by British bayonets, and paid for by British taxpayers. What a truly democratic ideal! One respect in which the reforms under consideration were defective was that they did not provide for a Press law. No measure was so necessary as a Press law such as existed in India in the days of Lord Lytton, and was repealed by Lord Ripon, with the help of so good a Liberal as Lord Cromer, who had since repented, recanted, and expressed his conviction that an unbridled and licentious Press was incompatible with the safety of our rule. To turn from these reforms to education; after 1854 Departments of Public Instruction, Universities, and Training Colleges were introduced into India, Elementary vernacular schools were multiplied, and the system of grants-in-aid was adopted, which was not altered in essentials by the Commission of 1882, and survived to the present day. At the last Census, ninety-eight in 1,000 males and seven in 1,000 females, were able to read and write. Those who compared our Oriental Empire with an English parish might comment upon the small proportion of educated people, but those to whom was vouchsafed the knowledge that the whole world could not be judged by British standards, and managed on British lines, would contrast the educational conditions of our Indian Empire with those of other parts of Asia, whether or not under European rule, and would realise how great was the work which had been done. Even in the Indian peninsula where the peace enforced by the British had enabled Native States to pursue the path of education, the figures were, with some conspicuous exceptions, not nearly so satisfactory as in British territory. The statistics incidentally exposed the falsity of the claim of the 1,000,000 who could speak English to represent the 299,000,000 who could not. It was found by the Indian Universities Commission that the acquirements of Indian graduates were to a great extent inadequate and superficial, and that they lived during their University course in lodgings with admittedly unsatisfactory results. We had since learnt how the shortcomings of this system made these youths, thus gathered together without control or cohesion, the easy prey of the agitator, and the Government of India had been driven in self-defence to take steps to enforce discipline amongst the student class, ever "*cereus in vitium flecti.*" The hostel system, a rough approximation to the boarding houses of our public schools, or rather to the licensed lodging-houses of our Universities, was now encouraged, but it was clear that further steps were necessary before the students at Indian Universities would be efficiently protected from being debauched by agitators, who led them along the same path which had caused students in Russia to be a thorn in the side of their Government, and too often a disgrace to their country. There were, of course, chiefs' colleges, technical, industrial, arts, engineering, medical, agricultural, veterinary, and normal colleges and schools. Everything was represented in the complex educational system of India, but as the State maintained a position of strict religious neutrality, no religious instruction whatever was given in Government schools, while private institutions, provided that their secular instruction was satisfactory, might teach any religion whatsoever wholly unchecked. In 1888 the important question of moral training was considered, and suitable text books, physical training, and sports were recommended as an antidote to the want of reverence, of respect, and of religious obedience, which were promoted by merely secular education. Efforts were made to prescribe the selection of suitable text books, but the great evils existing were hardly scotched, certainly not killed. Our education continued to be altogether too literary in character for men who had to make their own living. The East India Railway, by taking young natives of India into their carriage and wagon works for training as mechanics, did more good than many colleges. Lord Curzon, who was always ready to grasp the nettle, and from the very comprehensive and hostile criticisms upon whom so often made in that House he wholly dissociated himself, well knowing the cost, dared to uphold the cause of the vernacular languages, the sole resource of all but a small minority, which were generally neglected in the pursuit of the more marketable English. More, he encouraged primary education, for which the class who were now so closely associated with hon. Members on the Labour benches, had no use, in which they took no interest, and expenditure upon which they denounced. He introduced important reforms into the training colleges, and into primary and industrial schools, and in encouraging the Universities to control the instruction given in colleges and to keep up the standards he became the subject of obloquy and hatred to those interested in institutions, whose object it was to turn out the largest number of graduates without regard to the standard which they attained. The weaker colleges were at once the preserve of the Babu class, and the breeding ground of anarchists and agitators. Lord Curzon having given power to the Universities to set their house in order, and to stiffen the standards to something approaching a passable pitch, committees of Universities now perambulated the country for the purpose of inspecting the colleges and of discovering which was not very difficult, their weak points. It was, however, certain that the standards in these institutions needed to be still further raised. But, after all, the chief of the many and great defects of our educational system was that it did not provide, and could not provide, any kind of religious teaching, and thus tended inevitably to destroy the respect for authority which was naturally inherent in the Hindu mind. That which young Oxford or Cambridge read and rightly regarded as the mere opinion of the individual writer, young India took as dogma, or, as they said, as a "Shasanam, which came down from Heaven." A seditious print, known as the *Indian Sociologist*, which in this refuge for conspirators had so far, to his great regret, escaped the attention of the public prosecutor, gave at the head of each issue a text from Mr. Herbert Spencer—

> "Every man is free to do that which he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man. Resistance to aggression is not simply justifiable but imperative. Non-resistance hurts both altruism and egoism."

This was the kind of pernicious stuff upon which young India fastened and fed. It was true the Government could not teach religion in its schools, but it could encourage, and should encourage, what we would in this country for want of a suitable expression describe as "denominational" institutions. The peoples of India themselves realised that education without religion was dead sea fruit. Proofs of their faith in this behalf were found in the existence of the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College at Alighur, the Central Hindu College at Benares, the Khalsa College of the Sikhs, and the Arya Vedic and Islamic Colleges of the Punjab. It was, of course, impossible now to put the clock back, and in respect of higher education, at any rate, to exalt the Orientalists above the Anglicists. But they should build upon existing lines and follow indigenous leads. Indeed this would be good policy even apart from the crying needs of the educational system. The radical fault of these colleges, namely the absence of moral teaching, and of the inculcation of standards of duty, was not present in institutions of indigenous growth, nor did they find them hurling Mr. Spencer's precious dogmas to the hungry student, or Burke's Speeches on American Independence, or Mill's "Liberty" without Stephen's crushing rejoinder, nor did they deal in philosophy of a class which, of doubtful advantage on the banks of the Cam and the Isis, was downright mischievous on the margin of the Ganges. The Government should also have greater control over the text books which Universities now prescribed for colleges, and for the upper classes in secondary schools. The text books of history might with advantage be amended so as to shew that the small armies which won India were always supported by a great Navy, and that England's position in this respect was till now at any rate unimpaired. They might also teach the elementary truth that everywhere representative institutions originated in the extension of aristocratic and oligarchic privileges, and that this stage had necessarily to be passed, and that to ignore experience and to force the pace was to place power in the hands of classes full of prejudice against the poorer and the lower castes and classes, who were freely credited with ideas of which they never dreamt, and with a desire for that of which they never heard. India, governed according to native ideas, was the India of the rule of caste, birth, wealth, and strength. Some competent authorities thought more good could be done by rewarding good colleges for taking proper care of moral training, physical fitness, coporate life and true traditions. By these means the competition in such respects would be set up amongst the pick of the colleges. It would be easy to reward them by choosing from the best the fortunate graduates to whom the Government appointments were given, now that the craze for competitive examination had happily given way to a more true appreciation of its worth. It was indeed all-important that Indian students should be placed under proper supervision, and since they were generally out-boarders, that some such system as the Bishop of Hereford, when headmaster, introduced into Clifton, should be established, and the tutors should have information regarding the *status*, antecedents, and character of their students, who now paraded Bande Mataram badges in school and college classes. Grants to aided colleges should not be given in cases where false concocted history was taught, for it was madness to subsidise institutions which aimed at the overthrow of British rule. These grants-in-aid, moreover, should be distributed so that different classes of the community might benefit, and most of the money should not go as it now did to managers, who confined instruction to one caste. Similarly, in our Government colleges and high schools the limited space should be allotted to representatives of all classes. Everyone must sympathise with a master in preferring to teach the high-bred, handsome, and intensely intelligent Brahmin youths, but it was their business to see that other classes got their share. It would not do to be democratic at home, and more aristocratic than the aristocrats abroad. Nothing indeed was so important as primary education, so needful for the masses, so unpopular with the classes, and a larger proportion of the total expenditure on education should be devoted to this head, and the numbers of inspectors of this class of schools increased. Seeing the importance moreover of the character of their public servants, and of the atmosphere in which they were brought up, it would be well that there should be a Government college on the same lines *mutatis mutandis* as the old Haileybury, with residential quarters attached, in which selected candidates for the Government service should spend a year or two, undergoing special training at the hands of a good European staff. Not the least important among the reforms

Government could, and should, effect was insistence upon a far higher standard of colloquial knowledge of the languages on the part of district officers. The Babu class spoke perfect English, the English official could not without an effort find non-English speaking natives with whom to talk, and his immediate subordinates would isolate him in his own district unless he persisted and insisted on breaking free from his bonds. It was not necessarily in his interests or in those of the people for whose welfare he was responsible, that his Babus made themselves the sole medium of communication. As Sir James La Touche, ex-Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces, lately said, the less advanced, or the less English-speaking, the population, the better and the closer to the people was the administration. He might also quote the Superintendent of Municipal Schools in Bombay, an Indian gentleman, who said—

> "The Indian graduate does not command much influence among the masses of his countrymen and does not represent them,"

though he was himself far from thinking this class a negligible quantity; his opinion, indeed, was of the contrary description. It would be evident from these suggestions, that he concurred with the views expressed by all the provincial governments after consulting the best authorities, official and non-official, throughout the country, to the effect that it would be a great mistake to abolish the fees charged in Government primary schools, and to pay in respect of private schools of the same class a subvention equal in amount to the abolished fees. Primary education could be helped by multiplying primary schools, not by making those existing free. The amount of money available was necessarily limited, and it should be devoted if possible to providing a primary school in every village. He did not know that there was, so far, even in the craze for the introduction of impossible institutions into India, a serious intention to try compulsory education. Nor was there any apparent reason why the Government should pay three-quarters of the cost of a graduate's education, or why graduates should be turned out from Government Colleges at a paltry cost of £6 and £3 a year for fees in first and second grade colleges respectively. The proposal to initiate a class of indigenous institutions, which for want of a suitable adjective he had described as denominational, might meet with some objection from the more narrow-minded members of the school which thought the British Indian Empire should be treated like an English parish, and regarded British methods of administration as suitable alike to the New Hebrides and the Old Hebrides, to New and to Old South Wales, to the North, South, East and West of the round world; but there were signs that the missionaries at any rate had passed this stage, and saw that the destruction of the faiths of the people, and the manufacture of faithless, discontented, and half-educated graduates, was the ruin and not the salvation of the country. At the Pan-Anglican Congress a bishop was reported to have said that they should not be in such a hurry to convert the people, and destroy their own religions, from which it was evident that great advances in the realm of reason and tolerance had been made since the days in which the Government of India was forced against its better judgment, by the Government at home at the pressure of public opinion, to divest itself of religious endowments, which had been administered by its predecessors in India, and which had subsequently been mal-administered by private bodies, to the annoyance and indignation of the communities concerned. Unfortunately those who loved English education best hated the English most, and the Government evoked a spirit that they did not even attempt to control or direct. They took the educated Indian away from pundit and priest, freed him from authority, his god for thousands of generations, and then left him to wallow amongst Anarchists, Nihilists, sedition-mongers and the like company, until he found his own, and too often a very low, level. Not only might the steps suggested in respect of education be taken with advantage, but in this and in other respects the Government should renounce the policy of alienating friends in a vain effort to conciliate enemies. This was habitually carried to such an extent as to endanger the good relations so essential between the Government and the

European population, official and non-official, such as planters and merchants, who were most valuable allies of the administration, and a very present help in time of trouble. Two men and a boy, or rather two boys and a man in Bengal or Madras, calling themselves by the great name of a Mahajana Sabah or an Indian Association would count for more than 230 loyal English planters, who expressed their views pretty freely when gathered together, but never agitated, and were always true to their salt. It was within the power of the Government of India, as it was within the power of no other body, to give object lessons by rewarding loyalty, so that never again should the saying be current, as it was now and long had been in India, that loyalty did not pay, and that its recognition was deprecated as likely to offend those of another school. Every Viceroy in turn thought it had been left for him to conciliate the babus and agitators, and each one in turn left India a sadder and a wiser man. The natives did not understand a power which was not manifested, and a ruler who stooped to expostulation, extenuation, and explanation, as far as they were concerned, had already abdicated. It was widely held amongst Indian princes, who were undoubtedly loyal to British rule, that even the reforms now under consideration had better have been withheld until the agitators had desisted from inciting their dupes to bomb-throwing and the like outrages. But if the reforms were in themselves good, they were twice good if quickly given, and being what they were he for one would give them at once. Certainly they went as far as was wise at a time when those who demanded reform on behalf of the peoples of India, which they could not prove they represented, continued to denounce British rule, and to palliate if not to applaud the murderous outrages committed by half-educated youths, who were their dupes and their supporters. Whether further advances would be necessary, and at what time, could under present circumstances only be the subject of sterile speculation. It was, however, folly to ignore the fact that the system of election was unpleasing to the people of India, and that men of good class would not submit themselves to the votes of all and sundry, by no means believing that one man was as good as another. Representation in India meant the due recognition of the principle of aristocracy. Happily it was far from being the truth that educated Indians as such were unfriendly to the British, or that the Brahmins, the hereditary and inevitable leaders of the non-Mahomedan people of India, were generally opposed to British rule, but it was the case that only those who had been educated in Western fashion were hostile to our Government, and it was the fact that this movement, like all others, was led by the Brahmins who predominated among, and who dominated, the English-educated class. The Mahomedans, of course, were on a different footing. They were united, had one religion and no caste, and so counted far and away beyond their numbers. Strong control should be kept over the Brahmin directors of schools and colleges, for they inevitably favoured their own caste, no doubt incomparably the best scholars, and cut out other classes, which had at least an equal claim on the administration. Another necessary measure was to train princes so that they should love to stay amongst their own people, instead of living their lives in Europe, the more fitted to which they became, the less suited they were to do their duty in that state of life to which they were called. Nor was it possible to omit the necessity for the establishment of some measures of control over Indians at Oxford and Cambridge, where little hot-beds of sedition were established such as flourished unchecked in London, with the inevitable newspaper to spread the poison abroad. It was almost incredible that meetings should be held without objection in Hampstead "in commemoration of the glorious Mutiny," and that a grossly seditious newspaper forbidden ingress into India should be published without let or hindrance in London. The present Government which had appointed many Commissions might be urged to appoint one more, to report on the political effects of our system of education, and to suggest remedies for its many and great defects. Surely our sanity would be seriously questioned if we went on manufacturing half-educated enemies. It became all true friends of India to acknowledge the great advances made already in the appointments of educationists eminent in British India and in native States, Mr. Theodore Morison and Mr. Syed Hussein Bilgrami to the Council at the India office, but such radical reform as was needed would never be effected unless upon the strong Report of a strong Commission, none of whose members had alternately praised and blamed the British Government according as either attitude suited their present plans. There was, indeed, need for reform, and without giving way to alarm, for which as yet there was no occasion, we should do well to remember that—

> "The same arts that did gain
> A power, must it maintain."

He begged to move.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) in seconding the Amendment, said he did not claim the knowledge of India which was possessed by the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs. He did not arrogate to himself that he had mastered all the problems of Indian government, although he had paid a short visit to our Eastern Empire, but he knew something of those problems from long and intimate correspondence with people who were acquainted with the conditions and circumstances of India. He did not mean to dwell at length on the polemical aspects of this question, which were discussed by the mover of the Amendment in the first part of his speech. On that side of the House they felt that the whole country was inbebted to the Secretary of State for India for having maintained, in spite of temptation to the contrary from many of the extreme Members of his own Party, that attitude which perhaps had saved India from a great calamity. He felt, however, that he could not assent even to the earlier part of the Amendment if it obliged them, quickly and without careful consideration, to carry out even moderate reforms if those reforms were to be given as concessions to violence, conspiracy, or assassination. There was a danger that that interpretation might be placed upon concessions by a large section of people in India, and that made one hesitate to adopt without careful reservation the earlier part of the Amendment. There was another consideration which it would be well not to leave out of account. There were as many natives of India who were liable to be alarmed by reforms too easily conceded as there were within our own country. He had talked over and over again with natives who were more ready to see the evils involved in undue concessions than even he himself was. Let the House remember that all India did not consist of Babus and their representatives. There were vast numbers whose loyalty was not a mere negative quantity, or not a quantity which could be calculated upon indefinitely. They had constantly supported us in the face of constant discouragement. There was nothing that struck one more in travelling about certain parts of India than the fact that many of the native races were alarmed lest the landmarks of their country and the traditions, habits, and customs to which they were profoundly attached might be impaired, if not entirely abolished, by these political reforms. Some members of the Indian population who were most articulate had learned the methods of Western politics, and the tricks by which a small party was made to appear a large one; but they did not alter the profoundly conservative views of many of our best friends amongst the native races. His chief object in seconding the Amendment was to refer to the question in which he was specially interested, namely, educational reform in India. He did not think that in Indian official circles any opinion was more prevalent or more universal than that a reform in education was imperatively required. To a great extent he attributed this not to a lack of enthusiasm on our part, not to the backwardness of any authority in India, not to any desire to crush out the intelligence of the native races, and so make them more subservient. Such a figment of the imagination did not exist among the responsible rulers of India, but he thought that much of our educational machinery in India for the last fifty years had been mistaken, and that many of the mistakes still existed. They were too ready originally to adopt the latest fads and ideas and the freshest contrivances, believing that they would last to the end of time, and to plant them wholesale upon India. Competitive examinations and the pursuit of University degrees gave them the idea that a University was only a place for conferring degrees. That was the last possible attribute which he should like to attach to a University, and for his part he would not be sorry to see an M.A. degree conferred on every child six weeks old, so that they might be done with the superstition that degree granting was the only function of a University. That idea had impressed itself on the people of India. We forgot that while Indians adopted our habits, they did not move forward with the quickness and readiness which we did in the matter of reforms. They had got embedded in their minds that book-learning and competitive examinations were the be all and the end all of everything. That idea exercised a thraldom over the mind of the native which it never attained with us. Even in our wildest vagaries it had never obtained here. We forgot also that we had made mistakes before, and that we might be making mistakes now. The hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs had spoken of the opinion that there should be free and compulsory education as one held by none but a few extremists. That was not his own experience. That was not only an idea indulged in by a few extremists. He had repeatedly heard those who professed to be leaders of the Reform Party in Bengal express their adherence to that idea. He thought there was nothing more mad than the fiction that free and compulsory education in India would advance education there, because such a system had been introduced in this country a few years ago. It was mere midsummer madness. It was all very well for the Babu to urge that such a system should be adopted, but did they think that the agriculturists of the Punjab would accept compulsory education? The other day when talking to a leading Indian Gentleman he asked whether, in his opinion, compulsory education would prove altogether acceptable to the native agriculturists. "Oh, yes," he said, "they would have to accept it whether they liked it or not." But who would be responsible for enforcing it? The burden would lie on the much-abused English official. He did not think his hon. friend the Member for Nottingham would be ready to face the music in connection with the difficulty of making education compulsory to the millions of agriculturists in India. We had sometimes forgotten the multitude of races with which we had to deal in India, and how a system of education suitable for one might be entirely unfitted for another. We had introduced a system of education which was predominantly literary which was largely founded on modern philosophy in absolute contrast to all the ideas with which the thought of India had moved for centuries. We had introduced what we called political science, which meant a number of theoretical books upon the constitution, which were understood in Western countries, but which, unfortunately, were almost all of one type. Students read these books in our own Universities, and there was no harm done. They read them as only the expression of one side, and not as axioms. That was not the case in India. The natives read these books as if they were mathematical truths incapable of being controverted, while at the same time they assimilated our ideas and used them for their own objects and in their own ways in political agitation and controversy. There was one special characteristic in which the native races were divergent from the Western. Was it not the case that we were more or less religious on principle, by teaching, by tradition, by one's sense of duty; and, after all, were we not as a nation fundamentally secular in our minds by the force of environment? The absolute opposite was the case with the native races. Some individuals might, if they thought it better in order to affect advanced opinion set aside the predominant religion. He had found among the agitators in Bengal that the old religion of their race was spoken of with a shrug of the shoulders and as if that was a matter for the lower and not the educated classes. But, however that might be, it applied to a very small number of the inhabitants of India. It was not the case with the vast mass of the people, who were, by instinct and not like us by principle, down to the finest fibre of their being, religious. It was the first motive which dominated their lives; and if we attempted to found their moral education on any other basis we were building, so far as the native races were concerned, on sand. They could not understand what was meant by all our Cowper-Temple clauses. They believed in the religion handed down to them for long centuries, which was part of their bone and ran in their blood. They believed in no other. It was all very well for some people to say that we could not adopt any attitude except a neutral one in regard to religion, and to dismiss the subject with that remark. He was inclined to say that that was a piece of cant. Why should we divide ourselves from what was the dominant influence of the lives of these native races if we wished to get hold of them? We should never get at the root of the minds of the natives if in their education morals were divorced from religion. Over and over again leading gentlemen of the great races of India had expressed to him, not only during his short visit to India, but over a long series of years, their dislike of this divorce of religion from their schools. He had no wish, if it were found difficult for the authorities, that these should themselves introduce the teaching of religion in the schools. But let the authorities ally themselves with those who would. Let them have open doors to the teachers of religion. The only alternative was to encourage those private schools, those free schools to which the noble Lord had referred and in regard to which he had read some words paragraph denouncing them as the remnants of a bygone system. He took exactly the opposite view from that taken in the words quoted. It was a lesson even for us at home, where we saw the effect produced by a system which necessarily divorced education from religious teaching. There was another aspect of education to which he wished to refer. By all means let us make our education better. But let us not be subject to a traditional superstition in regard to it. He could assure the House that the superstition did not largely prevail amongst those responsible for educational administration; but the public at large and those who spoke on platforms were far too apt to speak as if education consisted solely of reading, writing, and arithmetic. For himself, the more he had to do with education the more he was inclined to regard that as a small part of it. What he looked to was the more vivifying and fructifying elements. We must make our education for the future more practical, but let us not introduce the jargon of technical education with all its jaw-breaking terms. We had ourselves fallen under a sort of tyranny of that kind. We had various classes of schools—higher grade schools, industrial schools, schools of applied science—till we hardly knew where we were. We forgot the real germ of truth that lay at the bottom of the whole thing—that we must make the pupils in our elementary schools here, as well as in India, understand somehow that what they were being taught had some practical effect on their lives. He was not very anxious, nor did he see that salvation lay that way, to establish a few technical colleges. We knew what that meant. It would just lead to the training of a few men to whom the be-all and end-all of their life was to qualify themselves for some Government appointment. That was one of the banes of India at present. By all means have these technical colleges where they were wanted for special purposes; but we should not imagine that by building up that kind of technical education we were forming anything but the apex of our educational pyramid. We must lay our foundation more widely and deeper down. He would rather aim at a technical education in the elementary schools. We could teach the children of the native races of India first of all the dignity of work. That was a novelty to the Eastern mind. We could teach them in the great agricultural districts, which formed the hardest problem with which we had to deal in India, that nature was not merely a series of antagonistic, hostile, supernatural powers, such as it appeared to the mind in these vast silent territories. We could teach them that it was a force of which they might make an ally, from which they could draw the best of all its resources; that it might become their best helper and co-operator, their familiar associate all their life long. We might try that, and then we should get hold of the practical side of agricultural schools. But, above all, we should not forget the conditions with which we had to deal. We must not attempt to mix together in those schools these different races, a practice so much complained of by those who endeavoured to reach native opinion. We had broadened the schools so much that the parents did not find them a fitting training-place for their children. It must be remembered that we were in India dealing with races profoundly aristocratic, however distasteful that word might be to hon. Members below the gangway. We could not force democratic views upon races which were of that temperament. We could not reach them by breaking their traditions as to the conditions which divided class from class. To attempt to do so would only make the schools unfamiliar places which they only thought of as the first step in that career of artificial training, to be followed up by other weary steps to examination, and finally, to end in divorce from those of their own race. Let them be given, above all, something that would help them out of the official service in their own country districts. Let them be helped to seek the alliance of those who represented the different nations in the country. Let not their educational efforts be associated with the notion that the schools could be framed in accordance with ideas that would be satisfactory to the Nonconformist conscience. Let them be taught above all, that British rule maintained its proudest boast of administering absolute, impartial, unbiassed justice between the different classes, races, and religious convictions that came under our sway. That was the problem we had to face in India, and we could only face it by seeking an alliance with all that was best and most characteristic in the native races.

Amendment proposed,—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, while it recognises that the reforms now under the consideration of the Government of India are suitable and sufficient in respect of questions with which they deal, is of opinion that the educational system in India stands in urgent need of reform.'—(*Mr. Rees,*)—instead thereof."

Sir Henry Craik.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe), congratulated his right hon. friend the Under-Secretary upon his statement, to which the House had listened with much pleasure. As an old political comrade he congratulated him on his appearance at the Table. He was a master of Indian finance, and when a few years ago he was in a position of responsibility on the Royal Commission, he had waged war on behalf of the Indian taxpayer and had come out triumphant. Very satisfactory was the statement, so far as the figures were concerned. The right hon. Gentleman had shown them surpluses year after year, not multiplied as the result of under-estimates, but the result of natural growth of the prosperity of the country. Very pleased he was to hear the statement in reference to opium. Last year the noble Lord the Member for Kensington spoke of the premature action of the Government in regard to opium, and drew a lurid picture of what might happen; but it was gratifying to find that there was reduction in the area under poppy cultivation, and promise of further reduction, in accordance with the "accepted policy" of helping the Chinese Government in efforts to extinguish the opium habit among their people. This was the first time "accepted policy" had appeared in official papers and it marked a great advance. So long as the present Government remained in power those words would stand. The reduction in the salt tax was a measure of humanity for the poor ryot who had suffered much from the high price of salt for many years, and everyone must rejoice that the policy of reduction had been exceedingly successful, owing to increased consumption. He had heard the reference to the Police Commission with great interest. There was hardly any part of the Indian administrative system which required to be more carefully watched and needed more thorough reform. He hoped it would receive very drastic treatment. The Report of the Commission respecting the Indian Police was not very pleasant reading, and he was satisfied that a great deal required to be done to improve the morals of the police in India. Nothing was more important for the welfare of India than the development of railways and irrigation works, and he was delighted to hear his right hon. friend say that he proposed to introduce a Bill for the further advancement of the railway system. The Report of the Committee on Indian railways would well repay hon. Members for its perusal. The first thing they found was that the railway system in India was in a state of chaos. That was the result, one of the many unfortunate results, of what he would term the Curzon *regime.* Lord Curzon thought fit to create a new railway board, which was exactly like the fifth wheel of a coach. The Committee appointed to consider the railway system of India, in a most exhaustive Report, had pointed out how the creation of this new railway board had really denuded the railway system of India of responsibility,and that the state of the whole thing was that of confusion worse confounded. It was to be hoped that the carrying out of their recommendations would put an end to this. He believed that the two things which lay at the root of the prosperity of India were a well developed railway system and irrigation. The Amendment just put from the Chair really embraced two things. In so far as it invited the House to declare that the educational system of India stood in urgent need of reform he was inclined to agree with it; and the system might be remodelled on the lines indicated by the hon. Member, who had just sat down, and directed to the building up of character and training the intelligence for the affairs of life. The present system was too much an attempt to develope the intellectual faculties and did not sufficiently build up character. There was no man more capable of dealing with this subject than the present Secretary of State. When the Resolution declared that the reforms under consideration were suitable and sufficient, he confessed, before he gave his assent to that, he would like to see what the reforms were. Hon. Members who had listened to what had taken place the other day, or who had read the speeches, would realise that there was a grave situation to deal with in India; but that must not deter them from holding fast to the only clue out of the difficulty. Speaking at this time last year, Lord Morley, then Mr. Morley, used these words—

> "Criticism on the attitude of Lord Minto and His Majesty's Government leaves out of account the fact that Lord Minto did not come quite into a haven of serenity and peace."

No one in that Assembly at present knew that so well as he himself did. He had said last year, that the Secretary of State would have been better advised if he had a little more lifted the curtain and taken the public into his confidence, and he was of that opinion still. The Government two years ago found a state of things internally in India which formed a heritage to which few viceroys had succeeded. The reason for that, if anybody wanted to know it, he would find by going into the library and reading the speech of Lord Curzon, made in the House of Lords, the other day. He who read it would see the spirit out of which these difficulties arose. Mr. Morley went on to say—

> "Our policy was to compose the unexampled conditions of the controversy and confusion by which we were faced."

A situation had been created which required very grave and patient handling, and the country owed a great deal to the firmness, patience, and sympathy of Lord Morley when he went to the India Office. He did not put himself into the hands of the chief officials as other Liberals had sometimes done when they went to the India Office. That was all he thought that he need say. The situation was grave. It called for a very cool head, a firm and even temper, but, above all, a courageous adherence to the principles of reform. He had read with the greatest delight these words of Lord Minto—

> "No anarchical crime will deter me from endeavouring to meet as best I can the political aspirations of honest reformers."

That was very fine language for a man in his position, for they knew what it was for a Governor-General in Simla and in Calcutta to say those words before those by whom he was surrounded. Lord Minto might fairly be compared for coolness of head, tenacity of purpose and warm sympathies with a great people, to his great predecessor who, to his immortal honour, earned the sobriquet of "Clemency Canning." To a certain extent this discussion on reforms was a little premature that evening. In order to obtain full information they wanted the Report of the Hobhouse Commission, and the views both of the Government of India and the India Office. He earnestly hoped that the Report would be circulated during the autumn session, and that they would then be afforded an opportunity of going into the whole matter thoroughly. It had always seemed to him of far more importance that the head of the ship should be turned in the right direction than that the speed at which it travelled should be high. It had been turned in a very different direction directly Lord Morley took his present position on 11th December, 1905. They knew Lord Morley's mind; he was sure that neither he nor his efficient Under-Secretary would swerve in any shape or degree with reference to the direction in which the ship should continue to be directed. That being so, he was certain they might rely on the earnest and whole-hearted support of the House and the country.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said he had listened with some satisfaction to the speech of the Under-Secretary for India. The surplus which he had been able to declare in connection with the Budget indicated that so far as the financal state of the Government of India was concerned all appeared to be well. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the military expenditure as one of the items which had been growing in India, and it was only a very modified hope that he had held out that it would be reduced. During the last eight years the military expenditure accounted for in the Indian Budget had gone up from just over £14,000,000 to £20,750,000—an increase of £6,500,000 during that period. That in itself was a very serious item, and, if he might be allowed to express an opinion, not a little of the growing unrest in India was due to the growth of the spirit of militarism, as represented in the Budget by the growing expenditure on the Army. But there was one item which the Under-Secretary had not referred to, and which was not dealt with in these accounts, but was one on which the right hon. Gentleman was perhaps able to give them some information. Each native state of India incurred a not inconsiderable yearly expenditure for Imperial purposes. There was what was called the Military Transport Corps maintained exclusively out of native state funds for the exclusive use of the Imperial Government. In addition there were the Imperial Lancers, maintained by the native states in the same way and for the same purpose. He had had an opportunity of learning that this new form of impost was resented very strongly in at least some of the most progressive native states. It had its origin — this was his information — in a good-natured offer on behalf of one of the native rulers at a time when there was threatened trouble with Russia, and what was then a voluntary offer of help on his part to the Imperial Government had become practically a compulsory charge on those native states for all time to come. It hampered these native states seriously in many directions; and he would express the hope that now that the menace, or alleged menace from Russia, which had been used up to the present in regard to the safety of India had been removed, this impost upon the native states of India would shortly be dispensed with. Then in regard to education. It was a great satisfaction, he was sure, to everyone to find that the expenditure upon education this year or in the year coming was shown by the Budget to have increased. The increase however was far from being sufficient to meet the requirements of the case. The most that could be said for it was that it was a step in the right direction. The educational needs of India were very great, and what was further, the desire for education was very great among the Indian ryots. One of the sights which he never failed to see when he was visiting the villages away from the big towns, was the local village school, and it was most gratifying to him to find that, although the parents of the children were charged fees which, considering their position, were considerable, yet those fees were paid cheerfully. The children would go four or five miles in a morning to attend school. And there were some cases in which the village schoolmaster out of his fifteen rupees monthly salary would pay the fees of children whose parents were too poor to pay them themselves, in order to enable the children to get the advantages of the education afforded. Under these circumstances he thought that the Government would do well to be a little more generous in its expenditure upon education and educational requirements. He would not enter upon the question of the quality of the education given, further than to say that he agreed *in toto* with the criticisms which had been offered as to its exclusively literary character. That criticism, by the way, applied to our own country as well as to India. Unquestionably there was a greater need in India for a more all-round education than was at present given. One of the very pathetic sides of India was to be seen in its decaying hand industries. With a little encouragement from the Government, and with a little stimulus to education they might preserve most of these hand industries which represented a phase of the people's life which should not be allowed to die. It was matter to him for regret that the handloom was being superseded by machinery. He had previously referred to what was being done for education in the State of Mysore, and the taunt was thrown across the floor at him that Mysore owed its advanced state to its fifty years of tuition under British rule. As it happened, the State of Baroda which was never under British rule, was even more advanced, educationally, than was Mysore itself. In Mysore, free compulsory education had been promised, and would shortly come into effect. But in Baroda, not only was education free and compulsory, but the educational needs of the pariah children were attended to, and the Government in Baroda set apart a certain proportion of its civil appointments for the exclusive use of children of pariah parents educated in the State schools. A native State, able to do that, set an example which the British Government could well afford to follow. Surely if we held India for the good of the Indian people we should not be content to lag behind a small native State. He was very interested in the remarks about famine, and he would like to take that opportunity of heartily and cordially endorsing what the Under-Secretary had said about the humane activities and the practical work that was being done by Sir John Hewitt, the Governor of the United Provinces, whose work was of a kind which marked him out as one of the type of men whom India needed to develop it along higher lines. But while that was true of the United Provinces and of famine, there was still much requiring to be done to break down the ravages which plague and disease in its various forms was increasingly making. An alarming feature of the outbreak of plague and cholera in recent years had been its continuity, and its increasing virulence. He was delighted to learn that there was this year a very heavy reduction in the death rate and he prayed it might continue, and that at length the disease had been mastered. But the fact remained, that for the last decade of the last century the average death rate from this preventible cause was over a million a year, and during the seven years which had elapsed of the present century the death-rate had averaged more than 1,000,000 a year. That was a very serious state of affairs. At Poona he found the disease was being grappled with because, in spite of the opposition of one of the chief officials of the district, the authorities had called into co-operation a native committee to assist them in dealing with the plague and the remedies for it. Beneficial results were accruing, and the example was one which could be recommended to other parts of India. They heard much of the causes of the unrest in India, but the real cause, though there were others which had contributed, had been the hope deferred of the native Indians. Time and time again they had had legislation passed and reforms promised, and some reforms the Viceroy or the Provincial Governor had done what he could to inaugurate. But over and over again the promise which had looked so fair to the eye had been blasted to the hope, and as a consequence they had this gathering volume of unrest in India culminating in those recent acts which every friend of India must deplore, connected with bomb outrages. If the India Office, with, he hoped, the full approval and sympathetic support of the Indian Government, was determined to limit the excessive official interference with the natives, to associate Indians more and more with the administration of the country, and generally, both legislatively and administratively, to bring the people more into touch with Indian affairs, unquestionably the dawn of a new and brighter era was about to break in that distracted country. The mover of the Motion had played the part of a Mahatma in professing to know the future, and had expressed approval of reforms which had not yet been formulated. In so far as they had been formulated they were not of a kind which either the Liberal or the Labour side of the House could by any possibility accept with satisfaction. They were in most respects quite reactionary.

He hoped he would be in order in referring to a personal matter. The hon. Member who moved the Motion was good enough to refer to him and others in a way that had been common since his visit to India by persons in more or less official and high positions. He was not the only Member of the House who had assumed that certain things alleged to have been said by himself were necessarily correct because they had appeared in the Press. On two separate occasions Lord Cromer in another place had referred to statements attributed to him, and Lord Curzon had seemed on a recent occasion to be referring to the same thing. A good deal of sympathy had been expended on those Indian officials who were likely to be misrepresented and abused without cause by the native Press and by wandering agitators in India. More harm, however, was done to the cause of British rule in India by the unsympathetic, cavilling spirit represented in the speech of the hon. Member who moved this Motion, and by the *régime* of Lord Curzon, than by all the seditious writings and all the native Press put together. Calcutta one morning was astonished to find that he had been preaching sedition in India and libelling the Anglo-Indian officials. Calcutta itself knew nothing about it, and until the news was telegraphed out from London neither the officials in Calcutta nor the able journalists who conducted the Anglo-Indian Press were aware of what he was supposed to have been doing. What was the statement which appeared to set the heather on fire, not only in Great Britain, but as he subsequently discovered, all round the British Empire? *The Times* in a leading article on October 2nd, 1907, stated that—

> "The Bengali newspapers assert that he has declared the condition of Eastern Bengal to be worse than that of Russia, and that the atrocities which officials commit there woul caused more horror in this country, were they known, than the Turkish outrages in Armenia."

The Pressman who sent the cable home was challenged on the spot by five of his brother journalists, all Englishmen, and two of them English Conservatives, to produce his authority for the statement. He was unable to do so. The statement was a pure concoction. The man who made it had such a reputation for misleading the public at home concerning affairs in India that several of his brother journalists in Calcutta, prior to this incident, sent a warning note to the editors of papers here to be on their guard against statements emanating from him. One or two of the newspapers had the decency and the good taste to apologise for having assumed the statement to be true. But despite that, although every schoolboy who took an interest in politics was aware that the statement was a fabrication, hon. Members of that House, and still more remarkable numbers in another place, were not above accepting the unsupported testimony of this one discredited journalist and placing it against all the responsible authorities and journalists in Calcutta and other parts of India. He was prepared to abide by what the Viceroy said in regard to his general conduct. He was not troubled about a personal matter concerning his own reputation, but when his alleged sayings were used to prejudice people at home against the people of India he thought it necessary to make the truth known.

There was one aspect of the revenue which was to him a matter of great satisfaction and that was the decrease in the revenue from opium. At the same time there was a danger that the prohibition of the use of opium might encourage the use of other drugs of a more dangerous character. At Singapore he visited an opium den, and he saw subsequently morphia victims who were literally covered with sores from head to foot, and this was a far more pitiable spectacle than that which was presented by the users of opium. Therefore, it was necessary that they should be on their guard to see that in suppressing the one evil they did not create even a greater one. Another point he wished to refer to was the increase in the revenue from the sale of liquor. During the past ten years the increase had been £5,000,000, and that increase appeared to be still going on. It had been said that this was a proof of the prosperity of the Indian people, but he would like a little further explanation on that point. As a rule people did not drink to excess when they were comfortably off and well-to-do. It was when they were miserable that they tried to drown their sorrows in liquor, and it would be found that those villages of India where the local toddy shops carried on the most successful trade in liquor were those in which poverty and destitution were without parallel in any part of the world. He would quote to the House some figures which had been supplied to him by a gentleman, Rev. Herbert Anderson, who was at the head of a deputation which waited upon him in Calcutta, and who was the president of the temperance association there. These figures dealt with Bengal exclusively, and they showed that the revenue from the sale of spirits and liquors for the year 1905–6 was £1,100,000, and that was an increase of £73,000 over the preceding year. The last published accounts for the year 1906–7 showed an increase in the sale of liquor of over £48,000. That state of things in a nation where the use of intoxicating liquors was condemned by all forms of religion was very serious. He agreed with the suggestion made by Mr. Anderson that one necessary step to take to have this evil kept in check was to separate the revenue from the licensing function. At the present time they were both in one Department, and, without maligning anyone, he thought he might say that it naturally followed that the revenue officer was likely to be more active in extorting revenue than in acting as a temperance reformer anxious to keep down drunkenness. He thought the separation of those two departments would go a long way towards removing the pressure which was brought to bear in various ways to increase the sale of liquor in India in order to increase the revenue. That was a matter which demanded the serious attention of the Government both in this country and in India and one which he hoped would not be overlooked. Now he came to the reforms which were in process of being elaborated. The need for reforms in India was a question which was no longer in dispute. Those who had followed the debate in another place would see that their Lordships were practically unanimous in saying that reforms of some kind were imperatively needed in India. Perhaps he might be allowed to say a word or two upon what he considered was a very important cause of the unrest prevailing in India; he referred to the partition of Bengal. It was admitted that much of that unrest was due to the way in which the partition was brought about, and in this connection he remarked that not the least interesting incident in the recent debate in another place was the way in which everybody tried to evade responsibility for the partition. Lord Curzon quoted a telegram showing how the partition was forced upon him by the India Office, and the representative of the India Office replied that Lord Curzon insisted upon it, and the India Office agreed to it in order to humour him. The point he wished to make was that some reform was necessary in connection with the partition of Bengal. The particular form of partition which had been made was not only opposed by the Hindoo population of Bengal but also from its inception by the Mahomedan population and by the civil authorities from the Governor downwards. Surely there was at least a case for inquiry here. The present partition, geographically and otherwise, was not the best, and as to this point there was no dispute. The only justification put forward for it was that it gave to the Mahomedan population a sphere of influence in Eastern Bengal, that the Mahomedan people were now in a majority under the partition, and that to interfere with the existing partition might take away from them that majority. But surely the Government of India was not to be driven to the necessity of offending the Hindu population in order to maintain the Mahomedans in a majority. He would appeal with all the power at his command to the Secretary of State for India not to consider this question a closed book. If partition was an accomplished fact, at least they should see to it that the boundaries were so adjusted as not to give unnecessary cause of offence to a great number of loyal and law-abiding people. In regard to the reforms themselves, he had arrived at the conclusion that no matter what was done for India there could be no real pacification, no allaying of discontent, no breaking down of the barrier rising between European and Asiatic, until the people of India had some effective form of self-government. In the Civil departments the more highly paid positions were practically closed against the natives. The hon. Member for Montgomery had said that in Bengal there was no position which could not be held by a native.

*Mr. REES: I said which had not been held and could not be held again.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said there was not a single native employed in the salt department with a salary over 800 rupees a month. The higher positions were all reserved for Europeans. In the Customs Department the line was drawn at 700 rupees.

Mr. REES indicated dissent.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said the figures he was quoting were given by a native member of the Viceroy's Council in the Budget debate in 1905. That speech was made in the presence of the Viceroy himself and his officials, and as far as he could ascertain no one had controverted it. In the Public Works Department it was 1,200 rupees. The natives of India were barred from these higher positions. Formerly the natives came here and sat for examination with the view to obtaining these positions, but the number appointed was so very small that they no longer troubled to come. They asked that simultaneous examinations should be held in India and in England. There was one reform which he would suggest as thoroughly practicable, and he thought it was one with which most members would be inclined to sympathise. There were two branches of the Civil Service in India—the Provincial and the Imperial. The lower paid positions belonged to the former and the higher paid to the latter. Surely it would be possible to adopt a system whereby the Provincial Civil servants might, after a certain number of years service, and after proving that they were qualified, rise to the higher service. That would give young men who were capable administrators something to look forward to. At present they knew that once they had entered the Provincial service, the higher service was closed to them for all time coming. That was a question which might be considered by the India Office. In regard to the legislative department, he suggested that the whole system by which members were appointed to the various councils should be reformed. The Under-Secretary had referred to the growing cost to the people of official charges. It was a well-known fact that the Law Courts were becoming one of the most grievous burdens with which the people of India were afflicted. He was casting no reflection on the Courts; he was stating a fact which everybody knew in India. The habit of going to law had become so prevalent, and the law's delays so costly, that the obtaining of justice in India had become a serious matter. Under the old condition of things each village had its own council. These councils still existed in some villages. He suggested a restoration of the old village council, that it should be popularly elected and entrusted with certain well-defined powers in the trial of civil cases up to a certain amount in small petty disputes. These councils should also have the control of the village school of irrigation, grazing lands, and woods and forests within their borders. The charges for woods, grazing lands, fishing licences, and this, that, and the other charge, did not exist until a few years ago. These charges were grievous in themselves, but it sometimes happened that a piece of land which had been from time immemorial grazing land was suddenly declared to be forest land by the Imperial Government, and people whose cattle strayed on the land were fined for trespass. If these lands were placed under the village council the people would have a real interest in the administration of their own affairs. He had been blamed for saying, but he repeated here, that the ryots of India in intelligence and in capacity for looking after their own affairs would compare favourably with our agricultural population at home. They had no book learning, they did not know much about Western science, but in all that affected themselves they had a shrewd practical knowledge which reminded him of the Scottish farmer at his best. They could be quite safely trusted with those things. From those village councils they could elect district councils, and the districts councils in turn could elect the provincial councils. In this way the whole superstructure of Indian administration would rest upon popular election, and the people would be given a real control over their affairs. At present the provincial councils were practically passive, they had no power to move amendments on the Budget. Provided that enlarged powers were given to the provincial councils, the young men of India who were imbibing our Western ideas would have an outlet for their energies and scope for the exercise of their ability which would keep them out of the way of wandering agitators and other pestilent and pestiferous persons.

*Mr. REES asked what the hon. Member would do in the event of the Government being defeated in a provincial council.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said he was not proposing that the Government should be left in a minority on the provincial councils. He would be prepared to give the Government a small majority, though there should be freedom in the council to move amendments on the Budget and to deal with other questions. It was on these lines that he ventured to hope that the reforms, when they came to be hammered out, would take shape. It had been said that owing to the diversity of castes and creeds they could not have popular elections. He denied that statement. At the present time in Bengal three-fourths of the members of the local council were elected by popular vote. In Bombay one-half of the members, and in Madras the whole of the members, were nominated. In all the big cities and towns of India there were popularly-elected town councils.

*Mr. REES: Of lawyers.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said that that did not matter; they were elected by a popular vote. If the hon. Member was going to say that lawyers were not fit to represent the common people, there was some reforming to be done in the House of Commons. He could quote a number of cases to show that people of different castes and creeds could unite at elections to secure the return of certain members. He would give one illustration. The city of Benares was the holy city of the Hindus, and the facts he was about to state were made on the authority of the town clerk, who was himself a native Christian. In that city there was not a single ward in which the Mahomedans had a majority of electors. There were nineteen members elected by popular vote to serve on the council. Of that number twelve were Hindus and seven were Mahomedans. The same thing was found all over the country. In Madras a provincial member was being elected when he was there. Madras was a Hindu province, 83 per cent. of its people being Hindus, The Hindu organisation brought forward a Mahomedan gentleman who was subsequently elected to represent them. The talk about caste and creed was greatly exaggerated, and if it was desired to break down caste prejudices the best method was to give the people some form of popular representation in regard to which they would be compelled to work together for the common good. The present moment was doubly serious for this country in connection with India from every point of view. It was not merely that unrest was growing in India; unrest was growing throughout the whole of the East. There was trouble in Turkey and Persia, there was the great awakening in Japan, and there was the development taking place in China. India, after all, had more affinity with the East than with the West, despite 150 years of European occupation. The Hindus and Mahomedans with whom he came in contact were kindly well-intentioned people. The Hindus in particular were very much maligned, but if they had one fault greater than another it was their submissive loyalty. Those natives who were kindly affectioned, well-meaning, responsive to sympathy, having no higher ambition in life than to live loyal under the British Flag, were being treated as pariahs. We had responsibilities not only to the people of India, but also in the face of Europe; for if unrest was spread throughout India a conflagration might one day break out in China, Japan, and even nearer home, which would set India ablaze and burn up the last vestige of British rule. The people there would be loyal if they felt that their grievances were being acknowledged and redressed; but repression of legitimate reforms and a denial or postponement of what they had been led by proclamations by the Crown, by the promises of Ministers, and by speeches in their midst to believe were their rights as British subjects, would produce that feeling of hopeless despair which bred discontent and disloyalty and menaced the unity of the Indian Empire.

MR. MACCAW (Down, W.) said that, as one who had spent some years in India, he would like to say a few words in this debate. In the first place he desired to record, in common with previous speakers, and indeed with all who had any interest in the greatest of all our Dependencies, how much he deplored the present condition of affairs in certain parts of that country, and the attitude of a certain, though he would fain believe only a small portion, of our native fellow-subjects. The feeling of unrest which undoubtedly existed had arisen from various causes, for most of which we, as the ruling race, could not be held accountable; but there were others which he thought were the direct and logical outcome of our own deliberate acts. He might take the question of education, for instance, which was now under discussion. When we decided, many years ago now, to establish a system of higher education in India, he wondered if it ever entered into the minds of those responsible what, as time went on, was likely to be the result of their action. He did not think that even the most far-seeing amongst them could have anticipated the situation which now existed, and which was growing more acute day by day. The result of that system was that all the large towns of India were flooded with young men, educated up to a certain standard, by an education which had the effect of confirming them in their belief, though no doubt unintentionally so, that manual labour was degrading, and which quite unfitted them for earning their livelihood by the means which their fathers and forefathers adopted, with the consequence that their ambitions and thoughts were wholly turned, either towards the learned professions or to Government employment. The opportunities in both these walks in life were of necessity limited, with the result that numbers of educated and to some extent qualified men were thrown on the world without occupation of any kind, a sure hotbed of trouble in any country. The list was being added to year by year, and the position was undoubtedly becoming a somewhat serious one in this respect. Naturally these idle men became more or less discontented with their lot, and he was afraid in many cases harboured resentment against those who, quite unintentionally, had placed them in the anomalous position which they occupied. What was to be the remedy for this state of affairs, it was somewhat difficult to formulate. The suggestion had been put forward that the opportunities for University education should be very materially curtailed, but he did not believe that that idea would commend itself to many thinking men of the present day. One of the most important of our many duties in India was to see that our fellow-subjects there had placed at their disposal freely and lavishly all that Western knowledge could impart, and he trusted that this would be recognised so long as England remained the paramount power in the government of that country. He had no claims beyond those of an ordinary observer to speak on the subject of education, but he thought the general consensus of opinion appeared to be that our whole system there had been, and still was, far too much of a literary, as opposed to a practical character, and in this direction he thought most people were agreed a great change was required.

Technical instruction must receive much greater attention than had been the case in the past. In improved methods of agriculture alone a vast field lay open to the educated Indian, and there were few crops now being produced which could not be doubled and trebled in quantity and value, were recognised systems of scientific cultivation to be applied. In this work, occupations might be found for thousands of young men who, under the present system of education, had no career open to them beyond a struggle for existence in the overcrowded sphere of Government employment. With the aspirations of educated Indians to the fullest share possible in the Government of their country, he had nothing but the warmest sympathy, but even the most sympathetic mind must see beyond question that there were limits in this direction. So long as England remained responsible to India as a whole for the great trust which she had undertaken, the supreme control of affairs must remain vested in men of English race. The vast interests committed to her care were so complex and so varied, and at times so conflicting, in their character, that none but most impartial administrators could be considered as qualified to do them proper justice. This consideration alone, even if there were no others, which he was far from saying, must effectively dominate the situation for very many years to come. At the same time there was, he thought, a strong desire on all sides amongst Europeans in India, that capable natives should be associated as much as possible with the Government of that country. A great deal had already been done in this direction, but it was generally recognised that the time had come when a further step forward might be taken, and the Government scheme which was at present under consideration for the enlargement of the Imperial and Provincial Councils was awaited with a considerable amount of expectation, although it was felt than any advances of this nature must be gradual and in no sense revolutionary. He thought it was incumbent on all Members of the House to refrain from saying one word which might have the effect of aggravating the condition of affairs out there at the present moment, a position full of the gravest anxiety, but he was only stating what was common knowledge when he said that all well-wishers of India, both native and European, would join in condemning in the strongest possible manner the spirit of disorder which had been manifesting itself in certain quarters during the past twelve or eighteen months, culminating in the dastardly outrages which had been perpetrated quite recently. There could, he thought, be no two opinions worthy the attention of any right-minded man, as to the imperative course open to any Government when called upon to deal with a state of affairs such as had been shown to exist. Law and order must be maintained at all hazards and at all risks, and whether the offences were incitement to disorder, or disorder itself, the punishment must be equally swift and sure. The two measures recently passed by the Government of India for the suppression of bomb manufactures, and the more effective control of the Press, had not been placed on the Statute-book one moment too soon; indeed, there was a strong feeling amongst many well qualified to judge that the latter measure had been far too long delayed, and that if the incitements to outrage and other evils which existed had been dealt with strongly in their earlier stages, they would long ere this have been effectually stamped out. Liberty was not licence, and both the liberty of the Press and the liberty of the subject were seriously imperilled when anarchy was permitted to spread rampant throughout the land. He rejoiced to see that many of the well-known and leading native gentlemen had spoken out with no uncertain sound on this question, and were giving the Government their full support. One of the great dangers to be apprehended, if the lawlessness which at present existed were not put down with a strong hand, was the effect it would have on the trade and internal development of the country. In commercial circles in London the difficulty of raising capital for investment in Indian industrial enterprises had long been recognised. This, he thought, had its origin in the times when the flunctuations in rates of exchange between India and England were violent and extreme, and men who sent money out to India could form no accurate idea as to what rate it would be returned. Thanks to the wise measures taken by the Government of India, some few years ago, a much more stable condition of exchange had of late been established, though the effects of the old feeling of insecurity had not yet entirely passed away in some financial quarters. Another cause which had contributed in no small degree to keep British capital from flowing towards India, was the very unsympathetic attitude adopted by the Government of India towards all commercial undertakings. The long delay on the part of the Government in answering correspondence, and the mass of red tape formalities which had to be gone through, before any permission could be obtained to do anything towards opening up the country, so disgusted the enterprising capitalist that he entirely refused to have anything to do with the place, and became willing to lend his money for investment in any part of the globe rather than India. The fact was that up till quite recently there was no one connected with the Indian Government who had the slightest knowledge of commercial matters, and merchants were in a sense tolerated rather than encouraged. The appointment of a commercial member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, initiated a year or two ago by Lord Curzon, was decidedly a step in the right direction, as indicating that the Government of India were abandoning their former position of aloofness, and that they now recognised the responsibility which was on them to foster trade in every possible manner. It was to be hoped that some arrangement would be come to by which frequent changes in the holding of this office would be avoided, so that the member might always be well in touch with all the commercial requirements of the country. This improvement in the attitude of the Indian Government towards trade generally must, if continued, have ere long a good effect on the minds of British capitalists, but he would like to utter and emphasise a warning that if the idea was allowed to get abroad that law and order and security of property were not being rigorously maintained, the better financial feeling which was being gradually built up would rapidly be swept away, and the development of India retarded for years to come. One of the most important of all the matters engaging the attention at the present time of those interested in India was the question of railways. It was one which affected the whole country and everyone living in the country. Rapid and cheap means of transport were a necessity in any country, and more particularly so in a vast area like India, where distances were so great and where the material transported was for the most part of small value, compared to its bulk. The pressing need at the moment was not so much the opening out of new lines, though this was, of course, a matter that must be steadily pursued, but the proper equipment of lines which already existed. For years past the outcry had been great against the immense dislocation of trade which occurred season after season, in consequence of the shortness of rolling stock available for moving the produce of the country. To his own knowledge the coal trade of Bengal, which had come rapidly to the front of late years, and which was capable of infinite expansion if properly encouraged, was being most seriously retarded by the want of waggons to transport the coal from the mines in the interior to the places of consumption or ports of shipment. Continual protests were being made in the Viceroy's Council, at meetings of Chambers of Commerce, and by private representation, but all with no effect, and the state of affairs at the moment was as bad as, if not worse than, it had ever been. The general system of management seemed to be at fault. He did not mean the individual management of the lines themselves, for in most cases this seemed to be quite efficient, those in charge being a really capable and hard working body of men, but the general system of control, which was exercised by the Government itself, seriously needed revision. A few years ago, in consequence of severe criticism, a railway board, composed of experts, was established at headquarters and great things were at first expected of it, but greater still had been the disappointment. The true explanation he believed was that it had never had any real power, and those composing the board had always been kept too much in a subordinate position. The magnitude of the interest in railways was such as to warrant its being made into a separate Department of Government, with a free hand and a seat on the Viceroy's Executive Council being given to the chairman of the board. If this were done and full provision made in each year's Budget for railway requirements, there would then be some probability of the urgent needs of the mercantile community and of the country receiving that satisfaction which had been so long denied to them. This was a matter which he desired to bring most strongly to the attention of the Secretary of State. But all the arrangements which the skill of man could devise were of little value to India, unless backed up by favourable climatic conditions. The one great requisite essential to make the land prosperous, and the bulk of its people happy and contented was a plentiful supply of rain, properly distributed, and falling in its appointed season. This was all that was really necessary to secure a bountiful harvest, and with a full yield of food crops the country could never be considered as poor. He rejoiced to see that so far this season the progress of the monsoon had been satisfactory, and he trusted that its continuance would soon drive from the land that gaunt spectre of famine which had been threatening some parts of the country for so many months past. With a plentiful supply of food, and freedom from turnmoil and unrest, the future of India could only be considered as full of hope and promise.

*Sir HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said he had listened with great pleasure to the hon. Gentleman who had shown his knowledge of the wants of India, and also his sympathy with the legitimate aspirations of the people there. The hon. Member for Merthyr had referred to the alarming increase of revenue derived from the consumption of liquor in India. That subject had been noticed by those interested in India for many years. A deputation of Members of Parliament and others interested in the subject waited on the Secretary of State for India in August last, and the Memorandum had been forwarded to the Indian Government on the subject. He hoped the answer of the Indian Government would soon arrive and that the Government would be prepared to lay it upon the Table of the House. Everybody would recognise that the discussions on Indian affairs were far too limited in the House, but until some scheme of devolution of the business of the House was brought into operation he was afraid more time would not be able to be given to them. It was a gratifying sign that more interest was taken in the House in Indian matters than used to be the case. In certain quarters it was thought that the discussion of Indian affairs in the House of Commons was injurious to the Government of India, but so long as we lived under a democratic form of Government it was inevitable that the House of Commons should take interest in all matters relating to India. In his opinion nothing but good could come from discussions conducted in the spirit in which the debate that day had been carried on in relation to Indian affairs. The House of Commons had shown a true instinct in relation to the critical state of affairs in India in the various matters that had been brought before it in the debate. He would like to join hon. Members, especially the right hon. Member for Rushcliffe, in the expression of their sense of admiration of the way in which the Secretary of State for India had in face of enormous difficulties pursued his way in Indian affairs. The noble Lord had moved forward necessarily slowly but steadily towards the goal he set before him when he took upon himself the responsibility of administering the affairs of that Empire. He had done it in such a way as to merit the confidence of both sides of the House. When the time came to write the history of his administration it would be seen how deeply the noble Lord's mind had been written on the life of the future of India. At present we were in the midst of what was called a crisis and it was our present duty to consider what our action should be. The last twenty years had been an interesting epoch in the history of India. In the preliminary parts of the circular issued by the Government of Simla it was pointed out that everything was changed in India; that education had taken great strides forward, and that the number of scholars now learning English had been doubled. Those who had studied the history of India would have come to the conclusion that India had been accustomed during centuries to be governed by a small number of people whose intellect and culture fitted them for that purpose, and he ventured to submit that history would repeat itself in the growing power of educated India of to-day. The Secretary of State, in a speech delivered a short time ago, referred to the existence in India of two parties—the moderate party and the extreme party. He thought it would be more correct to say that there were three parties connected with political agitation in India. At the beginning of the twenty years period referred to, there was only one party pledged to constitutional methods in India; but, owing to the delay in securing reforms, another party grew up, and the movement in connection with this second party was stimulated by the partition of Bengal and all those things which were generally referred to under the term "the Curzon *regime*." Then came the third party of physical force and outrage.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I beg to call your attention to the fact that there are not forty Members present.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot move for a "count" between the hours of eight-fifteen and nine-fifteen.

*SIR HERBERT ROBERTS said that he and all who cared for the welfare of India deplored the outrages and deeds of violence perpetrated in India, and were prepared to do everything that was possible to support the Government in putting down with a firm hand all the symptoms of violence and outrage. He believed that all the constitutional leaders of the Reform movement in India were with them in a determination to do everything to support the Government in stamping out these deplorable symptoms and in restoring peace and confidence. In reference to the main principles of the reforms produced by the Government, they had long been expected and were overdue. They all knew the difficulty in connection with the machinery and the Government of India which made progress necessarily slow. He attached great importance to the Decentralisation Commission, and he was pleased to hear the Under-Secretary say that the Report would be presented in two or three months and that the Secretary of State for India hoped that before the end of the autumn session he would be in a position to announce the decision of the Government upon the important reform proposals. The Secretary of State himself had outlined the direction in which the reforms would travel. These were his words—

> "They will be steps which shall do two or three important or even momentous things in the history of India."

He summarised the two directions in which reform would travel under the following heads—

> "(1) Administration improvements. (2) We shall, I hope and feel confident, do something to give the population of India in all their grades some form and authorised opportunity of handling some of their own affairs."

He had no doubt it would be found when the reform proposals were laid before Parliament that, on the executive side, they would be in the direction of the election of some Indian on the councils, and, on the legislative side, in the direction of the grant of larger representation of Indians by their election on the legislative councils and the granting to those councils of wider functions in finance, etc. He desired to express his sense of the grave condition of affairs in India. On the one side there were elements in the situation there quite new to our experience as governors of the country. On the other side, there were some hopeful signs. They had in the Secretary of State a man of the temperament, courage, and ability he had already described, and they had a firm, courageous, and sympathetic Viceroy, and one who would make his term of office memorable in many ways in the Indian administration. But more than that, they had the fact that the most experienced administrators in India recognised the desirability of moving along the road of reform, and to his mind that was one of the most important factors in the present situation. The evident remedy, in his opinion, for the elements of danger in the Indian situation lay in an endeavour to establish closer unity between those who ruled and those who were ruled in India. Personally, he thought the dark clouds on the horizon would pass away, and he had a firm belief that another chapter could be and would be written in the history of British statesmanship in the administration of the Indian Empire.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) said he would like to add his humble tribute to the skill, clearness, and lucidity with which the statement on the Indian Budget was produced by the Under-Secretary. Having himself had a long connection with India, he listened to the right hon. Gentleman's statement with enormous interest; and kept wondering what an extraordinary, wonderful machine the Indian Government was. He had never been one of those who had tried to decry the Indian Government or the service to which he used to have the honour to belong. He thought it a very great, a high-minded, an honest, and an incorruptible Government, which had done a great work for India; but, when listening to all the good things the Under-Secretary had to reveal in his Budget—how taxation had been reduced, how communication had been developed, how the country, in fact, was advancing in every way, how plague and famine had been successfully coped with, and then how at the end of it all there was profound unrest and discontent all over the country—he could not help wondering why the excellence of our administration in India had ended in the dissatisfaction of the people. He believed the root reason was to be found in our failure to appreciate the peculiar national characteristics of the Indian people. With us, material objects always seemed to have a wider share in our range of ideas than those which he might call the ideal. We had never been able to understand the spiritual aspects of the problem, and that, after all, was the reason of our failure in connection with Ireland. We had never been able to understand what the Irish people thought about; and, in like manner, he thought we had failed to understand what the Indian people thought about. Irrigation works and protection against famine and plague were all very well, but they did not make up for certain spiritual desires there were in every people and more especially in the people of India. He was sure that it must come as a great shock to anyone who knew anything about India and her people that there was this unrest and dissatisfaction. He did not know any people more easy to get on with and to manage or who responded more readily to sympathy, and to hear that they were in a state of dissatisfaction with the Government seemed to come upon them something like a blow. What was the cause of it? It was partly want of sympathy and partly because for two years a spirit of unrest had been gradually growing. If twenty-five years ago we had only gone on with the policy of local self-government and had attached to ourselves that body of educated native opinion which was found in the National Congress—an extremely valuable and learned body—and had followed their advice, looking upon them as a kind of branch of the Government of India, we should have avoided many mistakes which we had made. There was no doubt a large amount of unrest in China, Turkey, Persia, and in fact all over Asia, and, of course, it had greatly affected India. The main cause, however, was our failure to understand the people's spiritual desires. We had given them a Western education, and had put Western ideas of freedom and self-government into their heads; but we had not been able to satisfy them in any way. The old *regime* had gone on. They could not see any difference, and at last a spirit of hopelessness had settled upon the educated people of India. They looked on the pledges that had been given that all subjects of the Crown should have an equal share in the country as having been broken, a feeling of despair had come over them, and it took a form which they all deeply regretted and particular forms of which they looked upon with abhorrence. If they had only gone on with the local self-government which Lord Ripon began they might have had a new India by this time. It was true they had district boards and they had to this day languished in a kind of way. It was said the people had a complete want of interest in them. But in the Bombay Presidency the average area of the jurisdiction of each of these boards was 440 square miles. The average income each board had to spend was £415, which was not a large sum. One-third of it went in education, over which the district boards had no authority at all, and a good deal more went in roads in which also they had no interest. Four-sevenths of the boards were nominated and not elected at all, and it worked out in the end that each really elected member had about 10s. a year for the area of a square mile to superintend. Under those circumstances they could not be expected to take an interest in the work. The whole thing was a farce. That was a thing that ought to be altered, and although the Under-Secretary for India very wisely would not be drawn into any hint as to what the reforms were going to be, as he was in a position of rather greater freedom and less responsibility perhaps he might make a few suggestions. One was that the natives should be on the executive councils. That, he thought, was adumbrated by Lord Morley the other day as an extremely possible reform, and he hoped it would be carried out. There ought to be some system of election to the councils. He did not see why each district should not return one member on the Council of the Presidency. He was greatly struck with the speech of the hon. Member for Merthyr, and he believed the plan he adumbrated of rising from the village community right up to the Council for the whole Presidency through various stages of election would be a feasible policy, and he did not see why something like it at all events should not be carried out. All the district officers had a great deal of writing to do, and had not time really to go about in the villages and make the acquaintance of people as they ought to do. If all these matters connected with public works were taken off their shoulders and put into the hands of district associations, it would give them more time to do their work and would interest people in the development of the country. They might at first make mistakes, but it was only by making mistakes that they learned how to administer. After all, our own history showed that the beginning of self-government in the widest possible sense was in the self-government of the village, and that eventually led to the fullest grant of local self-government it was possible for any nation to have. He hoped that that would be one of the reforms that the right hon. Gentleman would take into consideration. Then there were many minor reforms which ought to be possible—to move amendments to the budget, and to call attention to administrative acts, for instance. He did not believe there would ever be real peace in India if that ill-omened partition of Bengal was not in some way modified or done away with altogether. It was arranged in 1833 that Bengal was to have a Governor in Council, and he believed no further Act would be necessary in order to establish a Governor in Council. The Lieutenant-Governors were only put in as a kind of stop-gap until a Governor in Council was appointed. That would be a way out of the difficulty into which we had got. All they would have to do would be to go back to the original scheme of having a Governor in Council for the whole of Bengal, with various authorities for the outlying provinces, such as Assam, in the shape of Chief Commissioners. It was an infinite pity that when the Liberals first came into power the occasion was not taken to modify the partition. It was with extreme reluctance that he said a single word of criticism of Lord Morley. He had done a very great work for India and he hoped he would do still greater work in the future. The partition of Bengal was only an act of administrative convenience. There was no moral principle involved in it. There was nothing to connect it with the existence of the British Empire in India. It had nothing to do with any question of high policy, and the question of British *amour propre* ought not to be involved in it at all. If it was altered it would be a message of peace to the people of India; it would show that we took their wishes into consideration and did not wish to ride roughshod in any way over their aspirations, and with other reforms this evil chapter of unrest and dissatisfaction in India, which he deplored as much as anyone could, would be finally closed and they would go back to their old *status* of sympathy and affection between English and Indians which used to exist and which he hoped would exist again when these ominous clouds had passed away.

*MR. GWYNN (Galway) thought he was the first who had spoken in the debate without first-hand knowledge of India, but it was because they had in Ireland some experience of what it meant to be governed by an assembly that was foreign to them. In listening to the utterances of the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs, he thought he was listening to the kind of opinions that he was so familiar with from the Ulster Unionists contingent. Yet the speech of the one Irish Unionist who intervened was more liberal and more in harmony with their ideas as to what was meant by the value of education than that of the hon. Member who spoke with all the authority of long experience of official life, and whose speech made such a contrast to the utterance of the supposed violent agitator which was delivered from the Labour benches. The House, he was sure, would have considered which of those speeches was more likely to bring peace in India, and which was more likely to create irritation and discontent. The Amendment which they were discussing raised the question of education. Was it not a strange thing that they should have the pretension to decide what the people of India should be taught and how they should be taught—to decide upon the education of persons divided from us by half the world, strange to us in speech and in religion. They might ask themselves in what sense they were going to determine their education. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Rushcliffe said the ship's head had been turned in a new direction. By what star was that course set? What was the ideal that was to govern the education that they proposed to give to the people of India? Did they simply wish to maintain India as a place that provided an honourable and well-paid career for the sons of the professional classes and as a field for trade that they could not only keep free for themselves, but which they could regulate and in which they could tax the home products of British India in such a way that cheap Indian products should not have advantage over Manchester cottons? If in governing India they were actuated by the old notion of the relation of the mother State to its Colonies—the idea of the eighteenth century—he did not know that all the denunciation that had been heaped upon the present system of education had any real justification. He was not sure that the education which had been given under the wise guidance of England to British India had not been the very best education in the world to keep British India in a perpetual state of subserviency. The effect of that education had been to divorce the people of India from their religion, and from the whole tradition of their moral life. Judging from the Irish standpoint he was quite familiar with the kind of education which had been laid out for India, and that kind of education was calculated to kill in the people the spirit of resistance. Was that the idea with which they desired to educate the people of India? He quite understood the idea put forward by the hon. Member of Montgomery Boroughs, which was to avoid producing the agitator and produce the loyal man at all cost. He knew full well the loyal man in Ireland and the kind of education that had produced him. He would like to know what was the ultimate intention of the Liberals of to-day with regard to education in India. Did they regard the present state of affairs with satisfaction? Did they believe that the predominance of an alien race was the thing to be maintained in perpetuity? He knew that the average English Liberal regarded himself as a trustee of freedom in India, and he hoped that they were educating the Indian people to be some day free, although he was convinced that it would not be safe now to grant freedom to the people of India because there was a danger that they would be at each other's throat. He did not know that freedom would be so great a danger to the people of India, and the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil evidently regarded that danger as being wholly exaggerated and fictitious. If the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil was right he did not think Liberals could salve their consciences in that way because they professed to believe in the principles of nationality and development on the lines of racial freedom. If there was no such duty placed upon England as that of keeping the people of India from cutting each other's throat, in what sense were they to guide the education of India? It was true that there was no Indian nation, strictly speaking, but where were the nations that were once there? All through British India there was one common denomination, and that was the common subservience of the people. In framing their conception of what the Indian people ought to learn, were they to teach them with a view to keeping them in continual subservience, or were they going to educate them to become some day people that might be either friendly or hostile to this Empire, but, at least, they would be free people. That was, after all, an urgent question. Let them take the facts as they found them. Let them take the most brilliant book ever written about British India, and they would find in it, from beginning to end, a glorification of the spy. Was that the highest ideal of India from the British point of view? Was there no other ideal that could be set before the people of India than that of abandoning their own loyalty and their own religion, and taking upon themselves the service of the British Empire? The responsibility for what was being done in India to-day came home to all Members of this House. What was their hope and fear in regard to India? Was it their hope, was it their fear, that India some day might be free? [An Hon. Member: Yes.] That was a question he put to the Party opposite, and he hoped someone would answer it.

*Sir HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth) said the subject upon which he wished to make a few remarks was that of the great railway asset of India. He wished to associate himself with the congratulations of the noble Lord on the front bench in regard to the statement which the Under-Secretary for India had been able to make. He regretted that the right hon. Member had not been able to add some more material to that which he placed before them in regard to the railways. They had all read the financial Memorandum, and he only understood the right hon. Gentleman to say among other good things that they were proposing to take into consideration the recommendations of Sir James MacKay's Report upon Railways. From the financial statement which had been put before them it would be seen that the revenue of India was £50,000,000 a year, and that did not include the revenue derived from this great asset of the railway, which was £30,000,000 more. That arose from the fact that the mode of keeping the accounts of the railways had been altered for the better, the net revenue only of the railways being brought into the general account instead of the gross receipts being put on one side and the expenditure upon the other. There were 30,000 miles of railway in India, for which £253,000,000 of capital had been raised on the credit of the Secretary of State in England, the benefit of which had been given to the people of India. The revenue derived from that capital paid about 5½ per cent. upon it after allowing for all the expenses of working and all other charges. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the net receipts after paying interest were £2,500,000, and he thought he had rather understated the figures, because there was a large portion of the capital raised under the ægis of the companies which were now practically non-existent and which had largely been paid off by means of annuities, which included the capital as well as interest, and this amounted to about £750,000, which made a sum considerably over £3,000,000 as the net profit derived from this great asset of the railways by the Government of India for the benefit of the Indian Exchequer. All that profit had been derived from British capital and it had gone in relief of the taxpayers of India. The whole of that capital had been raised, with small exceptions, upon the credit of the Secretary of State for India on behalf of the British Government. If India no longer remained ours, the consideration of the security of that debt of £250,000,000 would be a very serious matter. This railway capital was in part raised by companies, with the guarantee of the Secretary of State, some fifty years ago, beginning at 5 per cent., and until the year 1900 the railways of India were carried on with a deficit remaining to the charge of the Indian Government. From the year 1900 to the present time, after allowing for interest, those railways had yielded a very considerable surplus, which had been growing every year until it had now reached about £2,500,000. Many of theIndian railways paid interest varying between 7 and 9 per cent., and in two cases they paid 12 per cent. and 16 per cent. The railway which paid 7 per cent. was the one with which he had to do and over which he had presided for many years, and that railway could now, if permitted, raise capital without the assistance of the guarantee of the Government of India. Fifty years ago it was necessary to give a Government guarantee because money could not be raised without it. When in India last year he had the pleasure of conferring with the Minister of Finance on the subject, and he made a suggestion which was favourably received. If the Secretary of State for India had to look after all this capital, it followed that the Government of India had to bring into its budgets every year the whole of the railway finance. They had to take into account in the ordinary Budget the provision of the means for new construction and further capital outlays on open lines, and the consequence was that very great delay necessarily occurred through the fault of no one, but simply through the fault of the system, and progress could not be made. The money available under the programme of the Indian Government was £10,000,000 a year for the whole of the Indian railways, and that was scarcely sufficient for equipment with the necessary rolling stock for the normal increase of passengers and goods and merchandise offered for transit and improvements of open lines. It was admitted on all hands that that was a state of things which ought to be remedied. His proposition was supported by two eminent Indian officials of experience who were directors at this moment of other companies. He would like to be informed by the Under-Secretary, if convenient, whether the recommendations which had been made on this subject had been adopted. It would be of interest to the House and also to the money market of this country to know whether the proposition as to the raising of capital without the guarantee of the Secretary of State had been, or was likely to be, adopted. It seemed to him that it was plain that a company which was paying so large a percentage on the whole of their capital ought to be able to raise money in London or in India without the assistance of any guarantee at all. There was another convenience which would result from the adoption of this plan. The interest which the Secretary of State had in the railways could be put in the form of stock, and some of it could be taken up by the native princes of India. He knew that some of them desired to take an interest in the railways, they knew that the undertakings were earning good interest on the capital employed. The railways were improving the revenue from the lands they possessed, and they had expressed the hope that they would be enabled to acquire an interest in them. One other point he would like to mention. Great credit was due to the Civil servants who were performing most beneficial work in connection with irrigation in India. These officers in the Punjab were carrying out works in districts where there was not a white man within a day's march. The circumstances of their employment were such that they could not take their wives or sisters to the places. He believed they were not sufficiently paid. The pay was supposed to be good enough to attract them as young men to the service, but looking to the enormous advantage which the work in which they were engaged brought to the finances of India he thought they deserved a more ample reward than they at present received.

SIR GEORGE SCOTT ROBERTSON (Bradford, Central) said the hon. Member for Galway had suggested that our system of education in India was designed mainly to render the people of India subservient and obedient, so that they might be the more easily controlled by the dominant power. On the other hand, they had lately heard great fear expressed everywhere that by our system of education the exact reverse of that was being brought about. There were conflicting opinions, and he fancied that his hon. friend was in a small minority. What were we doing in relation to the question of education in India?

It seemed to him that what we had been mainly accomplishing unconsciously, was to provide ourselves with a sufficient supply of clerks and subordinate officials for the large requirements of the whole of the great Empire of India. That seemed to him at first sight what had really been done. The system we had adopted had also been the cause of an immense amount of the present unrest in India. It had added considerably to that unrest owing to two different circumstances. First there was a general wave of emotion and of curious sentiment which had spread all over Asia, analogous somewhat to the flood which spread over Europe in 1848. That undoubtedly had had a great effect on the question of unrest in India. It had undoubtedly been increased by the successes of the Japanese against the Russians, and of the Eastern against the Western. It had raised hopes—false hopes he believed—throughout many of the Eastern nations that the East would in the future be the peer or the conqueror of the West. That was one of the causes of unrest. The next was the very question of education which they had been discussing. We had educated a large number of people to supply our own demands for clerkships in subordinate positions in India, and there was a large reserve of that educated class. Though the class itself was a very limited one in relation to the whole population, it was very powerful from the fact that they had got education. There being a large surplus of educated young men, many of them, of course, utterly failed to obtain the appointments for which they had striven to qualify themselves, and consequently they were discontented, and eventually they played the role of unemployed men wherever they were. They either submitted in a sort of heartbroken despair or were rendered furious with anger against fate, which in their case was synonymous with British Government in India. That was really one of the main causes of unrest in India. Another particular reason was the nature of the education given to the Indian. It was most specially a literary education. It was not professional, industrial or technical, and consequently when a man did not get an appointment he was rendered hopeless, and he gradually fell back into the position of the agitator. He might be asked what was the remedy? Well, the first thing they ought to do was to acknowledge the cause. If that was admitted to be the cause, he did not think there would be very much trouble eventually in finding a remedy. He wished to impress on the House his belief that what he had stated was the main cause of the unrest in India. The position was very serious and very critical, and it might have been dangerous but for the quiet firmness and excellent strength of officials both here and in India. He thought those men had observed that the first requirement of Government, especially in India, was the power of reticence. They were working silently; there was no declamatory speech; they did not go in for perorations. That was one thing, if not the chief thing, which had rendered the present troubled and critical time in India otherwise than dangerous. Of course, there always must be very great trouble in reconciling the people of India to the rule of a Western people. Some of these causes were permanent in their nature and some more or less ephemeral. He thought the wave of emotion in India had now reached its flood mark, and was about to subside; but there were other important causes which they might trace and deal with. They had always been there, and so far as he could see they would always remain. First of all, there was that curious but absolutely certain difference in manners, customs, and religion which peculiarly distinguished the East from the West, and which was carried into detail in such an extraordinary way that it actually became physical. There was in India a physical distaste of the East with the West; that could not be doubted. It was the same in China. A Chinaman disliked service with a Western, for the curious physical reason that he could not stand the odour of the Western. He attributed it to too much indulgence of the Western in animal food. Such things raised racial prejudices. He knew it was a delicate subject to touch upon; but one might mention a similar circumstance with which possibly they were all familiar in this country. He referred more particularly to the question of the Jews. It had been said that every country got the Jews which that country deserved. When they said that they paid a high compliment to themselves. But there was always a great difficulty in the way of friendly assimilation between the Jews and ourselves; and the chief difficulty had been really some question of ceremonial purity—some idea on the part of this race which originally came from the East. The same thing happened in India at the present day. He had been much struck by the impressive and thoughtful speech of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, and he might say how pleased he was to hear his repudiation of the slander of which he complained. It must have been a terrible thing to any Member of the British House of Commons that, at such a critical time, utterances of such a slanderous character should be attributed to him, and they were all glad that he was free from these imputations. The hon. Gentleman might not have been long enough in India to find out this peculiar repugnancy of the natives of India to Western men; but it was one of the main and permanent causes of the general dislike of the Eastern to the Western. It was very strong; it had always existed, and it must be faced. But allowing for all this, and for many other causes which he did not desire to enter into at the moment, it was interesting to give one's opinion as to what the immediate future of India might be. He was extremely optimistic about it, as the House might have gathered from what he had said. He believed that the main trouble was subsiding; that now, owing to the admirable strength and calmness displayed by the Viceroy and the officials at home and in India—owing to the strength with which they had been able to say that nothing in the way of those mad efforts and the detestable tactics of agitators should deter them for one single instant from proceeding with reform—they might be hopeful for the future. About eighteen months ago he was asked his opinion of what was going to happen in India, and he ventured on a prediction which had been happily disproved. He said that the great trouble was that the feeling of unrest in some places might lead to isolated outrages, and worst of all, that some unfortunate, unhappy Englishwomen might suffer, following which there might arise the greatest danger of al a white panic. That latter he ha always looked upon with the greatest dread. Curiously enough the outrages had occurred, but there had not been the slightest suspicion of anything like a white panic. It had been obviated by the calmness and courage of every white person in India, and by the admirable behaviour of the Viceroy and his Government. That was the reason why he thought they might look forward to the immediate future of India with distinct hope. He thought they were suffering now from a little too much government in India. The people in India were accustomed to look upon their Viceroy as one who was placed in a singularly elevated and isolated position, surrounded by all the paraphernalia of State, and he thought they had been a little surprised and perhaps disturbed, to see an official so highly placed come down from his exalted position and employ himself principally in working and driving forward the engine of State. He thought that one might fail altogether by being over-energetic in a particular occupation. One might steam up the engine to an extreme point of efficiency, but the strains might become too great, and the engine would suffer languor in its movements. Still worse, this highly placed official, this almost mysteriously apart man, had before all the people of India come down to be a kind of protagonist in what almost amounted to a party fight with his own subordinates in which he had been practically worsted. He thought that might well be understood by the people of India as a curious overturning of the natural conditions of things, and lead them to believe that there was now a chance for an agitator of any sort. He would like to say how he disagreed with the noble Lord the Member for Kensington in one particular about education. He thought that the noble Lord seemed to refer to the fact that in the schools they depended a good deal upon denominational teaching, and that the natives who attended them lost their religion. His experience led him to believe that that was quite illusory. In the great missionary schools which were largely attended by natives, because the education received there was very good, the missionaries insisted on reading a chapter of the Bible, but he was right in saying that hardly any child ever changed his religion from Hindooism to Christianity.

EARL PERCY said he was not referring to missionary schools, but to State schools where there was no religion taught at all.

SIR GEORGE SCOTT ROBERTSON said the same thing would apply in other schools; but even where they tried to change the religion of the children that was not effected. The head of one big college had explained to him that he did not know of any one instance of the change of religion of a child. He asked the gentleman how it was that the missionaries were able to continue their work under these circumstances; and the reply was that they believed that in the end their good work would tell. He himself sincerely believed that the future of India was full of hope, and that for the various reasons he had described. He did not for a moment believe that India was at all prepared for what we considered to be democratic institutions, and he was very glad to hear the remarks of the junior Member for Merthyr Tydvil on that point, and that in that hon. Member's opinion the Government should always have a majority of non-elected members on the provincial councils. We had a distinct mission in India. Although it might be that the education we were providing in India made the people at present harder to govern, it would be the meanest policy possible for us to cease giving that education merely on that account. He congratulated the Under-Secretary on the favourable statement he had been able to give on the Indian accounts; and he was sure that every person in the House and in the country at large was firmly persuaded of the excellence of the Government of India as conducted by Lord Morley and the Under-Secretary of State. There was one point not raised in the debate, the terrible old fallacy that India could never be governed by democracy. He supposed that that fallacy had passed away for ever. If anybody believed that it was equivalent to saying we were throwing up India in despair, but if it was looked at for a moment and regard was had to who had been the strongest Secretaries for India the names of Lord Morley and Sir Henry Fowler would be admitted to be amongst them, and if democracy was able to produce men of that calibre then it showed that India was able to be governed by democracy.

*SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.) associated himself with the previous speakers in congratulating the Under-Secretary of State on the statement that he had made. He had made it in a manner which convinced hon. Members that he compared not unfavourably with his illustrious chief. On behalf of those Members of the House who had served in India he thanked the right hon. Gentleman for his invariable courtesy and above all for his accessibility, which was a great virtue in an official. He had heard many of the observations which had been made with regard to the educational system in India, with feelings of amazement. When he took a broad view of the matter the one feeling that predominated in his mind was that of pride and exultation that England should have been able to work out so grand a system with such magnificent results. It could not be a very bad system which enabled foreigners speaking another language and living thousands of miles away to come to this country and compete with the cream of our own youth in our universities and beat them at their own tests. Within ten years there had been two senior wranglers at Cambridge, who were natives of India. The great bulk of the carping criticism which had been heard that afternoon on the educational system of India was wholly misplaced. The question of unrest in India had been discussed from various points of view, but if he might say so respectfully, none of the speeches made, not even that of the hon. Member for Merthyr, had really gone to the root of the matter. It was not merely a question of reform. We might grant concessions—nobody knew what they were at present, but it might be assumed that they were good, beneficial, and in the interests of the Indian people—but concessions and reforms such as were contemplated would not allay the discontent and unrest which were now so strongly seen in India. The real cause of that discontent and unrest lay in the spirit and policy of our administration and until that was changed they would not remove this discontent. The great question was, were we to govern India through, by, and in conformity with the wishes of the people, or to govern them as we were doing at present. entirely irrespective of and too often in direct opposition to, their wishes. Although he had a very high admiration for the late Viceroy of India, whose great qualities, all who knew him must recognise, he could not but admit that upon Lord Curzon rested in a large measure the responsibility for governing India irrespective of, and too often against, the wishes of the people. The climax of that policy was reached when he determined upon the partition of Bengal, which was one of the greatest errors, and one of the most profound blunders that were ever committed by the alien governors of a foreign country. But what was the real wrong? It was that it was an administrative act carried out in direct opposition to the wishes of the people affected. Thousands of meetings had been held to protest against it, and there had not been the faintest recognition of them by this country. Petitions of protest and telegrams innumerable had been sent to the Government of India, and to the Secretary of State, but they had been ignored. This defiance of popular opinion was the main cause of the discontent. When he left the Province of Bengal six years ago there was hardly a word heard of unrest and it was solely due to the policy of the Government that it had arisen. Bengal was the most important province of India, and what Bengal thought to-day, the rest of India generally thought to morrow. But what had been done to soothe matters in other provinces? Let them look at Madras. Gentlemen of position in that province had been prosecuted for sedition, and the Courts had sentenced them to transportation for life. That was a monstrous thing. What was the result of sentences of that kind? It was that they drove the peaceable citizens of Madras into the ssme degree of irritation and unrest as existed in Bengal. It was the same in Bombay. The most influential citizen of Bombay was being now proceeded against for sedition, and it would be improper under the circumstances to comment upon the proceedings, but he thought that to seize the present moment to prosecute the most popular man in Bombay was simply suicidal. If the Government wanted to create discontent and unrest in Bombay they had certainly adopted the very best means of attaining their object. As to the violence of the Indian Press it was no doubt very bad in some cases, but he was bound to say there was considerable justification for it in the language used by our own Anglo-Indian Press of India. He had seen articles calling the most distinguished natives of India polecats and cowards, and some of the papers even appealed to the authorities to flog the Congress leaders. What was the remedy? That was the real question. We were face to face with a situation of extraordinary difficulty; and nothing short of a reconstructed form of Indian Government would meet the case. He noticed that in a speech in the House of Lords the other day, Lord Morley referred to this question. He said—

> "For my part, I have no ambition to undertake such a task.'

He might have no ambition to undertake the task, but unless he faced the great problem of reconstructing the form of Indian government, neither he nor the Government he represented would ever get to the bottom of the unrest and discontent. What was the present form of Government? It was administration through the Indian Civil Service. He knew something of the Indian Civil Service; probably no man in England knew more than himself. Both his father and grandfather served thirty years in the Service; he was cradled in it and rose from the lowest to the highest place, becoming a Governor of a province, and served thirty-five years in it; and he had a son now serving in it. His family connection with the Service therefore extended considerably over 100 years, and he ought to know something about it. The Service had done magnificent work in the past; it was a splendid Service, and he was proud to have belonged to it; but, like other great institutions, it had had its day, and the time had come when it was bound to pass away and make room for an improved, altered, and more representative system of government. The Indian Civil Service was consistent only with absolute autocracy and a bureaucratic form of rule. It was really suited only to the government of a people by foreigners. The time had come when it was necessary to review the position which the march of events had rendered untenable, and the Government would have to consider in some way or another this large question of the reconstruction of the Indian Civil Service. All judicial appointments—he was speaking generally and not in regard to backward tracts—should be taken away from that service, and should be held exclusively by those who were trained in the knowledge and practice of the law. Judicial duties should no longer be left in the hands of officers who were wholly executive in their training and habits. That was one great change which would have to be effected, and we should also have to adopt a more popular and representative form of executive administration. At the time the Civil Service was organised it was felt, and rightly felt that India must be governed on an autocratic, one-man-rule method. We had got beyond that now, and expected Liberal statesmen, when they were responsible for the affairs of India to look at the question from an altered point of view. Did hon. Members believe that any form of administration of a country could be permanent when it was in the hands of a small number of foreign emigrants, pilgrims and strangers who were continually coming and going, and who, while in India, were in a state of isolation in religion, ideas, and manners from the people of the country? We could no longer continue to govern India on lines suited only to a slavish and ignorant population. And yet that was what we were endeavouring to do when we declined to face the problem of reconstructing a form of administration which was established more than 100 years ago, and which the course of events had rendered altogether inappropriate to the present time. He could conceive no more ignoble and unworthy policy than that a great Power like England should avowedly continue to govern the Indian people with the deliberate intention of holding them in perpetual subjection and with the set purpose of preventing their advance to freedom. That he laid down as a broad principle, which ought to meet with general acceptance on a Liberal Front Bench. But when they came to discuss the problem of the future of India they were met as Lord Morley met them in a speech he once made by saying: "You are crying for the moon." Even Lord Courtney, good friend to India as he was, had suggested that these were mere idle dreams. And yet these things were not idle dreams in the eyes of the people of India. We had imparted our Western ideas to them; they had learnt from us the conception of freedom; and, when they were trying to develop it and work it out, instead of co-operating with them and assisting and encouraging them so as to bridge over the disturbance which must inevitably exist in any change in the form of Government, we resorted to coercion and transportation, sometimes even without trial. These remedies would never meet the existing situation, and that was why he urged that a Committee of the House should be appointed in order to consider these wide questions, to take evidence from all points of view, and to advise the English nation on the course which should be followed. The present moment in India was critical. There was no doubt about that. So far from our difficulties being over we were only on the threshold of them, and what might happen in the future depended entirely on the wisdom, sagacity, and Liberalism with which this crisis might be met by the Secretary of State and the Under-Secretary.

MR. BUCHANAN said the debate had travelled over a considerable area and many most interesting speeches had been made, but he did not think it was incumbent on him to reply in detail to them. He had occupied a great deal of time already, and he did not think it would be fair if he were to occupy much of it now. He had listened to all the speeches with great interest and they had been most suggestive, and he hoped they would be helpful to the Secretary of State in the difficult task that lay before him. He confessed there were some things in the speech of his hon. friend the Member for East Nottingham which would not exactly make their task easier, because he must really recognise, as other speakers had, that they could only go gradually in advance. They had shown their willingness to do that, and he hoped that, when their scheme was produced, the fair mind of Members and of his hon. friend himself would acknowledge that they were endeavouring to take a real step in advance. He could not help thinking, whilst his hon. friend was speaking, that perhaps some of the sentiments to which he gave expression would not render a gradual and somewhat limited advance in the first stages as acceptable as it otherwise might have been. But he welcomed the statements made by other hon. Members. They had had an interesting speech from the hon. Member for Bradford, which was full of suggestive ideas, and they had had an interesting speech from the hon. Member for Merthyr, and although he did not profess that they would be able to agree with the proposals in detail made by the hon. Member, they were practical proposals put forward in a practical way. They had them under his name in the dossier at the India Office, and they were prepared to consider them in detail with other practical and substantial proposals which he had from time to time thought right to put his name to. The general point raised had been the question of education. As he had said in his opening remarks, they did not spend so much money on education as they would like to, but the amount had increased and was increasing. Instead of the figure being something like £1,600,000, they really spent out of public funds in India more like £2,600,000, and they were progressing in that direction. Action had been taken upon the Report of the Commission referred to, and they had been doing a certain amount with regard to technical and agricultural education, and, he hoped, they would be able to do more with regard to vernacular education. Technical education was rather a difficult matter. It was an expensive form of education to start, and he was bound to state from information he had obtained that some of their efforts had not been wholly successful and acceptable to those for whose benefit they had been intended. They hoped, however, that the difficulties might be obviated by arrangements better suited to the desires and occupations of the different localities in India. They were very much alive to all the suggestions which had been made with regard to education, and particularly to the suggested improvements in administration. Principally on financial grounds they could not undertake largely to increase the amount of money they could afford to spend upon education in the future. It was one of the subjects, certainly, Lord Morley had very really at heart, and he hoped to make very substantial progress during the time he remained in office. Although the debate on the Amendment had been exceedingly wide there were hon. Members who wished to speak on other subjects which would not be in order on this Amendment. In order that they might have that opportunity it was desirable that the discussion on the Amendment should come to a conclusion so that the remainder of the time at their disposal might be devoted to other subjects.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth) said that the debate was a distinct improvement upon previous debates, for there had been exhibited a real desire to approach the question of the Government of India in a sincerely sympathetic spirit. He did not wish to refer to the criticisms which had been passed upon a few Indian representative members of the Indian Civil Service, but he thought he was justified in protesting against the language used in another place by a distinguished nobleman who once held the position of Viceroy.

*MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that it was contrary to custom to answer in the House of Commons speeches made in another place.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL said that under the circumstances he would not pursue that subject. He wished, however, to associate himself with what had fallen from the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, whose able speech had shown the utmost toleration, and he felt sure that the feeling of the House generally was that the hon. Member had been most grossly maligned. He had been maligned himself, but perhaps in a less degree. His name had also been associated with the Extremists in India, but his own opinion was that Extremists, either in India or Ireland, were a positive danger to reform and good Government. He wished to associate himself with the appeal which had been made to the India Office to re-consider the partition of Bengal. On this subject he had always spoken with the utmost moderation, as he absolutely recognised that there was a very strong case in favour of the partition which was considered necessary in order to help the Government to carry out its duties. But admitting that, he could not understand why the India Office sat on its heels and refused to recognise that a great protest had been made. Those who protested were absolutely loyal subjects and embraced some of the greatest and most distinguished natives of India. The men who pressed this matter most on the Government were the territorial aristocracy. Three of the most distinguished men in Bengal who were behind this protest were refused a hearing at Calcutta, and that he could not understand. The eminent officials at the India Office were the salt of the Indian Civil Service, and why a body of that sort should refuse to listen to the arguments of the Bengali people passed his understanding. He begged the House to use the influence it possessed to press the India Office to smooth this matter over and arrange the partition in such a way as to obviate the breaking up of the Bengali people. He would not enter into any elaborate argument in regard to this partition. When 45,000,000 of people spoke the same language it was a considerable argument in favour of their ancient rights to be called a nation. Bengal was a nation, and the people there had spoken the language for centuries; as long as the English people had spoken English. The only claim they made was to be allowed to keep the Bengali-speaking districts under one governor. It was a reasonable request. During the past three years much wrong had been done and much bitterness had been aroused, and he believed that the feeling against British government would go on as long as we insisted on this partition. He was ready to say that British Government in India was an absolute necessity for the civilisation of India. He could not express his opinion too strongly as to the necessity of giving the Government every possible form of support when it had to deal with such crimes as had recently been committed, but if the Government of India was to receive that support from the people of India the only way to justify our rule was by listening to the reasonable demands of the people of that country and by doing justice without too much regard for the *amour propre* of officials.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said he would like to join in the appeal which had been made by hon. Members in regard to the partition of Bengal. It must seem exceedingly strange to the people of India that we in this country should take so much interest in their education. There could be no doubt that in all of the more essential matters of education the people of India were 1,000 years ahead of the British. He had recently seen a description of a University in India, which flourished about 1,500 years ago, where there were 100 lecture-pulpits from which 100 professors could simultaneously address the 10,000 students who were there assembled. He was not sure that the education there given was such as was suited for a conquering people. He rather thought there was some truth in the remark of a Scottish sergeant, who was with the British Army when it was conquering Upper Burmah. Referring to the Buddhist priests, who would not fight nor ask the people to fight because they considered it wrong to kill, he said "They are no use." The Hindoos were ahead of us in the more important parts of education, religion, and philosophy, but for a conquering nation it was more important to know how to shoot and to fight, how to lie and steal. With regard to the quality of our rule in India, one test of Government was the death-rate. In the year 1884–5 the death-rate was

26 per 1,000, and in 1904–5 it was 35 per 1,000, an increase of over 40 per cent. in a period of twenty years.

*MR. REES: That was because the earlier statistics were not accurate.

*MR. LUPTON said that was what was always stated when statistics were inconvenient. The Civil Service in India were quite capable of collecting statistics twenty years ago. The death-rate in India had increased owing to a state of things which was hardly a credit to this country. Many people there had not money to buy food. Tha extra Assistant Commissioner of Ferozepore reported that men in many of the villages do not get food for two meals in twenty-four hours. In the province of Agra, and Oudh, the Collector of Etawa wrote—

> "The united earnings of a man, his wife and two children cannot be put at more than 4s. a month. This income will enable the family to have one fairly good meal a day."

The Collector of Banda wrote—

> "A very large number of the lower classes of the population clearly demonstrate by the poorness of their physique that they are habitually half-starved, or have been in early years exposed to the severities of a famine."

The Commissioner of Fyzabad quoted Mr. Bennett's statement that—

> "It is not until he has gone into these subjects in detail that a man can fully appreciate how terribly thin the line is which divides large masses of people from absolute nakedness and starvation."

and the Commissioner added—

> "I believe that remark is true of every district of Oudh."

The same Commissioner wrote—

> "It has been calculated that about sixty per cent. of the entire native population are sunk in such abject poverty that unless the small earnings of child-labour are added to the small general stock by which the family is kept alive, some of the members would starve."

He could give quotation after quotation from Indian officials to the effect that the people had not enough to live upon. The plague, of which they had heard so much, was only a symptom of a state of things in India which was hardly creditable to our Government. The first thing a good Government should do was to see that its people were well-fed and not half-starved; and how could the people be well-fed when the income of the natives over great parts of India was only ½d. per day? That was the glorious Empire in India which the House was asked to uphold. In his opinion, the sooner a Government which was unable to support its people came to an end the better. The reason was that the crops raised by the people of India were not sufficient and that production was going down. In the Central Provinces the produce per acre was only 372 lbs. per annum, whereas the Government estimate was 600 lbs. In Berar, for nine years ending 1900, the average product of wheat per annum was only 144½ per acre as against 2,000 lbs. in England. Here they had proof that India was not in a condition sufficient to support the people. The reason for that was that the taxes extorted from the people were excessive, and accordingly they went to the money lender, and the money lender compelled them to sell their grain at once and at a low price. The consequence was that they could not get stock to manure the land, the land got worse, the people became poorer, and when a failure of rain came they had to starve. All that was done for the sake of maintaining great armaments in India. It had been said that India was lightly taxed, but the taxation had greatly increased in twenty years. The Indian Budget for 1887–8 showed that the amount of revenue to be raised was 774,000,000 rupees, whereas the estimate for 1907–8 was 1,116,000,000 rupees, or an increase in twenty years of 44 per cent., and a great part of that extra taxation had been got out of the land. If the revenue from land was taken, the figure for 1887–8 was, in round numbers, 229,000,000 rupees; whereas in 1907–8 it amounted to 304,000,000 rupees, or an increase of 32 per cent. If, however, instead of taking the land revenue alone, the items of irrigation and forests were added, the total revenue from the soil in 1887–8 was 246,000,000 rupees, and in 1907–8, 383,000,000 rupees, showing an increase of 55 per cent. He would now consider what this money raised from the poor people of India was spent upon. In 1887–8 the Army, including expenditure on military works, cost India 205,000,000 rupees; in 1907–8 it had increased to 309,000,000 rupees, an increase of 50 per cent. The great bugbear of Russia no longer existed, and there was no justification whatever of such a terrible increase in expenditure on armaments. But take the expenditure on salaries and the expenses of the Civil Department. That was in 1887–8, 250,000,000 rupees, contrasted with 379,000,000 rupees in 1907–8, or an increase of 51 per cent. The total expenditure on the Civil Service, collection, pensions, and Army had increased from 455,000,000 rupees in 1887–8, to 688,000,000 rupees in 1907–8, an increase of 51 per cent. The Hindoo got very little benefit from all that. He would compare the expenditure in India with the expenditure in England to show how the former told on the poor. The total income of the entire population of India was estimated by Digby at £284,000,000 a year. It was calculated that the income of the people of the United Kingdom was £1,800,000,000, or more than six times as much. If we spent on our Army, Navy, and Civil Service in proportion to our wealth, what was spent in India, we would spend £275,000,000 instead of £94,000,000. There was no wonder that there was unrest in India. It seemed to him that the House should calmly consider whether it intended to bleed India white, and go on taking from the poor Indian people those taxes from which they got no return. It would be very easy to reduce the taxation in India if native instead of European servants and administrators were employed. The wages of a European were forty times those of a Hindoo, and there was, therefore, no wonder that India was being ruined. The rupee had come down in twenty years, but the price of wheat, the chief product of the India ryot, had come down in like ratio, and the ryots had to pay 1½ rupees for every rupee they paid in taxation twenty years ago. He would not go further into this, as he thought he had said quite enough to show that the case of India required serious reconsideration. The plagues and famines would never be got rid of until this extravagant expenditure on the Army and Civil Services was stopped, and taxation was also stopped altogether in the poor districts for some five years or so, in order that the cultivators of India might recover. They were the hardest worked and most industrious people in the world, and if some hope was given to them that what they earned would go to them and their family, in that way India might in twenty years again become a prosperous country. At present our rule did no good to India. India had been called a rich country and was until we went there and destroyed their manufactures and their shipping. We had done this by laws deliberately passed to bring that about. We were now destroying their agriculture, their last resource, by excessive taxation, and it would be a disgrace to this country and to the party to which he belonged if they did not, now that they were in power, take the opportunity of trying to stop the ruin of India and of the people who, for a time, were committed to our care in that country.

Question "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and agreed to.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. MACLEAN (Bath) rose to call attention to the Motion standing in his name dealing with the condition of the church accommodation for soldiers of the Anglican community in India. It raised, he said, a question of national importance. The difficulty arose in this way. In 1860 certain Regulations were made by the Government of India for the provision of churches for British troops in India, and under Rule 3 a church was provided for the Roman Catholic and for the Protestant communities in the Army. That rule laid down that the word "Protestant" should include Wesleyans, Presbyterians, and other denominations. It was understood that there should not be more than one Protestant church provided, and certain regulations were drawn up, but under this rule that church was to be under the control of the authority of the Anglican Church in India. For thirty years that rule had never been acquiesced in by the Scottish Church authority. It met with a certain sense of satisfaction because it was interpreted in a tolerant spirit. But a change came over the tolerant attitude in 1897, and certain revised rules were contemplated to provide that in the event of any dispute with regard to the use of the church, so far as the military authorities were concerned the final appeal should be to the Commander-in-Chief of the station. If the question of want of accommodation in Protestant churches for these Protestant communities had been left to the military or the Civil authority no difficulty would have arisen, but the decision was left to the ecclesiastical authorities, and in spite of all the efforts of the Civil Government there the difficulty had remained persistent. Some of the hardships which the Scottish regiments had to suffer with regard to this were very great. They had no church set apart for the Scottish chaplain, and frequently had to worship in the school-room or music hall where the remains of the last night's entertainment had been left, which did not tend to a spirit of reverence. The position was that the Scottish regiments sent to India had to pivot around Presbyterian places of worship except in cases of military emergency. What was the result? He mentioned the glaring case of the 2nd Battalion Gordon Highlanders. For years they had been near the frontier expecting to take their place in the recent war. When they were at Peshawar they were ordered to march to the front. Subsequently they received an order to go back to Calcutta, where they now were, and the Manchester regiment was moved right up to the north to take the place of the Gordon Highlanders. Everybody would agree that that was extremely hard lines on the Gordon Highlanders, who had been waiting on the Frontier to take their proper part in the campaign. What was the consequence? The Gordon Highlanders were in Calcutta to-day and were not in a state of mutiny, but of great unrest and discontent, on account of the hardships imposed on them owing to the uncharitable action of the Anglican authorities in India. The regulations enforced were ridiculous. The idea that Scottish regiments were to pivot around such meagre provision as might be made for Presbyterians, while other regiments coming many years later could be moved about the whole of India in accordance with military necessity, was enough to break the heart of any soldier in any regiment in the British Army. He ventured to hope that whatever might be the difficulties in the way of the Secretary of State he would see that for the future the Government building set apart for religious worship should not be consecrated to the use of any one denomination, but should be open and free to all in the British Army. So long as such churches were claimed for one denomination they should be kept at the sole expense of that denomination. He hoped a common-sense opinion would prevail upon those who were at present standing in the way of a reasonable settlement of a most irritating problem.

*MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) said that the Scottish Members, believed that the Scottish regiments were under a great disadvantage at the present time because they were not sent to places to which otherwise they would be sent as there was no place there in which they could worship. They had no wish to make any complaint against the Anglican Church except to say that these were Government churches, and that Presbyterian services ought to be allowed to be conducted in them. But the Anglican authorities had gone further than not providing facilities, they had actually when they had allowed Presbyterians to worship in these churches, forbidden the ministers of the Scottish churches to administer the Communion there. That was a great insult. These churches were built by the Government out of public money and the clergy were mostly paid by public money. As these churches were built, maintained and supported by public money they ought to be as free for the administration of the Presbyterian Communion as the administration of the Anglican Communions. They did not quarrel with either the Anglicans or the Roman Catholics, but they did say that for the Scottish troops to be kept at Calcutta and not given the same chance as other regiments, because there was not a Presbyterian church in a district to which otherwise they would be sent, was a grievance under which they ought not to be allowed to suffer. At the present time the Scottish regiments were being unfairly treated because they were kept in places where there was not a Presbyterian church. If in other places they were allowed to worship in the same churches as the other denominations they would have the same chances as other regiments.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said it was stated in the White Paper recently issued that this was a question between the Church of Scotland and the Government on one hand, and the Church of England and the Government on the other; but all the churches in Scotland had the same interest in the matter as the Church of Scotland, and the whole of Scotland was unanimous and felt very deeply upon the point. He quite recognised that the scandal attending the consecration of churches in India would, under the Secretary of State's despatch, now cease, but he did not think the suggested remedy would be accepted as such, either by Scotland or by Scotsmen in the Army. The official papers referred to six or seven Scottish Infantry battalions, but they by no means represented all the Scottish soldiers in India. The artillery was very largely recruited in Scotland and in many of the cavalry and other regiments they found a large proportion of Scotsmen. They had to consider not six or seven Scottish battalions, but the Presbyterians in the Army, and he ventured to say other Protestants who were probably even a larger proportion of the Army. The present system under which the Anglican bishop or chaplain had the right to prohibit services of any other denomination in churches erected by the Government of India was intolerable. It had been worked without much Christian feeling, and they would never consent to the present arrangement. It was proposed in the last despatch that a Scottish regiment should be concentrated where there was an unconsecrated church. That was extremely unsatisfactory. Those who went into the military service wanted to go where there was likely to be work, and in many of the frontier places they would not find an unconsecrated place of worship, and again the unconsecrated places often compared unfavourably with the consecrated places of worship. It was not quite fair to call upon the people of India to provide churches for every variety of Christianity that happened to be represented in India, and the principle that there should be one Protestant Church in each station was the soundest. They therefore asked and expected that Protestants who did not happen to be Anglicans should be allowed to hold their services, solemnise marriages, baptisms, and the sacraments in the churches provided by the Government, and that no Government grant should be given to such churches from which they were excluded. It was not a matter which could be left to the discretion of the bishops of the Anglican Church; it was not from them that they sought their rights; they sought them from the Government.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) said that very strong feeling on the subject had been roused in Scotland, and he scarcely thought the Secretary of State had realised the strength of that feeling, or he would not have issued the report or suggestion referred to. He noticed the other day that in reply to a question the Under-Secretary referred to these Protestants as Nonconformists.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I never used that word.

Mr. C. E. PRICE said he did not catch the expression himself, but it appeared in the report of the right hon. Gentleman's Answer. He might have used it unwittingly.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Never; it must be a mistake of the reporters.

Mr. C. E. PRICE said he was aware that the right hon. Gentleman might say they intended to make provision for all Presbyterian soldiers in the different stations in India, but that would not meet the case. There were other soldiers beside Presbyterians, and the only way in which they could meet the difficulty was to allow all denominations to use the churches. He, therefore, suggested that no further grant should be made to the churches, either for capital expenditure or maintenance, unless they had an assurance that they would be open to the various denominations represented by the soldiers. It was nothing short of a scandal that they should place an annual charge for the churches upon the people of India, who were of an entirely different religion. If there was to be any charge, it should be placed upon this country, or, on the other hand, they should rely upon the Christian communities to support their own churches.

MR. BUCHANAN said he quite agreed with his colleagues from Scotland that Scotland and Scottish soldiers had a grievance, and he shared their natural feeling with regard to the action taken by the officials of the Anglican Church; but they must look at the facts. There was one sentence in the White Paper which was not read by the hon. Member for Bath, and to which no one else had paid any regard. It was the kernel of the whole matter. When the difficulty arose, and it became serious, the Secretary of State in 1899, Lord George Hamilton, took the legal opinions of Mr. Cohen and two other authorities and had it confirmed by the opinion of law officers of the Crown. Their opinion was that under the form in which permission was given by the Government of India to consecrate the churches, the bishops had sole control over them. They had got the right side of the law. The present position of affairs was that when this grievance arose they took the best course available, and found out what the grievance was. They found out that the best side of the law was with the church authorities. What was to be done? Surely the best course was that in future from that time onwards no church which was built out of the revenues of India should be allowed to be consecrated, so that this difficulty could not occur in the future in any church built out of the revenues of India after 1899. In that matter he thought they had done their best. The Government had endeavoured at the principal stations in India to supply facilities for Presbyterian soldiers to worship at their own churches, and that surely was the desire of Scottish Members. He thought Scottish soldiers should have proper facilities for attending the Scottish Church. [AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Wesleyans?] Surely hon. Members did not propose that they should go back upon the agreement they had made with the authorities of those consecrated buildings. How could they possibly do that? They had observed that agreement for five years, and it was a binding arrangement. As he had already said the authorities of the church had the best side of the law, and how could they alter that state of things by putting pressure upon the Government of India? Personally he was not in favour of altering the law so as to upset what had been done before 1899, because he did not think that would be fair. The Government were doing everything in their power to supply this want and remedy the difficulty which had occurred by building other churches at the principal stations.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said the reply which had just been given was not at all satisfactory. They were very much astonished to find that one particular Church had an exclusive right to use buildings provided by public money. He thought that was most unfair. A great many things had been legally done in this country which were unfair, but that did not mean that they should continue for ever, and the argument used in this connection by the right hon. Gentleman was in his opinion nonsense. Why did they disestablish the Irish Church, if they could not alter something which had legally been done? The House ought to insist upon having fair play to all sects in India. He appealed to the Under-Secretary for India to see that justice was done to the Presbyterians, and he hoped the law would be altered so as to permit all buildings built and maintained by public money to be used by all religious sects. They might be told that the Episcopalian Church was so powerful that the Government dare not go against them, but that was not the opinion of the people of Scotland or England. There was a very strong feeling about this matter, and the sooner the right hon. Gentleman gave way to it the better it would be for himself and the Indian Government, and for everybody else concerned. The right hon. Gentleman acknowledged that it was wrong and that it was an injustice. Therefore, let them have justice done to all the people, and let the Government understand that they must not favour the Episcopalian Church more than any other church. This matter could not rest as it was. The right hon. Gentleman congratulated himself on the fact that they could not take a division now; if they could have done so his tone would have been very different, but he might clearly understand that the injustice complained of must be speedily remedied.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire) said it was perfectly clear that the English law affecting the consecration of buildings did not apply in British India. The Under-Secretary for India had referred to some legal opinion, but unfortunately, no details were given. The difficulty in this matter had arisen from the supineness of the Government of India. The complaint was that the Government ought never to have given such a guarantee as that which had been referred to. He could appreciate the difficulties which had arisen in consequence of that, and he could appreciate also what the hon. Gentleman had said about no further church being consecrated; but when he turned up the despatch he found it stated in general terms that no church was in future to be consecrated for the Church of England except where church accommodation had been set apart for those of other creeds. He did not consider that that went far enough. He considered that where churches were built with Government money an exclusive right should not be given to any particular denomination. It seemed to him that so far as existing churches were concerned public money ought not to be given unless the Government were to have the control of them. He hoped the Under-Secretary would be able to give a satisfactory answer on that point.

MR. BRIGHT (Oldham) said he wished to speak on behalf of Nonconformists who might be with the Army in India. It was a monstrous condition of things that churches that had been built from the monies of others in India and also from the Indian Exchequer should be devoted to the use of any particular sect. He was not at all content to hear that Presbyterians were to be provided for in the future throughout India. Wesleyans and other Nonconformists had just as much right to be regarded as Presbyterians, and there should be no unfair discrimination on behalf of the Anglican Church. Surely, it was in the power of the Government of India to cease to pay sums of money to the churches. He had a strong impression that when the clergy found that the money was not forthcoming they would modify their views. He hoped the Government would be able to take a view which would have some regard for Nonconformists generally.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it appears from the Accounts presented to Parliament that in 1906–7 the Revenue of India amounted to £73,144,554, the expenditure charged against Revenue to £71,555,179, and the Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue to £8,712,668.—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Resolution to be reported.

GRAND JURY (IRELAND) ACT (1836) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:

CAPTAIN CRAIG moved an Amendment to insert at the beginning the words, "Subject to the provisions of this Act." He explained that this Amendment was necessary, so that a subsequent Amendment which he intended to move on Clause 2 might be in order. The Amendment he intended to move on subsection (2) of Clause 2 was to insert the words, "not exceeding one-half of the whole." The effect of that would be to prevent a county council from having to defray more than half of the expenditure involved in works which it might be decided to carry out. He simply wished to ask the Chief Secretary or the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture whether he was willing to insert the words, "not exceeding one-half of the whole." He brought the Amendment forward because everyone knew that on the seaboard the local representatives on the county council had not the same voice as those who represented inland districts in matters of expenditure. Everyone knew the difficulty of getting anything spent out of the rates for the fishing industry or for piers and harbours in Ireland. His Amendment would be in favour of those who are carrying on the fishing industry. When the Bill got its Second Reading on the previous night the Chief Secretary would not say a word in explanation, and the reason why he had put down his Amendment was to try and elicit from him why the Bill was introduced at all. Clause 1 was right enough, because it carried out the wishes of Parliament; but Clause 2 seemed to have been introduced under the influence of a single follower of the Government. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to insert the words 'Subject to the provisions of this Act.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.) thought the hon. and gallant Member did not exactly realise what was intended to be done by the Bill. At the present time the expenditure of a county council on a pier or similar work was limited to £300. The Department was willing to contribute a certain sum in aid of what the counties were entitled to spend, but there were some works they could not afford to assist unless the county councils were prepared to give more money than that authorised by the Grand Juries Act. It was to meet this difficulty that the Bill had been introduced. Quite recently the County Council of Antrim desired to do some work at Ballintoy. They were bound not to go beyond £300, but the Department had agreed to give £1,000, and the work would be carried out. It was proposed by the Bill that £1,500 should take the place of £300. The remainder of the clause merely dealt with procedure. Under the Grand Juries Act the money had to be paid into the hands of the county treasurer. The clause declared that in the case of the Department giving the money that would not be necessary. The Bill was desired by every maritime county in Ireland

CAPTAIN CRAIG said that last night the Vice-President had stated that the reason £300 was increased to £1,500 was that in the reign of King William IV. £300 meant more than it did now.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: That was a point I put forward.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: The only point.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Oh, no. It was quite true, however, that the cost of labour and material had increased since those days, but the real reason of the Bill was that works were being delayed, and he hoped the House would see its way to rid the county councils of the impediment. He did not see that Members from the North of Ireland or elsewhere had anything to gain by stopping the county councils from spending the rates as they desired.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) said that from force of habit the right hon. Gentleman had only stated half the case. He had mentioned the case of Ballintoy in which he had interested himself, but had been unable to get a money grant. Now that the right hon. Gentleman's solitary follower was Member for the division in which Ballintoy was situated it was possible to get a grant. The existing law was that the county council could give £300 and no more, and the Department accordingly had to give £1,000. He thought that was very satisfactory. What would be the position if the Bill passed? The right hon. Gentleman would say that the Department would put down £300 if the county council paid £1,000. There would be few seaboard members on a county council, and would they be able to persuade the other members to give £1,000? It could not be done in the North of Ireland. The real object of the Bill was to allow the Department to put the screw on the county councils, and say: "If you do not find £1,500 as the Bill authorises you, we will not put down £50," knowing perfectly well that it was almost impossible in Ireland to get a county council to make a charge over the whole county for the purpose. The only proper way out of this was what the right hon. Gentleman was trying to avoid. If there was to be a contribution, half should come from the county and the other half from the Department, instead of which the right hon. Gentleman was trying to get the Department a free hand to bleed the county councils for the full £1,500 a year, and if they did not agree the Department would do nothing. In the interests of the fishermen, in whom the right hon. Gentleman had never interested himself until very recently, and of the seaworks along the North Coast of Ireland of which he spoke so sneeringly it was necessary that these piers should be provided, and that the condition should not be imposed on the county councils of providing more than half the whole sum which meant that the Department should provide the other half.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.) said his experience of seven or eight years of local government was that county councils took a very broad view of all these questions which were brought before them. He remembered that some four or five years ago the county council of his own county unanimously agreed to a liability which represented a large sum in connection with maritime works in the county, although the great majority of the constituencies, owing to their distance from the sea, did not benefit in the least from the proposed maritime works. This Bill was, in his opinion, a very useful measure. On many occasions in his own county they had been considerably hampered by reason of the fact that they could not exceed the limit imposed by the law, and he congratulated the Vice-President of the Agricultural Department upon bringing in this Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 26; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 211.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Clark, George Smith
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hills, J. W.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Moore, William
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Captain Craig and Mr. Lonsdale.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Armitage, R.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Bryce, J. Annan
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Devlin, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius

Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N)
Middlebrook, William
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H.(Denbighs)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A. H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL moved a new clause providing that nothing in the Bill should prejudicially affect any right of the Crown or of Government Departments.

New clause (Saving of rights of the Crown and Government Departments)—(*Mr. T. W. Russell*)—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. MOORE thought that when they had the Second Reading of the Bill on Tuesday night, and the Committee stage rushed through at the end of the session on Wednesday night, it was at least the duty of the Government, if there was a new clause, to put it on the Paper in order that the House might see it. Failing that course, the Government might at least have the courtesy to say what the new clause was. He moved to report progress in order that the House might see the new clause on the Paper. The House ought to have the opportunity of considering the new clause, and if the Bill stood over for a day it could do so. He objected on principle to a new clause, which was not on the Paper, being rushed through at that time of night.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Moore.*)

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the clause simply read: "Nothing in this Act shall affect prejudicially any right, power, or privilege invested in or exercisable by the Crown or any Government Department." He wished to explain that the clause was not put down because he had not thought it was necessary and inasmuch——

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I must first put the Motion to report progress unless the hon. Member withdraws.

Mr. MOORE said there had been a recent decision in Ireland in connection with which he would like to consider the new clause, and he could not withdraw his Motion to report progress.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 26; Noes, 144. (Division List No. 212.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Clark, George Smith
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hills, J. W.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Moore and Mr. Lonsdale.

NOES.

Abraham William (Cork N.E.)
Acland Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Armitage, R.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Devlin, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward

Mr. Caldwell.

Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Jones, Lief (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.
Middlebrook, William
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Whitbread, Howard

White, Sir George (Norfolk)	Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)	Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)	
White, Patrick (Meath, North)	Wilson, W.T. (Westhoughton)	

Original Question again proposed.

MR. MOORE wished to know from some Member of the Government as the Attorney-General for Ireland was not present to help the House on points of law, whether, under the Grand Jury Acts, the Crown was bound. Perhaps the Minister in charge of the Bill could tell them. If he could not, then they had better wait for the further consideration of the Bill till he could. When they had a new Bill like that they were entitled to know whether it went beyond the Acts which it proposed to amend. He hoped he would receive a reply.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) asked if he might suggest that the Government should restore to the Orange Party the right to kick the King's Crown into the Boyne.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the Orange Party never had that right.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said he had already explained that the draughtsman of the Bill considered that the Crown was protected by the Grand Jury Acts, and that all that was done by the Bill was to enlarge the expenditure. It was in order to keep all the security and protection necessary that the clause had been inserted to guard against any mistake.

MR. MOORE said that surely if the Crown was bound by the Grand Jury Acts it was not necessary to move that Amendment. He put it to the good sense of the Committee that, if the Parliamentary draughtsman was of opinion that the ground had already been covered by the Grand Jury Act and if it was not the intention of those in charge of the Bill to extend the Grand Jury Act, they should be very careful of the mere *ipse dixit* of the Treasury. The House ought to have an opportunity to consider the matter, and he would like to know whether advice had been given by any law officer that the Amendment was necessary. It might lead to very far-reaching results. He was as anxious as any other Member of the House to protect the rights of the Crown—but by the new clause so far as they had had an opportunity of considering it (which meant having it read by the Clerk at the Table) not only the rights of the Crown were protected but the rights of any and every Department. He supposed even the Estates Commissioners came into it. The House ought to have had an opportunity to consider the terms of a proposal which might be so very large in its operation. He asked once more, had any legal man of reputation, apart from the Treasury, said the Amendment was necessary? If not, he did not think the Amendment was necessary and the House ought not to proceed with it.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had taken into his confidence and consulted the Member for North Antrim on the subject.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL moved a further new clause, the words of which, he said, were taken from the Grand Jury Act and it was desirable that they should be repeated.

Clause read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. WALTER LONG said there was obviously no objection to the principle of the clause which the right hon. Gentleman had moved, but he was bound to say that it was unreasonable for hon. Gentlemen opposite who desired as he desired to go to bed, but who having no interest in this legislation expressed their desire to go to bed by shouting "Divide." It was unreasonable and improper to do that when the Government in this legislation were adopting a course which he believed to be without precedent. He ventured to say that when the Unionists were responsible for government, if they had brought in a Bill, read it a second time on Tuesday, moved it in Committee on the following night, and had then on the second night asked the Committee to insert two new clauses, one after the other, neither being on the paper, hon. Gentlemen who were impatient at the attitude taken up by his hon. friends behind him, would, whether they came from below the gangway or from the other side of the House, have offered strenuous resistance to the passage of the Bill and would have criticised the action of the Government in unmistakable terms. He was sure that hon. Gentlemen opposite, if they expressed the views in their minds, would agree with the view he put forward that that was not the way in which public business should be conducted. He did not desire to offer, nor did he suggest his hon. friends would offer, opposition to the passage of a clause which was necessary, but he said that the Government draughtsmen were public servants, paid to do certain duties, and among them to know the work they had got to do and accordingly prepare their Bills. To ask the House in Committee at half-past twelve o'clock in the morning to deal with legislation proposed and brought forward in this slovenly fashion was to insult the House of Commons. He desired to make this protest, not because he wanted to make any personal attack on the Government, but because he felt he was voicing the opinions which would have been expressed by every Member of the House if the Unionists had been responsible and had brought their legislation forward in this way. He never remembered a case like it, and he desired to make the strongest protest against it and to say that if the Government repeated these tactics they would have themselves to thank if proceedings were prolonged far beyond an hour that was reasonable.

Mr. BIRRELL quite agreed that it was not unnatural in the circumstances to want to know what these two new clauses were about. When they were examined they would be found to be simply clauses saving the interests of the Crown and the purchase of titles under Charter. It very often happened that clauses and considerations of that kind were omitted by the draughtsman because he assumed the rights of the Crown required no special protection or were already protected under the legislation of which the Act was an Amendment. The draughtsmen were not absolutely arbitrary in these matters. Various other persons were entitled to be considered. There were those who advised the Crown, those who advised the Woods and Forests, those concerned with persons acting under charters, and the words had been put in to secure that no injustice should be done. He quite agreed that it was not desirable to move new clauses in Committee in that way, but these new clauses were of a most innocuous kind. With the general principle which the right hon. Gentleman enunciated, he agreed.

Mr. MOORE said he had nothing to complain of in the general principle which had been enunciated by the right hon. Gentleman on the front Opposition bench and very fairly accepted by the Chief Secretary. But the argument between the front benches went on the assumption that these new clauses were necessary. He said that when it came to that hour of the night the Committee was entitled to see whether they were necessary or not. The law officers were elsewhere, but he presumed the Minister was posted with their advice, especially in a matter where the draughtsmen were of opinion that these clauses were unnecessary. He pointed out that they had not had any definite answer as to whether the old Grand Jury Act protected the Crown or not, but at any rate the first new clause protected the Crown, and he wanted to know what was the object of the second new clause which protected the right of people holding by Charter under the Crown. If the Crown was protected, all persons claiming under the Crown were equally so. What, therefore, was the necessity of the second new clause? He must protest against the introduction of a clause they had never seen. The other object was to prevent the public general statute which the Bill corrected, interfering with local and personal rights under local and personal statutes. He did not think there was a lawyer in the land who thought that such a Bill as that would interfere with local and personal rights already given by Parliament. It seemed to him quite superfluous, and if it were not introduced by the particular Minister who introduced it at that hour of the night, he would be inclined to let it pass, but knowing the reputation of that Minister, he could not but think there was something behind it.

Agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered this day, and to be printed. [Bill 340.]

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for the Second Reading read.

Mr. BIRRELL said he was glad to think at all events that there could be nothing irregular about this Bill for it came to them from the House of Lords, where it was read a third time without a division. It would be within the recollection of those Members of the House who were present during the debates on the Evicted Tenants Act of last year, that in the House of Lords a proviso was added to one of the provisions of that Bill, providing that no tenant who occupied a farm from which a previous tenant had been evicted should be, if cultivating that farm in a husbandlike manner, obliged even on the payment of compensation to give up his holding. That was put in the Act in the House of Lords on the very creditable ground that no person in these circumstances should be required to leave his holding if he chose to remain in it. The words of the proviso were proposed by Lord Robertson and inserted in the Bill and became law. However, some tenants on Lord Clanricarde's estate were willing to go and had made arrangements to go on payment of compensation by the Estates Commissioners. But the point of law was raised that, having regard to the language of the proviso added in the House of Lords, if the land was being cultivated in a husbandlike manner it was beyond the purview of the Estates Commissioners, and beyond the powers of the Act for that tenant cultivator to be affected and to go. That was not the view taken by the Judge in the Court of first instance, but the Court of Appeal in Ireland, which was the final appeal under the statute, unanimously decided that the learned Judge was wrong, and held that according to the true construction of the proviso, once the farm was being cultivated in a husbandlike manner it was outside the purview of the Act. That matter was brought before the House of Lords by the Bill which he was now moving to have read a second time, and which was intended to carry out the object which both Lord Robertson and Lord Lansdowne with characteristic fairness at once admitted they had intended the proviso should carry out. The noble Lords both stated when dealing with the Bill that their object had been not to protect the landlord of the land, but to protect the occupier of the land. If the occupier did not want to go and was cultivating his land in a husbandlike manner, he was not to go. So long as that was assured the noble Lords were content, and they therefore allowed the Bill to be read a second time. When the Bill was considered in Committee in the House of Lords an Amendment was made which, when the Committee stage was taken in the House of Commons, it would be for the Committee to consider. But so far as the general principle of the Bill was concerned, there was complete unity of opinion in the House of Lords, as he hoped there would be in the House of Commons, that the object of the measure was merely to give effect to the legislation of last year. He would, therefore, ask the House to read the Bill a second time, and when they got into Committee they would have an opportunity of discussing the Amendment made to the Bill by the House of Lords

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Mr. WALTER LONG said that when the Chief Secretary referred to this question a short time ago, he (Mr. Long) stated on behalf of his friends on the Opposition side of the House that it was impossible for him without notice of the debate, to examine the references which the right hon. Gentleman had then been good enough to give. He, of course, took an early opportunity of reading the debates which took place both in the House of Commons and in another place, and he satisfied himself that the language used in another place, and also by himself and his friends in reference to the Act of last year, had been accurately described by the Chief Secretary. The difficulty it was proposed to deal with in the Bill was one that it was not easy to dismiss in a few sentences, even at that hour of the morning, but he wished to say at once that he and his friends would not offer any opposition to the passage of the Bill on its Second Reading. When they came to the Committee stage they would have to consider the Amendment inserted in another place, and it would be for them to say what their view of it was. What they felt was that the Chief Secretary had stated the view held generally by Unionists in both Houses when the Evicted Tenants Act was passed, namely, that while they expressed grave doubts as to the wisdom of the Government's policy, as to its ultimate success, and as to its effect on the prospects and prosperity of other tenants in Ireland, they admitted that if the evicted tenants question was to be dealt with by legislation, the one thing that ought to be insisted upon by Parliament was that no tenant sitting on a farm and carrying on his business in a decent and proper manner, in accordance with the ordinary rules of good husbandry, ought to be disturbed. While Parliament was then asked to accede to the request to protect the sitting tenant when he wished to remain in his holding, it was quite obvious that it was impossible and unjust to ask that Parliament should say to the tenant who was anxious to go, that he was not to go, because there was some other reason against him doing so. Then came the question, was the tenant in reality anxious to move? That raised a very controversial and difficult question, No doubt allegations could easily be made by both sides as to the undoubted pressure being put on tenants to express their opinion one way or the other. But all that Parliament could ask within the limits of the Bill or within the operations of the Evicted Tenants Act was that the man should assent to his removal to another farm. He regarded the Bill as a necessary complement of the proceedings which occurred in both Houses during the passage of the Evicted Tenants Act. While holding that view, he hoped he would not be considered as committing himself to the acceptance of all the views, from time to time expressed, in regard to the Evicted Tenants Act. He would certainly offer no opposition to the progress of the Bill on the Second Reading, but when it came to the Committee stage, he should suggest that Parliament ought to protect the sitting tenant from injustice and from removal against his will.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

Order for the Second Reading read.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.) said that this Bill, which was a Consolidation Bill, had come from the House of Lords, and he hoped it would be given a Second Reading that night. As regarded the Market Gardeners Act, he proposed in Committee to move an Amendment to this effect: "Clause 42, page 20, line 41, at end, to insert, 'Provided that where such a tenancy was a tenancy from year to year the compensation payable in respect of an improvement comprised in the Third Schedule to this Act shall be such (if any) as could have been claimed if this Act had not been passed." He had put this Amendment down to make it quite clear that it was a Consolidation Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) thought that the Amendment would carry out the intention to make this simply a Consolidation Bill, and he would be glad to assist the Government in carrying out their object.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.

EAST INDIA LOANS (RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION WORKS).

Order for Committee thereupon read, and discharged.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR F. BANBURY said he was sorry the Government had brought on this Bill at such a late hour. It was in the ordinary course of events a very important Bill which provided that certain sums of money might be taken from the Consolidation Fund and advanced to local authorities. The Bill was originally introduced in 1875, and the reason for its introduction was that certain monies should be advanced from the public exchequer to public authorities for certain purposes which were clearly laid down in the Act. The fact was that local authorities had not been able to borrow so cheaply as they wished to do, and it was thought advisable to give them the nation's credit for the purpose of carrying out certain works. The whole object of all the Bills founded on that Act had been to provide money for local purposes. That Bill provided for the raising of £3,700,000, a large sum of money, and it also provided for money to be written off for bad debts in Ireland. He would have liked to have said a few words on that question, but as it was so late he would confine his observations to Clause 6 of the Bill. Clause 6, he would venture to say, was a clause which had never been introduced into a Bill of that sort before since the Local Loans Act was authorised in 1875. Clause 6 extended the purposes for which the Public Works Loan Commissioners were authorised to lend money. He thought the House would be rather astonished to learn that the Clause allowed the Public Works Loan Commissioners to lend money to the Territorial Army. He did not think anyone would advance the argument that the Territorial Army was a public work organised by a local authority. The County Associations in connection with the Territorial Army were formed for certain purposes in connection with national defence, and had really nothing to do with local works or local authorities. He would not at that late hour attempt to consider the question whether it was right to borrow money for the Territorial Army, but he wished to remind the House that in the last Parliament when the Unionist Government borrowed money for the purposes of the Army and for the purposes of the Navy they brought forward separate Bills for the purpose, the Military Works Bill, the Military Loans Bill, and the Navy Works Bill. At that time hon. Gentlemen opposite denounced the Unionist Party for doing that, on the ground that it was not sound finance, as the expenses for national defence ought to be defrayed out of the revenue for the year. Yet now they had the Government of purists bringing forward a clause which enabled them to borrow money for the purposes of the Territorial Army, and instead of bringing it forward in a separate Bill as the Unionist Government had done they put it in a Public Works Loan Bill and brought it forward in the early hours of the morning, after the House had been discussing all day the Indian Budget and other things. He was prepared to say that there were not five men in the House who knew of that clause in the Bill. He had only discovered it himself a short time previously. The clause read—

> "The Public Works Loan Commissioners may, in manner provided by the Public Works Loans Act, 1875, as amended by any subsequent enactment, lend any money which may be borrowed for any of the purposes for which a County Association, formed under the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, 1907, is for the time being authorised by the regulations made

by the Army Council under Section 4, subsection 1, of that Act to borrow, and may so lend on the security on which the County Associations is similarly authorised to borrow."

Section 4, subsection (1) gave power to borrow money if authorised by the Army Council, but that clause gave power for money to be borrowed for any purpose. It might be used for the men, for the purchase of their uniforms, for the purchase of their ammunition, or for any other purpose, and Parliament would have no control whatever over the purposes for which the money was used. It said in the Bill "in the manner provided by the Public Works Loan Act, 1875." He found in that Act that Clause 9 said that the money might be expended from time to time in making loans for the purposes of any works. Nobody could say that to pay the men and provide them with uniforms was what was known as a public work. The Act laid down that the money must only be expended on works, and therefore it was not right to apply it to other purposes. The first schedule began by saying the works for which the Commissioners might lend money should be docks, harbours, piers, lunatic asylums, fire stations, schoolhouses, waterworks, wash-houses, etc., and it went on—and he believed it was on that that the Secretary to the Treasury would found his argument—or any work on which the Commissioners were authorised to lend money by any Act after the passing of that Act. There was no definition in Clause 6 as to the object for which that money should be advanced. If there was a definition saying that the money should be advanced for drill halls, or rifle ranges, the hon. Gentleman might say he was justified in introducing the clause in that Bill. There was no doubt that the schedule authorised the money to be raised for the purposes of works, but even if the hon. Gentleman would amend Clause 6 so as to prevent the money being used for any purpose other than works he still maintained that a separate Bill should have been introduced, and that the matter should not have been dealt with in a Public Works Loan Bill so that nobody in the House except himself knew that it was in the Bill. The hon. Member for Halifax and the First Lord of the Admiralty, he remembered, took a firm stand on that point when the Unionist Party was in power, and he hoped they would take an equally firm stand now. He did not know of any other Bill of that character containing such a clause as Clause 6. He had reason to believe that the hon. Gentleman was prepared to meet him to a certain extent, and if he would undertake that the money would only be spent on drill halls or rifle ranges, he did not propose, as it was so late, to put the House to the trouble of a division. Still, if there should be any time he reserved his right to criticise the Bill on the Committee stage. If the hon. Gentleman would give the undertaking he had asked for, he thought the House might allow the Bill a Second Reading.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.) said the Bill, as the hon. Baronet had pointed out, with the exception of Clause 6, was the usual Bill which appeared at that time of the year. He thought the hon. Baronet was somewhat unnecessarily alarmed as to the intentions of Clause 6.

SIR F. BANBURY thought the hon. Gentleman would admit that he had been careful to say nothing as to the intentions of the Government. But they might have a bad Government, and they must safeguard themselves against that.

MR. HOBHOUSE said he was glad of the acknowledgment of the hon. Baronet as to the excellencies of the present Government. It came as a surprise to him that anyone should think that the Government was prepared to borrow money on loan for the purchase of buttons, or anything of that sort. The object of the clause to which attention had been called was to extend to the Territorial Forces that power of proceeding by way of loan which the auxiliary forces already had. He would be very happy to give to the hon. Baronet the assurance he desired, and he did not think that under the circumstances there should be any further objection to the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) asked what sum was likely to be expended under the Bill on the Territorial Forces. If the hon. Member could not give him an answer then, perhaps he would be able to do so before the Committee stage of the Bill was reached.

MR. HOBHOUSE said the sums mentioned in the schedule were very nearly the same as those which were inserted in the Bill last year and in years before. The sums taken were not to cover specific amounts required, but that the Treasury might have such sums as they thought necessary.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said that even if the assurance which the hon. Baronet had asked for were given, they ought to have a very clear statement from the Government why that method of procedure had been adopted. It was a new proceeding to borrow money in that way. A very similar point had been raised in the year before last. If that principle was extended, instead of coming on the Estimates for a particular loan it could be got under the Public Works Loans Bill, which ought to be reserved for matters which needed no discussion in the House.

MR. T. M. HEALY thought the House was entitled to some explanation with regard to the proposed remission of loans in regard to certain railway companies. There were two clauses in the Bill of a remarkable character, one of which remitted a certain sum of money which he thought the Midland Company had agreed to bear. They ought to have some explanation why an important company like that should get a grant from the Crown equivalent to £17,000. Another loan was equally remarkable—the loan relating to the Fishguard and Rosslare Railway Company. That company was largely under the Great Western of England. He was not objecting to these loans; he was only asking for information, and he was deprecating the suggestion which would hereafter be made by the Treasury, that they had constantly given Irish loans and could not get the money out of Ireland when, as a matter of fact, so far as he could understand, the Treasury were remitting now two sums, one of £17,000 and the other of £7,000, making a total of £24,000, to two railway companies, both of which had very large English connections. They were entitled to know. When this Railway Act was being passed some years ago, when the present Member for East Worcester was Chancellor of the Exchequer, he (Mr. Healy) strongly objected to the Bill. He said—

> "You ought to dandle these little Irish companies on your knees instead of breaking them up and selling them in splinters to English companies."

But the Treasury foreclosed on the Irish companies on the pretence that the English Midland was giving them the whole of the debt. Now they found that, instead of the truth being told by the Government, as a matter of fact a sum of £17,000 was still left due and a Bill was brought in, when it was supposed that everybody had forgotten the transaction, to remit the £17,000 due from this English company. The Secretary to the Treasury was new to his office and was not responsible for what was done by the Treasury seven or eight years ago, but their hatred and abhorrence of the Treasury was great, and every Public Works Loans Bill since he had been in that House was a job. He always read every line of a Public Works Loans Bill. They were monuments of Treasury incapacity, and Board of Works (Ireland) incapacity, the gravest of the follies of the English Treasury and the Irish Board of Works. Seven or eight years ago a solemn promise was given that the Midland Company took all the responsibilities of the Limavady Railway. Let them look back to the debates he raised at that time and they would find from the statement of the then Chancellor what a splendid thing he said it was, and how the British public could not be any longer out of their money with these peddling Irish companies. The statement was that the great English company was taking over the whole of the liabilities, and that was the excuse given for breaking up the little Irish line and selling it for a song to the English company. They sold it for the small amount of the mortgage, and the whole of the Irish shareholders were swindled out of their debt. Now, seven years after, a fresh story had to be told. They found that the English company had not taken over the Treasury debt, and they had to bring in a Bill to wipe off this sum of £17,000. The House was entitled to know the reason of that. He would like also to know why £222 was being remitted. £227 had been borrowed and £5 paid off in the course of thirty years. There was a statement made the other day in the House that the Board of Works were continually remitting loans to tenants. He found on looking at the Bill that the remission of loans to landlords amounted to the sum of £250 and the remission of loans to tenants—he was judging by their names—to a sixth of that. These facts should be borne in mind. When Irish Members went to the Treasury and were met with the statement that the Treasury were continually making loans to Ireland which were not paid back, it should be remembered that the persons to whom the Treasury were remitting loans were English railway companies and Irish landlords.

*Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) said he entirely agreed with the Member for the City of London (Sir F. Banbury) with regard to tacking on to this Bill such a clause as Clause 6, though he approved of the object. He would like to ask whether it would be made quite clear that these loans were for permanent works, as otherwise county associations might be misled.

Mr. HOBHOUSE said he could assure the hon. Baronet that the Treasury would take every care that something in the nature of a permanent asset was provided. He would like to assure the Member for North Louth that the effect of his speech upon him would be that he would scrutinise with the greatest care every possible suggestion in regard to loans from any quarter of Ireland whatever.

Mr. T. M. Healy.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Why is this money to be remitted?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I thought that matter would probably come up in Committee. If the House permits me I shall make a statement then. It will be more convenient that I should do it in the Committee stage.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

EAST INDIA LOANS [RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION WORKS AND GENERAL PURPOSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise money in the United Kingdom, on the security of the revenues of India, for the construction, extension, and equipment of Railways in India by State agencies or through the agency of companies, and for the construction of Irrigation Works, and also for General Purposes for the Government of India (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS [REMISSION].

Committee to consider of authorising the remission of certain debts due to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, in pursuance of any Act of the present Session, to grant money for the purpose of certain Local Loans out of the Local Loans Fund, and for other purposes relating to Local Loans (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nine minutes after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 23rd July, 1908.

The Lord Hampton—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

London United Tramways Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments.

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill. — Read 3ª, and passed.

Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill.—Moved, That Standing Order No. 143 be considered and dispensed with in respect of the said Bills, and that the Bills be now read 3ª, agreed to; Bills read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to.

Holderness Water Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Provisional Orders (Procedure) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Monday next.

PETITION.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Petition against proceeding until the Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law has been issued; of persons signing; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY (TERRITORIAL FORCE).

Report, dated 18th July, 1908, by the Director-General of the Army Medical Service, as to the progress made in constituting the medical service of the Territorial Force.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES.

Shipping casualities which occurred on or near the coasts, or in rivers and harbours, of the United Kingdom, from 1st July, 1906, to 30th June, 1907; and shipping casualties which occurred to British vessels elsewhere than on the coasts of the United Kingdom, and to foreign vessels on or near the coasts, or in rivers and harbours, of British Possessions abroad, reported during the same period, etc.; with Charts and Appendices.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LONDON CORPORATION.

Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London, for the year 1907.

PARLIAMENTARY RETURNS.

Treasury Minute, dated 21st July, 1908, directing that the annual account required by the Uganda Railway Act, 1896, shall be discontinued.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COMMONS BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee with a further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Monday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 177.]

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Monday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 178.]

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Joint Committee on the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.], the Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.], and the Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.], that the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.] ought to be allowed to proceed. The said Report (with the Proceedings of the Committee), to be printed. [No. 175.] Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out; Bill reported with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next and to be printed as amended. [No. 176.]

TOBACCO GROWING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Report from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on Monday next.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (MERCANTILE CORPORATIONS AND COMPANIES BILL) [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Monday next.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, this Bill is regarded as of considerable importance by the friendly societies of this country, and as such I think it merits a few words of explanation to this House. When I say that the membership of the friendly societies includes some of the best elements of the working classes of this country and that the accumulated savings of those societies amount to over fifty millions, I am sure your Lordships will agree that their wishes deserve consideration, at all events, at the hands of the Legislature. This Bill has the unanimous support of the friendly societies in the country, and it has also received the unanimous support of all parties in another place. In fact it is really a non-contentious Bill. It has been supported consistently by the National Conference of Friendly Societies for some years past.

The Bill is really an amending Bill. It seeks to alter the law in one or two cases, and also to make the law clear on one or two points which have arisen with regard to the constitution governing the friendly societies. But there is one clause in the Bill of particular importance which the friendly societies are most anxious of seeing passed into law—Clause 2. At present infants of or under one year cannot be admitted as members of friendly societies. This clause would permit them to be so registered. I believe that the age of one year was originally named because it was feared that people who had charge of infants might cause their death by neglect or otherwise in order to claim the insurance money from their society. But members of industrial insurance companies are able to insure their children from birth, and I am glad to say it has not been found in practice that the evil to which I have just alluded does exist, or, at all events, to any appreciable extent. Therefore this clause only puts the friendly societies on the same footing in this respect as industrial insurance companies; and as there is some competition, I understand, between the two classes of societies it is eminently fair to the friendly societies that this should be so. Having regard to the at least equally deserving character of friendly societies and to the fact that they are probably better supervised than the industrial insurance companies and that the members of friendly societies have interests in common and acquaintanceship in common, it is far less likely that the evil I have just mentioned would occur in the case of friendly societies than in the case of industrial insurance companies.

There are other points in the Bill, but they are really legal points of a rather complicated character, and I do not think that any detailed explanation of them is necessary at this stage. Clause 4 defines the word "security" in the Friendly Societies Act; and Clause 9 deals with the case of an officer of a society who is unable to account for moneys of the society but where the case is not strong enough to justify the allegation of fraud. This Bill, I may mention, is to be read in conjunction with the principal Act of 1896. It may appear, on the face of it, that the difficulties entailed by legislation by reference might ensue in relation to this Bill; but Clause 13 provides that, if the Bill passes into law, it shall be printed as one with the principal Act of 1896, and this confusion will, therefore, be avoided.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Denman.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I do not interpose for the purpose of opposing the Second Reading of this Bill, but I cannot help thinking that one feature of the Bill to which the noble Lord has referred was passed over rather too lightly. I sat on the Committee which inquired into the subject of infant insurances, and I am bound to say that the tendency of the evidence was that this was a very serious evil. Although it may be true that there are societies which are entitled to do this, certainly the feeling on the Committee was that the power of doing it as it existed ought to be checked—I do not mean to say absolutely prohibited, but that, instead of being allowed to get the money, the parents should be compelled to take the amount that they would have received in money in the expenses of the funeral, which was, of course, the point on which it was said infant life was insured in that way. That seems to me a very serious question not lightly to be disposed of.

As to the legal question, I do not know what it is. The noble Lord did not expound what the question was, but merely said it was for the purpose partly of making the law clear—a very desirable object if it can be done. Then the noble Lord said there was some provision which altered the law; but he did not state what the law was or what the alteration consisted in. As I say, I have not risen for the purpose of opposing the Second Reading, but I shall certainly ask for more particulars when we go into Committee.

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

LAW OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT BILL.

Order of the day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: My Lords, I rise for the purpose of asking your Lordships to allow this Bill to pass through Committee *pro forma* so that it may be reprinted as amended and recommitted, thus following the precedent so recently put before your Lordships in dealing with the Nurses Registration Bill. As your Lordships will remember, this Bill came up from the House of Commons in a form which excited some very severe criticism, especially on the part of the noble Viscount opposite, Lord St. Aldwyn, who objected altogether to its being entertained in the form in which it was presented. It is, in fact, a conspicuous example of legislation by reference.

The subject of the Bill, however, recommended itself to your Lordships approval, and it was read a second time. Since then Amendments have been placed on the Paper which, if incorporated in the Bill, will meet the defect in form to which attention was properly directed. The Amendments standing in the name of the noble Viscount will entirely meet this objection. There is also an Amendment, standing in the name of Lord Ridley, to insert a new clause which was approved in another place. What I now propose is that your Lordships should go into Committee *pro forma* so that these agreed Amendments should be accepted and incorporated in the Bill, after which it will be recommitted. We shall then begin again at the same stage, but with a Bill which presents an entirely new shape.

There I might, perhaps, stop; but I am aware that there is some feeling in high quarters as to the possible reception of the Bill so amended in another place. It is suggested that if the Bill goes back so completely transformed, although it accomplishes exactly the same object and makes no greater or less change in the law, there may be some feeling in another place unfriendly to its reception. I have consulted the hon. and learned Gentleman who introduced the Bill elsewhere and conducted it through all its stages, and he does not entertain any anxiety on this ground. He is, at all events, ready to run the risk. Moreover, there is little or no chance of the Bill getting through this House unless it is so transformed, as your Lordships would not willingly approve of such a conspicuous example of legislation by reference as the Bill presents in its present shape. I beg to move.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*Lord Courtney of Penwith.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, ordinarily on this Motion there is no debate, but it may be convenient to say a word or two on the subject that has been broached by Lord Courtney. My desire is to further the Bill. That is my sole object. At present it is in a form in which it is not likely, I apprehend, to commend itself to the House. Indeed, it is in a very inconvenient form, because it is a rather extreme instance of legislation by reference. What, therefore, is to be done? The noble Lord proposes to go into Committee *pro forma* in order that the Bill may then be re-committed and come on again in October after the recess. So far as the postponement is concerned, I think that is the right course to take. But then what course is to be adopted?

There are two courses open. One is that which commends itself to the noble Lord in charge of the Bill and also, I understand, to Lord St. Aldwyn, namely, to strike out Clauses 1, 2, and 3—that is, all the clauses in the Bill—and substitute others incorporating the Act of which this purposes to be an Amendment, so that when the Bill went back to the House of Commons it would not be recognised even by those who claim its paternity, for there would not be a single word of the old Bill remaining. I am not putting it that that is an impossible view; on the contrary, if the noble Lord and the noble Viscount are convinced that it is the best course I would not put my view against theirs.

But I consider that it is a preferable alternative to amend the Bill as it stands with all its defects and introduce a Bill alongside of it which shall be a real Consolidation Bill, consisting of the old Act and of this Bill as amended. I think that course would facilitate the progress of the Bill in another place. It is rather a piece of Parliamentary tactics. I do not wish to dogmatise, and still less to be obstinate; but I think that is the better course, for pure consolidation has never been objected to in this or in the other House.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: My Lords, I understand from the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack that he does not object to the proposal made by the noble Lord opposite, but that he prefers the alternative he has himself suggested. I confess that I very much prefer the proposal of the noble Lord opposite. I think it is important that we should take in hand so gross an example of bad drafting as this, and show the House of Commons that at any rate this House does not intend to pass legislation of that kind. Therefore, I should be very sorry if, concurrently with the Bill drafted as your Lordships would desire to see it drafted, a Consolidation Bill were sent down to the other House, because it would then be possible that the Commons might prefer the original Bill and negative our Bill. I understand that the noble Lord in charge of the Bill does not intend to take any further stage beyond this formal stage until after the adjournment. The practical work of Committee would therefore be taken in October, which would give plenty of time for noble

Lords who desire to amend the Bill and put it in a proper shape to place their Amendments on the Paper.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: I have not said anything about deferring the further consideration of the Bill until October, but I think that course so desirable that I offer no objection to it.

House in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived. Amendments made. Bill recommitted, and to be printed as amended. [No. 179.]

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, the Bill which I have the honour to present to your Lordships for Second Reading to-day is substantially the same Bill as the present Lord Derby introduced into the House of Commons when he was Postmaster-General. Its object is to amend the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1907, with respect to the construction and maintenance of telegraph lines for telephonic and other telegraphic purposes. Your Lordships are aware that when the Postmaster General desires to construct a telegraphic line along a road application is made to the local authorities, and if those authorities give leave the work is proceeded with; but in the event of a local authority objecting, the case is taken before a County Court Judge. In the case of a road where there is no grass margin, but only a hedge and ditch, the property generally of the adjacent landowner, and where permission is refused by this landowner, the Postmaster-General has no means whatever of constructing the line. In some cases this had led to considerable trouble, although I must say that during the time I have been connected with the Post Office—nearly three years—we have had very little trouble indeed with way-leaves. There have, however, been one or two occasions when the agents of the landowners have objected, but on the Postmaster-General approaching the landlords themselves they have invariably given us the facilities required. This Bill only gives us power in the case of land within 20 feet of any street or road; if the ditch or hedge is further than that the Bill is non-operative. Another clause in the Bill deals with the cutting of corners. At the present time we have no power, where there is a corner, of going across another man's land, and we have to take the wires right along the road. This is not the case in a town, for under another Act we can take a telegraph wire across anybody's house. By this Bill we shall have similar powers in the country. The landowner is very carefully safeguarded, as if he objects to the carrying of the wires over his land he can appeal before the two Railway Commissioners or the County Court Judge. There is one other question with regard to the lopping of trees. At the present moment a local authority has power to lop trees providing the owner refuses to do so. We have no such power, and we propose, subject to arbitration, to take this power in connection with trees which obstruct a telegraphic line on a street or road, giving the owner or occupier of the land one month's notice. These are the main provisions of the Bill, which, I may add, is strongly supported by the National Footpaths Preservation Society and the National Trust for the Preservation of Historical Monuments. I beg to move.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I do not wish to offer any objection to the Second Reading of this Bill, particularly as the Bill has been before both Houses of Parliament in previous sessions. But I wish to point out that it makes a somewhat new departure, because up to now, if the Postmaster-General proposed to place wires across the approach to a dwelling house or to erect a post within ten yards of a dwelling house, he could only do so with the consent of the occupier. This Bill would enable the Postmaster-General to put up a post and to carry wires along right in front of a person's window, so long as it was within twenty yards of the public road. That is a very considerable power to give to the Postmaster-General, and I think that when your Lordships are giving a Second Reading to a Bill you ought to be aware of what the effect of it may possibly be.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I do not rise to oppose in any way the Second Reading of this Bill, but there is one clause in it to which the noble Earl omitted to call attention, and which, I understand, was put into the Bill during its passage through the other House. I refer to Clause 3, which runs—

> "Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act no telegraphic line shall be constructed on, over, along, or across any land dedicated to the recreation of the public, or any hedge or bank adjoining such land, without the consent of the person in whom such land is vested, or under whose control and management such land for the time being remains."

It seems to me that if all the landowners in the country are to be taken to arbitration, it would only be reasonable that those in whom recreation grounds are technically vested should be similarly dealt with. You are just as likely to have persons unreasonably objecting in cases of this kind. As the clause now stands, there is absolute prohibition where the person in whom the recreation ground is vested refuses his consent. The noble Lord referred to the lopping of trees. At the top of page 3 of the Bill there is an expression which is new to me as far as the English language is concerned. The sentence runs—

> "The Postmaster-General shall issue instructions to his officers with a view to ensuring that trees shall be lopped in a husbandlike manner and so as to avoid injury to their growth."

I understand the rules of good husbandry and also the proper management of trees, but I do not quite understand the expression "lopped in a husbandlike manner." In these days when ladies are so assertive of their rights, I am not quite sure what this is meant to imply. There may, however, be some authority for this word, but I think that before we give the sanction of Parliament to it it should be examined with care.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I am rather anxious to do penance in a white sheet on the matter of the word "husbandlike," to which the noble Lord has alluded. In the course of the proceedings on the Agricultural Holdings Act the noble Marquess opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, introduced an Amendment in which that word was included. I took upon myself to doubt whether it was familiar in Acts of Parliament; but the noble Marquess adduced such strong evidence that it was a word, not merely familiar in the English language, but completely proper to the occasion, that I was entirely convinced, and I am bound to support its retention on this occasion.

LORD BELPER: My Lords, I do not know that I understood the remarks of Lord Balfour aright, but it seems to me questionable to extend the powers of the Post Office to lands which are dedicated to the recreation of the public. I do not know that such lands come entirely in the same category as lands privately owned. I think there ought to be absolute power to prevent telegraph wires being put across recreation grounds or any interference with the pleasure of the public. I hope, therefore, the noble Lord will not limit the rights of the public in any way.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, I am glad that Lord Balfour drew my attention to Clause 3, which I had omitted to mention. This clause was introduced in the House of Commons, and it seems to me that some amendment is advisable. I therefore propose, subject to your Lordships' approval, to move, in Committee, to add at the end of the clause the following words—

> "Provided that if such consent is withheld or any condition is attached thereto to which the Postmaster General objects, a difference shall be deemed to have arisen between the Postmaster-General and that person, and Sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Telegraph Act shall apply as if the difference arose under that Act."

The effect of that will be to put these public recreation grounds on exactly the same terms as everybody else in the Bill. I do not know whether your Lordships would object to that, but it seems to me to be the proper course to adopt.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

WILD BIRDS BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING].

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, this Bill refers to a not very important matter in relation to the Territorial Forces Act of last year, although it is one which has a certain bearing upon the efficiency of those Forces. The point arises in relation to the presidency of the Associations formed under that Act. Some of your Lordships may remember that when the Bill came up from the House of Commons it was left to the discretion of the Army Council as to whether or not the Lord-Lieutenant of the county should be the president of the Association, the idea being that there might be some cases in which the Lord-Lieutenant would obviously not be the person who ought to take charge of the organisation of the Territorial Forces in a particular county. When the clause came before the House in Committee the noble Duke, the Duke of Northumberland, moved to insert words that the Lord-Lieutenant should not act if he did not assent. That was objected to from this side of the House, and my noble friend Lord Portsmouth moved the insertion of the words which are now in the Act, empowering the appointment of the Lord-Lieutenant, or, failing him, such other person as the Army Council may think fit.

I do not think at that time we were quite certain what the words "failing him" meant, whether they meant exactly the same thing as the noble Duke desired to insert—namely, that the Lord-Lieutenant should always be the president unless he agreed not to act, or whether they meant something different. As a matter of fact, we are now advised that they do mean practically the same thing as the noble Duke's words, and some inconvenience has arisen, and is likely to arise in future cases, owing to the existence of this provision in the Act. Some of your Lordships may have noticed a correspondence which appeared in the newspapers a short time ago between the noble Earl, who I think has not yet taken his seat in your Lordships' House, Lord Derby, and my noble friend Lord Shuttleworth, in relation to the case of Lancashire. That was a correspondence which, both for good taste and good feeling, reflected the highest credit on both parties, but it did draw the attention of the Army Council and of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War to the existence of a possible inconvenience in these cases. That inconvenience arises in this way. Where a man has been acting as chairman of the Association and has become *de facto* the president, a difficulty may arise if a new Lord-Lieutenant is appointed and becomes *ipso facto* president of the Association. If such a difficulty should arise your Lordships will see that the Government of the day would be confronted with a dilemma. Either they would feel themselves bound, for the sake of the efficiency of the Territorial Force, to appoint the chairman of the Association Lord-Lieutenant, which is not a reasonable thing to expect—the duties of Lord-Lieutenant are by no means confined to the administration of the County Association, and I think it would be generally agreed that to bind the Government of the day to appoint the chairman of the County Association Lord-Lieutenant, whoever he might be, would not be a desirable thing—or, on the other hand, they would run the risk of possibly losing a very efficient chairman of the Association, and, even if he agreed to remain on, of causing a good deal of unrest and disappointment in the Territorial Force itself, owing to the fact that they would believe that their chairman had been superseded.

I need hardly say that in introducing this Bill, which leaves it open for the Army Council to appoint somebody else than the Lord-Lieutenant president of the association in special cases, no disrespect whatever is intended to that high office. I think that is sufficiently shown by the fact that so many Lords-Lieutenant have undertaken, not merely the duties of an honorary presidency but also those of active chairmanship; and I should hope, therefore, that this Bill will be generally agreed to because the case is not in the position in which it was when the Bill was before the House last year. I think that the noble Duke opposite, in moving his Amendment, may have feared that the Army Council might introduce outsiders, and possibly military officers, who had no special connection with the county, and make them in some cases presidents of Associations; but the Associations are now formed, and even if the Army Council wished to do such a thing, which they certainly do not, it would not be in their power to do it. Therefore this Bill only meets the rare case to which I have referred, where the chairman ought to be allowed to go on being the principal person in relation to the County Association.

It may be asked, What is the particular urgency of this matter? We have had one case in which very marked inconvenience has arisen. In that particular case it was not that Lord Derby felt that his personal position was compromised in any way, but I happen to know for a fact that the general body of the Territorial Association in Lancashire felt very strongly the idea of his being superseded in the principal place, and it caused a considerable degree of unrest in the county which was by no means confined to the political friends of the noble Earl, Lord Derby. Lord Derby certainly acted from no personal motives in the matter, but he was very anxious that, if possible, some steps should be taken to meet future cases. It was on that account, I think, that he acted, and I have no doubt that if he were in the House he would give his warm support to this Bill. These cases might arise in the future. I should be very sorry to discount the expectation of life of anybody, especially of a Lord-Lieutenant, but a vacancy might occur at any moment, and it is conceivably possible that we might be again confronted with the same difficulty. I hope, therefore, your Lordships will agree to give a Second Reading to this Bill, and if you are good enough to do so, allow it to pass so far as this House is concerned before we adjourn for the summer recess.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª—(*The Earl of Crewe*,)

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: My Lords, as this matter arose out of an Amendment of mine, perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words. I wish to dissociate myself altogether from any circumstances that have lately arisen. I know nothing about them more than all your Lordships do from the public prints, and I beg that in anything I may say I may not be supposed to be referring to this particular instance at all.

It seems to me that this Bill is a rather more important one than the noble Earl who has just sat down would lead us to believe. The Lord-Lieutenant occupies a double position; he is Lord-Lieutenant and *Custos Rotulorum*, and I ask the noble Earl what the duties of a Lord-Lieutenant as such are. By his old duties as Lord-Lieutenant he was head of the Territorial Forces of the county Under the Cardwell system that was changed, but he still remained the titular head, and when the Government introduced their scheme they very wisely made the Lord-Lieutenant again the head of the forces under the new condition of things. If you take away from him that right, what do you leave him? I believe that you leave him the recommendation of deputy lieutenants, and that is rather a peculiar duty for a Lord-Lieutenant who is not the head of the Territorial Force to perform, because all Lords-Lieutenant have been told that in future the deputy lieutenants are to be chosen from the ranks of those who have done good service in, or in connection with, the Territorial Force. Certainly, by excluding the Lord-Lieutenant from the Associations, you are going to deprive him of the means of judging of their services. I cannot think that that is a good step to take. You will reduce the Lord-Lieutenancy to a mere title.

I do not, I confess, see why the Government have gone back from their intention, very deliberately expressed last year, to make the Lord-Lieutenant the chief head of the new organisation they were creating. We have heard from the noble Earl an account of the particular transaction to which I do not wish to allude further. But what does the noble Earl's argument amount to? It amounts to this. You have a Lord-Lieutenant and you have some one in a subordinate position to him—namely, the chairman of the Association. The chairman of the Association has done such good work that it is for the advantage of the force that he should continue to do that work, and the Lord-Lieutenant has left most of the work to him. In order to get over that difficulty, which I should have thought was a very common difficulty in all relations of life—there are many instances in which a vice-chairman is more active than the chairman—you are going to sweep away the right of the Lord Lieutenant altogether.

I should have thought that one very simple way of getting over the difficulty, one which I have known in other connections carried out very successfully, would be to hint to the new Lord-Lieutenant the fact that the chairman should continue to take a leading part in the management of the Territorial Force. This Bill removes all duties from the Lord-Lieutenant. Is the case sufficiently common, is it one which is so difficult to get over in the way I have indicated or in some other way, that it is really necessary to disestablish the Lord-Lieutenant? I am particularly glad to hear that the Government did not know what the words "failing him" meant. I thought that was so at the time, and I think I have some ground for complaining, because I only accepted them on the ground that the Government did know what they meant, and that they meant what they have turned out to mean.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I venture to express my agreement with the noble Duke when he tells the House that this proposal is a rather more important one than the noble Earl in charge of the Bill seems to suppose. I have referred to the report of the debate upon the clause of the Act last year, and I have no doubt that what was present to all our minds on that occasion was that, unless there were very strong reasons to the contrary, the Lord-Lieutenant of the county was the proper person to be at the head of the Territorial Association. May I read from the report of what then took place? I said—

"What I would rather like to elicit is whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to give a Lord-Lieutenant at any rate the refusal of the honorary presidency, or whether they desire to preserve to themselves the right of refusing even an honorary presidency in certain cases."

Thereupon Lord Elgin, who spoke for the Government, said—

"It was the intention of the Bill that the Lord-Lieutenant should be appointed in all cases in which that would be at all practicable, the only reason for putting in the reservation being that there might be cases in which it was inexpedient or inconvenient for the Lord-Lieutenant to act. Obviously if that were so the decision must rest with somebody, and His Majesty's Government thought that, on the whole, this being a scheme for military defence, it was better to put upon the Army Council the responsibility of giving or withholding approval."

The end of that discussion was that some words which my noble friend behind me had moved were not accepted, but we did accept the words "failing him"—that is, the Lord-Lieutenant—at the suggestion of Lord Portsmouth, who was then Under-Secretary of State for War. That is the history of the case.

It is now desired to alter the law, and to alter it in such manner as to dissolve the intimate relation which we desired to see between the Lord-Lieutenant and the presidency of the Territorial Association. That is, I think, a very considerable change, and my only doubt is whether the change which His Majesty's Government propose is not really one which goes beyond the necessities of the case. There was, as we all know, a leading case which attracted a good deal of attention the other day, and of which I venture to say, concurring with the noble Lord opposite, that the manner in which it was conducted between the two parties was entirely creditable to both of them. A solution of the difficulty has been found, and now it is desired to prevent a recurrence of a similar difficulty. The noble Earl admitted that these cases were likely to be extremely rare. and I would put to him whether, in order to provide for cases so rare, it is desirable to strike what looks like a blow at the connection between the Lords-Lieutenant and the County Associations.

The Lord-Lieutenant is responsible for the recommendation of deputy lieutenants, and I believe that quite lately—I shall be corrected by some of my noble friends if I am wrong—the Lords-Lieutenant received a circular in which it was put to them in very unambiguous terms that in future all deputy lieutenants were to hold office because they were persons likely to have special opportunities of promoting the success of the Territorial Associations. This shows to my mind how necessary it is that the Lord-Lieutenant and the president of the Territorial Association shall be one and the same person. The noble Duke suggested that the difficulty might be met in some other manner, and the suggestion which I venture to make to noble Lords opposite is that as this cannot really be such an extremely urgent matter, the discussion of the Bill might be allowed to stand over and be resumed after we have had time to consider at our leisure the effects of the proposal put forward by the noble Earl.

THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, of course if the noble Marquess opposite makes that appeal we are really not in a position to resist it, and therefore we must give way, although I know my right hon. friend was anxious to have this matter settled. The noble Duke suggested that it might be possible to make it a condition of the appointment of a Lord-Lieutenant in certain cases that he should not act as president of the County Association. That seems to me to place a very invidious duty upon the Government of the day. It had occurred to us whether that course could be taken instead of the one we have adopted, but it certainly does seem to me that to exact from a Lord-Lieutenant on his appointment a promise that he will fail to act under the Act of Parliament is a rather anomalous and inconvenient course to take. Of course, it is possible to do that, but it seems to me to place both the Government of the day and the man to whom the office is offered in an invidious and disagreeable position. It is perfectly true, of course, that these cases may not be very numerous, but when they do occur they are extremely important; and in the particular Lancashire case to which reference has been made the effect upon the Territorial Force there, connected with one of the most successful of County Associations, would have been, I am informed, very great indeed. I understand that there would have been something like a general resignation of all the people concerned in the promotion of the Territorial Force there, and that is a prospect which naturally my right hon. friend, however great his respect may be for Lords-Lieutenant, could not regard with equanimity.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Does the noble Earl mean that this consequence would follow the fact that the Lord-Lieutenant became president, or the fact that, as president he would take an active and leading part in the management of the Association?

THE EARL OF CREWE: If a Lord-Lieutenant is appointed and is president of the County Association, what part he will take will be within his discretion, unless the expedient suggested by the noble Duke were adopted of, as a preliminary, exacting from the Lord-Lieutenant an honourable obligation that he would fail to act.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Not fail to be president, but fail to act; that is all.

THE EARL OF CREWE: If the noble Duke will look at the Act he will see that it is assumed all through that in ordinary cases the Lord-Lieutenant will be the president. Obviously it could not be to the interest of the Army Council to appoint any person other than the one to whom, in the particular circumstances, the duties ought to be entrusted. It is hardly to be supposed that the Army Council would go out of their way to appoint someone else to make the scheme a failure. In the great majority of cases I have no doubt that the Lord-Lieutenant would be the active chairman of the Association. However, I do not know that it is worth while labouring the matter further. If the noble Marquess desires to have it postponed, postponed of course it must be.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: To put myself in order I move the adjournment of the debate.

Moved, that the debate be adjourned—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne*).

On Question, Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned *sine die*.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, I rise to move the addition of a new clause to provide that a Justice in Ireland shall not be disqualified to act for any purpose under the Licensing Acts by reason only of his being interested in a railway company, which is a retailer of intoxicating liquor. A similar disqualification existed in this country until the Licensing Act of 1902, in which a clause was inserted precisely similar to the one I now move. I think it is quite manifest that it was not the intention of the legislature that a magistrate should be disqualified from sitting for such a cause, and as the disqualification has been removed in this country, I ask that the law in Ireland should be assimilated with that in England in this respect.

Amendment moved—

"'After Clause 2, to insert the following new clause: 'A Justice in Ireland shall not be disqualified to act for any purpose under the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906, or the Licensing (Ireland) Acts, 1833 to 1905 or this Act, by reason only of his being interested in a railway company which is a retailer of intoxicating liquor.'"—(*Lord Clonbrock.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, with the object of the noble Lord's Amendment I am in entire sympathy, but I think it is my duty to point out that the proposed new clause is hardly relevant to the purposes of this Bill. The Bill is one dealing with married persons when habitual drunkards and with persons found drunk in charge of children. It is quite true that it does deal with summary jurisdiction, but the Amendment is of a general kind, enacting that a Justice in Ireland shall not be disqualified to act "for any purpose" by reason only of his being interested in a railway company which is a retailer of intoxicating liquor. Having had some experience in the interpretation and administration of the law, I venture to say there is great inconvenience in a clause being inserted in a Bill which is not really germane to the purpose of the Bill; and I suggest that such an Amendment would not be held to be in order in the other House. I know that we are not so strict here, but I suggest to the noble Lord that his proposed new clause is not relevant to this Bill.

LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, after what has been said by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, I beg to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

An Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

COSTS IN CRIMINAL CASES BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, this is a Bill which is mostly consolidation. There are certain Amendments inserted in it which are the result of the recommendations of a Departmental Committee two or three years ago. They are not substantial Amendments, but they do tend to convenience. I think your Lordships would not wish me to enter in detail into the uninteresting subject of costs in criminal cases, but I shall be very glad to answer any question in Committee.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICES.

Second Report of the Select Committee considered (according to Order), and agreed to.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government, in view of the statement made by Lord Denman, when speaking on the Earl of Donoughmore's Motion on Wednesday, 15th July, that—

"The Government were not prepared to ask British taxpayers for a further contribution; eliminating taxpayers and ratepayers, only the landlords and tenants remained, and it was evident that there would have to be a readjustment of existing contracts as far as those parties to the bargain were concerned. . . .";

whether this is to be taken to mean that existing agreements between landlord and tenant that have been signed by both parties and lodged with the

Estate Commissioners are to be re-arranged between the said parties before the estate is declared to be an estate by the Commissioners and the closing day fixed.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, the Question which the noble Earl has placed on the Paper arises out of a mistake in *The Times* report of something I said in your Lordships' House in the debate on the Irish Land Purchase Act. I do not think that the mistake was mine, because I noticed that in the report in *Hansard* and in other newspapers it was not as in *The Times* report. Referring to the bargain contained in the terms of the Act of 1903, I said a readjustment of the existing contract would be necessary. I made no reference whatever to existing agreements. I do not know whether the noble Earl requires any further information in answer to his Question.

CRAN MEASURES BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order), and dispensed with, and Bill read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

IRELAND—PROCLAIMED COUNTIES.

LORD KILLANIN rose to ask His Majesty's Government: (1) Why the whole of the County of Galway was proclaimed instead of the restricted areas which are in a state of disturbance. (2) What are the legal grounds for the assertion of the Government that the expenses of extra forces of the Royal Irish Constabulary in disturbed areas can be made chargeable only on counties at large. (3) If the peremptory directions of the Irish Government to the Galway County Council to levy the demands for these expenses—made each half year from September, 1905 to September, 1907—of various districts and townlands were wrong and illegal. (4) Whether, if the laws is as they assert, they will immediately introduce legislation to remedy the glaring injustice of this indiscriminate mode of taxation in this matter. (5) When and for what periods have counties in Ireland been proclaimed under 6 & 7 Will. IV., c. 13, during the last thirty years; and what demands for the expenses of extra police were made on each such occasion; and on what areas—whether counties or baronies, districts, or other parts of a county—were these demands ordered to be levied; and to move for Papers.

The noble Lord said, My Lords, in bringing this matter for a second time under your Lordships' notice when I have so recently raised it, I feel that possibly some apology is due to your Lordships; but my excuse must be that I consider the treatment of the proclaimed counties and the heavy expenditure both out of the Exchequer and locally—I understand something like £47,000 in the last year, and in the County of Galway something like £16,000 in one year—a subject of very great importance. I, therefore, think I am justified in bringing it again to the notice of the House and of the Government, and, so far as is in my power, to the notice of public opinion, especially in Ireland, where I hope by attending to this matter some improvement may take place.

I also have this excuse for bringing the matter pertinaciously under your notice, that I am an elected county councillor in the County of Galway, and, as such, it is my duty to protect the interests of the ratepayers whom I have the honour to represent on that body, and who I consider, by the treatment of the Government in this matter, are being dealt with most unjustly. Furthermore, when I brought this matter before the House a fortnight or so ago the noble Lord who represents the Irish Office and the noble Earl the Leader of the House practically confessed that they were unable to answer the questions and the points I made; and the noble Earl, with his usual courtesy, asked me to bring up the matter again.

I do not desire to go at great length into the whole story, but I think it is necessary more or less to describe the situation. Certain districts in Ireland are, unfortunately, in a state of disturbance. That is admitted by everyone. The Lord-Lieutenant has proclaimed the counties in which those districts are; he has poured into those counties an immense number of police, and, thereby, a great expenditure has been incurred. This mode of dealing with the trouble does not commend itself to me, for the very simple reason that it is doing no good whatever and is absolutely ineffectual. In spite of the large numbers of police poured into these districts, in spite of new barracks being built, these crimes and outrages still go on unchecked and they even increase. The police seem to have no power of stopping them, and they actually take place in the presence of the police, who are simply spectators of what goes on. The reason for that is quite easy to see. The people know that whether they are arrested or not, they will not be punished and nothing will happen. Consequently, these practices, in spite of the presence of the police, continue.

Possibly the contention of the Government is that, though this mode of treating the matter is not directly effectual, it may be effectual through the taxation which it is necessary to place on the districts. That is reasonable. I do not myself admire that mode of punishment, but I recognise that if this taxation was levied on the disturbed districts, if the taxation was made punitive, it would possibly deter the people from continuing these practices, and thus remedy the matter. But whatever chance there was of that form of dealing with the matter being effective, is completely destroyed by the fact that the Government, instead of levying the taxation for the extra forces of police on the disturbed areas where the outrages take place, levy it on counties at large, including districts that are peaceful and have no connection whatever with the disturbances. In that way they are, to my mind, depriving this taxation of any possibility of being indirectly effective.

I would also point out, in this connection, that the districts in which these disturbances take place are not alone not being punished by the taxation, but they are actually deriving benefits from the presence of the extra police. You have only to be acquainted with these small towns and villages in the West of Ireland, where the population is numbered by hundreds, to know that the moving of a hundred policemen to that district is a great advantage. There are the most amazing stories in circulation as to what is going on in reference to private lodgings for the police, means of conveyance, and provisions. I have heard—and I believe it to be true—that in a certain town in the West of Ireland a house which is usually let at £30 a year has been taken by the police authorities at £30 a month; and cars are hired in these districts for the conveyance of the police at an expenditure for which you could get a special train from Dublin to Galway. The Royal Irish Constabulary was never, and is not now, an unpopular body in Ireland. It is composed of good-looking and attractive young Irishmen, and, therefore, in these districts they are a great addition to the society of the place, and, as a matter of fact, I have heard that in a small town in the West of Ireland there have been within the last month five marriages of members of the Royal Irish Constabulary.

There is another point of view, and it is the one which, as a county councillor, I admit more especially interests me, and that is that by levying this taxation over the whole county you are not alone not making the taxation punitive, but you are including within it a large number of people and great tracks of country which are as quiet and peaceable as possible. I am not referring to small districts where it is inevitable, perhaps, that those who are innocent should suffer. I am referring to the whole of the western half of the county of Galway. If the noble Lord wants to know what positions I am referring to I may mention them specifically. I refer to the rural district of Clifden, to the whole of the rural district of Oughterard, and to at least half of the rural district of Galway and also to the town of Galway, and I say that in all those districts there is no ground for taxing the people. I also wish to ask why the whole of the county of Galway was proclaimed. The section of the Act of Parliament which gives the Lord-Lieutenant the power of pro claiming districts gives him full power—in fact, directs him—to proclaim only those portions of a county which are in a state of disturbance. It is Section 13 of 6 and 7 Wm. IV., c. 13, and is as follows—

> "The Lord-Lieutenant may declare by proclamation that any county, county of a city, or county of a town in Ireland, or any barony or baronies, half barony or half baronies in any county at large, or any district of less extent than any barony or half barony, is or are in a state of disturbance and require an additional establishment of police."

Will the noble Lord say that any of those districts to which I refer—they are fifty miles long and fifty miles broad—are in a state of disturbance requiring additional police? As a matter of fact, are there any additional police in those districts? Is it not rather the fact that police have been taken from those districts in order to be placed in the disturbed districts? I submit that that part of Galway is quite undisturbed, and that the people are living in that perfect peace which always obtains in Ireland when there are not agrarian troubles. Therefore I contend that to proclaim the whole county was an abuse of the Lord-Lieutenant's power considering the section I have just read, which expressly and wearisomely mentions the various sub-divisions of a county which he may declare to be in a state of disturbance requiring an additional establishment of police. I therefore deliberately ask His Majesty's Government to have the whole of the western portion of the county of Galway unproclaimed.

It is an insult to that part of the county to proclaim it; but far more important is the injury done to these people by inflicting the extra taxation upon them. It becomes worse when we recall that nearly all that district is scheduled as a congested area, and at this moment the county council of Galway are having to tax those districts for the purpose of starting relief works to prevent the inhabitants dying of starvation. Therefore I say it was tragic to include those districts. His Majesty's Government might just as well proclaim and levy this taxation off the county of Middlesex, and, in my humble opinion, it would be less absurd to do so, because at least in the county of Middlesex the noble Lord, Lord Denman, resides as well as the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and, although I do not accuse them of intentionally encouraging this disturbance, I do say that in fact they are more connected with this agrarian trouble than anyone living in the western half of the county of Galway.

What is the answer of His Majesty's Government in this matter of levying the taxation on the whole county? I understood the noble Lord who represents the Irish Office to say that it was necessary to levy it on the whole county. I understood him to speak sympathetically the other evening, and to imply that if it could be levied on the districts they would do so, but that they were compelled to levy it on the whole county. Of course that is a legal matter, but I have looked as well as I could into it, and I would refer the noble Lord to two sections in the Acts of Parliament which deal with this matter which I consider are very pertinent. I mentioned these sections to the noble Lord yesterday so that he would have time to give me an answer, because I desire the matter cleared up. I submit to His Majesty's Government that there are only two ways of putting extra police into a disturbed county—they must come either from another county or from the reserve depot in Dublin. In the case of police being moved from one county to another, Section 28 of 6 and 7 William IV., c. 13, decides what is to be the area of charge. That section says that in such a case the expenses of such police—

> "During such time as they shall be, or remain, in any county or any barony or half barony, or other division of a barony, or county of a city or county of a town, or town and liberties, shall be defrayed in the same manner in all respects by such county or barony or half barony, or other division of a barony or county of a city or county of a town, or town and liberties, in respect of which such expenses shall have been incurred, and to which it shall be by the said Lord-Lieutenant declared that such expenses relate."

I therefore submit that, in so far as these police are moved from another county, the expenses must be defrayed by the district into which they are moved. But in the case of police sent into a county from the reserve in Dublin, Section 8 of 2 and 3 Vict., c. 75, says—

> "One moiety for the payment of police composing the said Reserve Force shall be raised off the county, county of a city or county of a town . . . provided always that it shall and may be lawful for the Lord-Lieutenant, if he thinks fit, to direct that the monies or any

proportion thereof, so payable in respect of the Reserve Force, shall be raised off any barony or baronies, half barony or half baronies, or other division of a barony, for the better execution of the law wherein such Reserve Force or any part thereof may have been employed, instead of the county at large."

Therefore I contend that it is in the power of the Government, in so far as the police coming from another county or from the reserve depot in Dublin are concerned, to see that the expense is placed on the baronies and not on the counties at large.

In conclusion, I would appeal to His Majesty's Government to give full and fair consideration to this matter. I have not raised it in any party spirit. In fact, I think that calling attention to it is of advantage to the Government and to Ireland in that it might lead to people realising what is occurring, and to a stop being put to these disturbances. I should be glad if that were the result. In that way I should be doing a friendly turn to His Majesty's Government. But I do most earnestly ask them to look into the whole question, and if they do they will see that the present mode of dealing with the matter is proving wholly ineffectual, that in the meantime there is a wasteful expenditure of public money, and that the manner in which the taxation is being levied is most unjust.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing the counties and portions of counties proclaimed under the above Act during the last thirty years, with the dates at which the proclamations were made and withdrawn."—(*Lord Killanin.*)

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, in the able and eloquent speech which the noble Lord has addressed to the House he has dealt with two separate and distinct questions; the first was a matter of law and the second a question of policy. I will endeavour to deal first with the question of law. The county of Galway was proclaimed because the Lord-Lieutenant in Council was satisfied that the county was "in a state of disturbance" such as to "require an additional establishment of police" within the terms of the Statute, 6 Will. IV., under which the proclamation was made. Police reports show a very considerable part of the West Riding to be undoubtedly in a state of disturbance. But even assuming that certain limited areas were not disturbed to an extent that would require additional police, that would not affect the question about which Lord Killanin appears mainly concerned—namely, the charge upon the local authorities. Even if limited areas only were proclaimed, the county at large would equally have to bear the charge.

LORD ASHBOURNE: Under what section?

LORD DENMAN: Under Section 37 of the Act of William IV. the amount chargeable for extra police under Section 13, sent in pursuance of a proclamation, has to be raised off the county at large. In 1880 and 1882, when a number of counties and parts of counties were proclaimed and the police forces largely increased, the law officers advised that the charge for additional police appointed in pursuance of the proclamation must be on the county at large and not on any limited district of the county. Some of the proclamations of 1880–2, as the noble Lord is aware, remained in force for many years. I think the last proclamation remained in force till the year 1899. In the case of Galway the additional police were withdrawn in 1898. Throughout, under both Liberal and Conservative Governments, the charges have been made on the counties at large.

The present Law Officers agree that the law is as stated by their predecessors in 1880. The extra police for which charges were made against certain districts and townlands in Galway, as stated in the third part of the Question, were not additional police appointed under proclamation as in the present case, but consisted of detachments of the established police forces of other counties, temporarily sent to County Galway. Under 11 and 12 Vict., cap. 72, Section 6, the charge for such detachments—namely, a moiety of the cost—was made upon the county at large. In 1874 that was the opinion of the Law Officers of the day. In the year 1900, however, the then Law Officers of the Crown advised that the charge could be made upon the rural or urban districts in which the men were employed, and this course appears to have been followed until March, 1906, after which date the original practice was reverted to on the advice of the present Law Officers, who agree with the view expressed by the Law Officers of 1874, that the charge should be on the county at large, a view which has been supported by judicial decision. Speaking generally, it may be said that it is open to any local authority who consider that the methods of charge for extra police are illegal to test the matter by proceedings in one of the superior Courts. I have stated the opinion of the present Law Officers, and that it is supported by a judicial decision.

LORD ASHBOURNE; What is the judicial decision, and when was it given?

LORD DENMAN: It was given by Mr. Justice Harrison at the Wexford Assizes in 1888. The noble Lord has quoted the case of the reserve force of police. It is true that in some cases the reserve force may be used for a rather similar purpose to those in counties; but the law regarding that force is that it is to be used for "sudden and extraordinary emergency." A continued state of disturbance requiring comparatively permanent additions to the police force, as in County Galway at the present time, must be treated under the Act of William IV. Even if the reserve force were used, I understand that it would not be sufficient, in the opinion of the Government, for the purpose of policing County Galway at the present time.

In reply to the fifth question, I shall be glad to give the Return asked for, but to enumerate the extra expenses of police would entail enormous labour, and I hope the noble Lord will not press for that part of the Return. As to the question of injustice, I cannot admit that there is any injustice resulting from the mode of taxation. I admit that this is a rough-and-ready method of dealing with this matter, and in some cases no doubt innocent persons must suffer with the guilty. But what would be the effect of narrowing the area? Supposing a particular grazier has his cattle driven; he is probably the largest ratepayer in the district, and therefore if we narrowed the area not only would that man suffer all the inconvenience and hardship of having his cattle driven, but in addition would have to pay the greater part of the expense of the police sent to protect his property. I quite admit that in the case of the noble Lord himself and of the neighbourhood in which he resides, it is a hardship to have to pay for the misdeeds of other people in a different part of the county. I admit that. But the question, I think, is whether some people should suffer a certain amount of hardship, or a much smaller number of people suffer considerably greater hardship. I gather from the tenor of the noble Lord's remarks that he was averse to drafting police into County Galway at all.

LORD KILLANIN: I said it was useless.

LORD DENMAN: Well, my Lords, I submit that if the condition of County Galway is bad it would be considerably worse if the police already there were to be withdrawn. After all, the remedy is with the people of the County of Galway itself. Let them set their faces against cattle-driving and other forms of disturbance and then the police will be withdrawn, and if a better state of things should come to pass in that county there is nobody who would welcome such a state of things more warmly than the Chief Secretary.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, I cannot allow this debate to terminate without saying a word with regard to the extraordinary statement to which we have just listened. The condition of things is entirely due to His Majesty's Government. They have not taken steps to put down cattle-driving, but have allowed it to go on increasing until it has spread over eight counties, and they have proclaimed six counties under the Act of William III. and placed enormous expense upon them for extra police. The law if properly administered is perfectly capable of dealing with cattle-driving, and I want to know why His Majesty's Government have not put into force the powers they already possess. The condition of Ireland is one of increasing lawlessness. The Chief Secretary in his speeches has tried to gloss over the state of affairs, but there were during the first six months of this year, I believe, more cattle-drives than in the whole of last year and more people under police protection. Yet I think I have never heard a responsible Government make a weaker answer than that made by Lord Denman to my noble friend.

*LORD MACDONNELL OF SWINFORD: My Lords, in rising to speak on this subject I crave from your Lordships a full measure of that indulgence which of your goodness you concede to those who address you for the first time. I venture to address your Lordships to-day because I am familiar with the subject under your notice, because I have sympathy with the views of my noble friend Lord Killanin, and because the subject possesses certain aspects to which I wish to invite your Lordships' attention.

My purpose will be facilitated if your Lordships will permit me to explain very briefly what the organisation of the Royal Irish Constabulary is, so far as that organisation is germane to the questions placed on the Paper by the noble Lord. The Royal Irish Constabulary is divided into two bodies, which are recruited under different legal provisions. One of these bodies is called the Free Force, and the other body is called the Reserve. The Free Force is limited by law to a maximum strength of 10,678 officers and men; the Reserve is similarly limited to a maximum strength of 412 officers and men. The Reserve Force, as its name implies, is intended for use on emergencies only. It is quartered in one body in the Constabulary Depôt in the Phœnix Park. On the other hand, the Free Force is divided, triennially, among the counties of Ireland and the City of Belfast, which for special reasons is policed by the Royal Irish Constabulary; and the number of men allocated to each county is technically called the Parliamentary *quota* of that county. It frequently happens that the *quota* of a particular county has proved inadequate for the county's needs and as the *quota* itself cannot be increased during the currency of the triennial allocation, other means are provided by law and practice for meeting the particular emergency or by increasing its total police force of the county.

Lord Killanin said there were only two ways of doing that, but there are four. One way is by the magistrates of the county, in special meeting assembled, requisitioning the Lord-Lieutenant for any increase. Another way is for the Lord-Lieutenant, on the advice of his Privy Council, to increase the police force of any particular county. A third way is to employ part of the reserve in the county, and the fourth and last way is to transfer for temporary service to the disturbed county part of the *quotas* of other countries, which, being in a peaceful condition, can afford to spare the men. No matter under which of these four methods the police *quota* of a county is reinforced, one-half of the cost of the reinforcement falls upon the rates. The important question raised by the noble Lord, Lord Killanin, really comes to this. Should the cost be recovered from the county at large, or should it fall on the disturbed districts alone?

Where the police force of a county has been strengthened by the action of the magistrates or the initiation of the Lord-Lieutenant on the advice of the Privy Council, the invariable practice has, I believe, been to treat the cost as a county at large charge; where the reinforcement has come from the reserve, the practice has been to treat the cost as recoverable from the particular districts in which the additional police have been employed. But where the reinforcement has come from the Free Forces of other counties the practice has varied. Under the last and the present Liberal Administration it has been treated as a county at large charge. During the last five years, at all events, of the late Unionist Administration, the charge was recovered from the districts whose condition made necessary the introduction of the additional police.

My Lords, it is, I think, very desirable that there should be uniformity of practice in this matter. I confess that, looking at the matter from the point of view of an executive officer, my preference is strongly in favour of the interpretation which the Unionist Law Officers have placed upon the law. I consider that it is in the interests of peace and order and of fair play that those people who are peaceable and law-abiding should not be fined because of the sins of people who are disorderly. I think it is unfair that if three-fourths of the county are peaceable and orderly, those three-fourths should have to pay for the one-fourth which is disorderly. I have had much experience of the use of police in this way. In India we used to call them punitive police, and I found this method one of the most efficient in manitaining order. Under a Western as under an Eastern sun the most sensitive part of communities or of individuals is their purses, and if you bring sufficient force to bear in that direction you generally re-establish order and deter other people from breaking the law.

I have only one remark more to make, and it is with reference to what has fallen from the noble Marquess opposite. I am not here to speak for the Government; I speak for myself alone as a private Member of your Lordships' House, but, of course, I have had exceptional opportunities for acquiring information, and, indeed I feel that in addressing your Lordships I suffer from the inconvenience that I have so lately come from public service. But I think I may say that the enforcement of the Coercion Act did not relieve the Unionist Government from having recourse to this strengthening of the police force of the country. Speaking for myself alone, I am disposed to think that, when the Unionist Government, with intentions of which I completely approve, made its excursion into the fields of Liberalism in 1898, it introduced into the Local Government (Ireland) Act certain provisions which have had very great effect upon the magisterial benches throughout Ireland. I have belief and confidence in my countrymen that whatever hasty action was then taken will in time be justified; but in the meantime the action of the Unionist Government has had this effect, that it has compelled the Liberal Government of this day to cope with disorder in Ireland with broken harness and with blunted weapons.

Lord ATKINSON: My Lords, I have no desire to discuss the point of law, and I do not at all rise to enter upon the material question how far the action of the Government of 1898 blunted the weapons for preserving law and order. I will only venture to say, in passing, that if they were blunted, at all events, we managed to maintain law and order in Ireland. But I rise for an entirely different purpose. I am one of those who had the good or evil fortune to give an opinion that it was not necessary to do such an extremely absurd, and, in my opinion, perfectly abortive, thing as when one division of a county was disturbed, to punish, not only that division, but its peaceful neighbours. Accordingly, we advised that under the statute it was competent, when a district was proclaimed, to send police to that district, and to charge its support upon that district. I now rise to make a suggestion. Lord Denman invited my noble friend to raise the question in a Court of law. That was a very barren and mocking invitation. He cannot raise it in a Court of law. The question is not whether the Lord-Lieutenant is bound to have the expenses raised from the disturbed districts; it is whether or not an option is given to him to direct that it be levied off the larger area. I suggest to the Government that in one of the proclaimed counties the Lord-Lieutenant should direct that a small sum should be levied on a particular area, whereupon the legal question whether the Lord-Lieutenant had or had not the jurisdiction to charge over the smaller area could be decided. If he has not, then I quite agree with Lord MacDonnell that unquestionably the law ought to be changed, for nothing could be more unjust than that people who have no connection with the disturbances should be mulcted for the support of the additional police that are necessary to check the disorder of their neighbours.

***Lord ASHBOURNE**: My Lords, the case presented with singular clearness and fairness by my noble friend Lord Killanin is that it seems unjust to tax the wider area, a substantial portion of which might be entirely innocent, if there is a power of concentrating the charge on the portion of the county which is disturbed. The noble Lord who replied on behalf of the Irish Office stated that until 1906 the practice had been as stated by Lord Killanin, but that in that year a change was made, and instead of the smaller localities being charged the expenditure was spread over the whole county. It is obvious, from the speech of Lord Macdonnell, that the practice which was stopped in 1906 had been acted upon on previous occasions by various Governments and under various Law Officers without question; and Lord Macdonnell has intimated very clearly that, in his opinion, the power of charging the smaller area was a wise and useful power, and that as a question of policy and prudence it would be well to adopt that course. Lord Atkinson has also presented the case in the fairest possible way. I venture to suggest that, by the light of what has fallen from both sides of the House, it would be only fair and reasonable for the Government to apply their minds to this question and see whether they have not a discretion to make the charge upon the narrower locality if they think it expedient in the interests of law and order.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, the noble Lord opposite who replied on behalf of the Irish Office said, in the concluding words of his speech, that the people of Galway must set their faces against cattle-driving. I ask whether the Government have set their faces to the best of their ability against cattle-driving. The answer, I think, is, "No." The fact remains that after many months of their efforts cattle-driving still goes on, not alone in Galway but in other places. I should like to draw attention to a statement made by Judge Kenny at the Galway Assizes the other day. He said—

> "The only part of the County Galway not in a state of extreme lawlessness is Connemara."

Connemara is the most congested part of County Galway. What, then, becomes of the argument that it is in the congested districts that the people want these extra grass lands? The fact is that this cattle-driving is engineered by the people in the small towns and by the young blackguards who gather round the public-houses at night. It is not the people in the congested districts who indulge in these raids. Lord Denman said that the grazier would suffer if the extra rate was put on the particular district where the cattle were driven, but the truth is that he would much rather pay the extra rate and have his cattle protected. I admit that on the whole Ireland is peaceful, but there is, as I have said before in this House, a gangrene in the country that will spread if it is not stopped. We have to look forward—and next winter, if the measures that we are continually promised are not properly put into force, we shall have further trouble. The answer of the Government is an evasion of the actual question. I only hope that a little backbone will be put into this matter. The Government know as well as I do that cattle-driving could be stopped if they put into effect the remedies at their command.

THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, in spite of what the noble Earl has said it appears to me that the question raised by Lord Killanin is purely a legal question or, at any rate, almost entirely a legal question, and consequently the discussion has very properly in the main concentrated itself on the legal aspect of the case. Previous to the year 1900, owing to a decision, I imagine, of the noble Lord opposite, Lord Ashbourne in 1874——

LORD ASHBOURNE: I did not come in until 1877.

THE EARL OF CREWE: Well, owing to the decision of the Law Officers of the Conservative Government of that year the charge was placed on the county and it so remained up to 1900, when the Law Officers of the then Government gave a different decision. The noble and learned Lord, Lord Atkinson, stated that it would not be possible, for the reason he gave, for the county council of Galway or any other county council to do what my noble friend behind me invited them to do, which was to bring the matter into Court. The proposition, therefore, of Lord Atkinson, was this, that assuming the present Law Officers are right in denying a discretion to the Lord-Lieutenant, and in saying that he is obliged to charge on the county, the Lord-Lieutenant should place himself within the possibility of an action's being brought against him by making a small charge on some particular barony or half barony. I will consult my right hon. friend as to whether he is prepared to recommend any action of that kind. Noble Lords will understand that I cannot, of course, say what view he will take. I think there is no doubt that there is a very plausible case for saying that if this extra establishment of police is to be regarded as punitive, the punitive effect will be more concentrated if the charges are made on the particular district to which the police are sent. But at the same time, it does not do entirely to lose sight of the consideration mentioned by my noble friend behind me, namely, that if everybody in the disturbed area was guilty of disturbance, it would no doubt be a proper method to charge all the money on them; but even in this small area there would be a large proportion of innocent people, who would have to pay more per head if the whole charge was concentrated on the small district. I do not say that that is conclusive, but it is a point which has to be considered. I was a little amused at the way in which the noble Earl, Lord Mayo, seemed to me to give away Lord Killanin's case when he quoted the statement of Mr. Justice Kenny that the whole of county Galway, except South Connemara, was in a state of extreme lawlessness. If that is so, it is clear that the charge ought, at any rate, to be distributed over the greater part of the county.

Lord KILLANIN: Judge Kenny said, I think, Connemara, and that would include the whole of the district which I referred to. I did not allude to the West Riding but to the western part of the county, which is not disturbed and ought not to be included. With regard to the Return, could the noble Lord not make it a little fuller, showing on what areas these charges were levied? Perhaps it would be easier if I reduced the period to the last twenty years.

Lord DENMAN: I should think that would entail an enormous amount of labour and correspondence. I will give the noble Lord the counties which have been proclaimed.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN CATTLE.

The Earl of ONSLOW rose to call attention to the report of a deputation which waited upon the Prime Minister to invite him to repeal the Diseases of Animals Act, 1896, which prevents the importation alive of cattle into this country from abroad; and to ask what is the attitude of His Majesty's Government on the subject. The noble Earl said: My Lords, I observed in the usual channels of information a short time ago that a deputation had waited on the Prime Minister with respect to the state of the law affecting the introduction of live cattle from abroad. No very lengthy report of that deputation, or of the answer which was made to it, was given; but so far as I could gather, the right hon. Gentleman said that he came from a constituency interested in this question, and that he was prepared to give very favourable consideration to the introduction of live cattle into this country if he could be satisfied that they came from countries where there was no disease. But we also were informed that the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture took a very different line, and was not at all sympathetic to the objects of the deputation. I confess that that is entirely in accord with everything we have heard from the noble Earl either in this House or elsewhere. The question was raised last session or the session before, and the noble Earl, with no uncertain voice, said he had no intention of departing from the policy of his predecessors. There has been some agitation in this matter, and it has been chiefly based on the idea that there is a scarcity—I believe it has been put as high as a famine—in the meat markets; but if your Lordships will look at the prices of recent months and of recent years you will see that meat is not really any dearer now than it has been on frequent occasions, due to temporary causes, in recent years. There have been some fluctuations, consequent, I believe, on a shortage of maize in America. As a result, the price of cattle went up in May and June, but I see from the official reports of the Board of Agriculture that it has gone back again. In the report dated July 2nd, I noticed that there was a marked fall in the price of beef, and that all the dead meat markets, especially American and Argentine chilled, were dull. The following week all kinds were more or less down, and then on July 16th it is reported that, while Scottish and English beef remained firm, there were heavier supplies and prices were lower. I venture to think that there is no ground for the assertion that there is a marked scarcity in the supply of meat in this country, and that there is no difference between the present position and the position in recent years. Then it has been alleged that there is a feeling of grievance on the part of our Canadian brethren on this question. I should like to ask whether any, and if so, what representations have been made by the Government of Canada to this country as to the state of the law which prevents the importation alive of Canadian cattle. My own belief is that there is no feeling at all in Canada on the subject. I have heard it said by Canadians that at the time they were sending over store cattle to this country they were not alive to the fact that they were sending us the raw material and that this country was making the profit after fattening the cattle and turning out the finished article, but they now preferred to do the finishing off of the raw material at home and get the profit from both rearing and fattening the stock as well. I assume that there has been no great agitation on the part of our Canadian cousins to have cattle admitted alive into this country, and I venture to think that the recent rise in price is only one of those fluctuations in the market which we must anticipate. I hope to hear from the noble Earl opposite that he, at any rate, has not departed from the policy he has announced to Parliament, and that that policy is endorsed by his colleagues in the Cabinet.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, the Act of 1896, as your Lordships are aware, prohibits the importation of cattle unless they are slaughtered at ports of landing, such as Deptford, Liverpool, Bristol, and Glasgow. I have to say that the Government do not propose, in existing circumstances, to initiate any legislation on the subject. I may, perhaps, be permitted to add that the President of the Board of Trade intends to appoint a Departmental Committee to inquire how far, and in what manner, the general supply, distribution, and price of meat in the United Kingdom are controlled or affected by any combination of firms or companies. I have had no representations lately from the Canadian Government on the subject, and I am informed on very high authority indeed, that whatever restrictions we are obliged to put on the importation of Canadian cattle will be loyally accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Moved, "That the Lord Balfour be appointed to take the Chair in all Committees of the Whole House next week in the absence of the Chairman of Committees: That the Lord Balfour be appointed to take the Chair in all Committees upon Private Bills next week in the absence of the Chairman of Committees;—(*The Chairman of Committees*)—agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Seven o'clock till Tomorrow, Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 23*rd July*, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Private Bills.—Ordered, That Standing Orders 220 and 246, relating to Private Bills, be suspended for the remainder of the session.

That, as regards Private Bills to be returned by the House of Lords with Amendments, such Amendments (if unopposed) shall be considered forthwith.

That as regards Private Bills returned, or to be returned, by the House of Lords with Amendments, such Amendments (if opposed) shall be considered at such times as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine.

That, when it is intended to propose any Amendments thereto, a copy of such Amendments shall be deposited at the Private Bill Office, and notice given on the day on which the Bill shall have been returned from the Lords.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Salmon, Trout, and River Tweed Fisheries Bill.—Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Salmon, Trout, and River Tweed Fisheries Bill, with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Sir John Jardine.*)

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1.) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Margate Corporation Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to:—Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway, Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford-upon-Avon Junction Railway, and East and West Junction Railway (Amalgamation) Bill [Lords]; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to regulate the sale of certain Poisonous Substances and to amend the Pharmacy Acts." [Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to legalise the use of Cran and Quarter Cran Measures in connection with trading in Fresh Herrings in England and Wales." [Cran Measures Bill [Lords.]

PETITIONS.

CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from West Hants and East Dorset, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Norfolk, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions for alteration: From Rochdale; and West Hants and East Dorset; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: From Bettws Garmon; Carnarvon; Liverpool; Llandwrog; and Pentonville; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Barry; Brechin; Menmuir; and Monifieth; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PARLIAMENTARY RETURNS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 21st July, 1908, directing that the Annual Account required by the Uganda Railway Act, 1896, shall be discontinued [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW RELIEF (PAUPERS RELIEVED IN A YEAR AND PERIODS OF RELIEF).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 5th August, 1907; *Mr. Burns*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 250.]

SHIPPING CASUALTIES (1906–7).

Copy presented, of Abstract of the Returns of Shipping Casualties which occurred on or near the Coasts or in Rivers and Harbours of the United Kingdom from 1st July, 1906, to 30th June, 1907, and of the Returns of Shipping Casualties to British Vessels elsewhere than on the Coasts of the United Kingdom and to Foreign Vessels on or near the Coasts, or in Rivers and Harbours, of British Possessions Abroad, etc., with Charts and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Chamber of London.—Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London for the year 1907 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 251.]

HOUSE OF LORDS (MANUSCRIPTS), VOLUME IV. (NEW SERIES).

Paper [communicated 22nd July] to be printed. [No. 249.]

ARMY (TERRITORIAL FORCE).

Copy presented, of Report, dated 18th July, 1908, by the Director General of the Army Medical Service, as to the progress made in constituting the Medical Service of the Territorial Force [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Earlier Issue of Education Code.

MR. H. GOOCH (Camberwell, Peckham): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can see his way to issue the Code earlier in the year so as to give local education authorities more time to make their arrangements before the summer recess.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman*). I should be glad if an earlier issue of the Code were possible, but in view of the fact that questions are continually arising during the earlier months of the year, which require careful consideration and occasionally consultation with other departments, it is impossible for me to make any promise.

Increase of Rents of Tenants at Box, Carrickmacross.

MR. MCKEAN (Monaghan, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on what grounds the rents of three tenants in the district of Box, Carrickmacross, named Bernard O'Reilly, Thomas Walsh, and Peter Callan, were raised, respectively, from £3 8s., £4, £4 15s., to £4 2s., £4 18s. 6d., and £5 14s. 6d., at a sitting of the Land Commission Court held in Carrickmacross on 5th November, 1907, Mr. Justice Dodd being the presiding Judge and Mr. Williams his assessor; and what are the qualifications of Mr. Williams for the position mentioned.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell*). The rents in question were judicially fixed by the Land Commission Court of Appeal under the provisions of Section 88 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, and the Land Law Acts. It would be entirely irregular for me to ask the Commissioners to state the grounds of their decision. Mr. Williams is one of the assessors appointed pursuant to the eighty-ninth section of the Act of 1903. He was previously an assistant

Land Commissioner, and his qualifications when appointed to the latter office in 1906 are stated in House of Commons Return No. 151, of 1902.

Anarchism and Slander in India.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal received a communication signed by the Nawab of Murshedabad, the Maharajas of Kasimbazar, Burdwan, and Gidhour, and Maharaja Prodyot Kumar, Tajore, deploring the anarchism brought to light in their province of Bengal, and urging that seditious writing poisons the mind of the young and led to the conspiracy recently discovered at Calcutta, and that the Government of India should bring in Press legislation which will deal efficaciously with the present unbridled licence to slander by irresponsible press men and root anarchism out of India; and whether the Governments of India and Bengal propose to take any action upon this representation.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan*). The letter referred to in the Question has been published in the Indian newspapers, and has, no doubt, been considered by the Government of India. The Secretary of State has nothing to add to his recent utterances on the subject of seditious writing in India.

Military Training for Europeans in India.

Mr. REES: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the attention of the Government has been called to the recommendation of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce, to the effect that every European and Eurasian in India should be trained to arms in the interests of the State and for the greater security of the European community; whether the Government of India has under consideration the question of increasing the capitation grants so as to enable all classes to serve without being put to personal expense, and giving such aid in the way of practical military training to firms and companies as may enable them to provide for the proper training of their employees; and whether the Government of India contemplates giving further active assistance in general to the volunteer movement in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The recommendation of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce referred to by the hon. Member has not come before the Secretary of State, nor has he yet received any proposals from the Government of India on the subject of volunteering in India.

London Street Ambulances.

Mr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Departmental Committee appointed to consider the question of ambulances for street accidents in London have presented their Report, and when it will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am informed that the Committee are considering their Report, and hope to present it in the autumn.

Mr. COOPER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that during the sitting of the Departmental Committee on London ambulances litter ambulances amounting to more than 100 were placed in the streets of London; whether he will state by whose authority these ambulances were placed in the streets; how much was the total cost; and whether this cost will be a charge upon the rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) A large number of litter ambulances have been placed in the streets by my authority; some were authorised before the appointment of the Committee, others since its sittings commenced. The cost of a wheeled litter with the appliances and shelter is £35 14s. 6d. This is defrayed out of the Metropolitan Police Fund.

Supply of Books to Prisoners.

Mr. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the fact that public attention has recently been directed towards the Regulations in prisons as to the supply of books and other matters, he will make investigations by Departmental Committee, or otherwise, with a view to improving these Regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone*). The Regulations are receiving my attention.

Official Shorthand Writers at Assizes.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that at the Herefordshire Quarter Sessions on 29th June no official shorthand writer was in attendance, and that the local reporters declined to act, on the ground that the remuneration was inadequate, with the result that the chairman was compelled to remand the remaining prisoners to the Assizes, and that at the Surrey Assizes at Guildford on Thursday last no official shorthand writer was present in the second Court and the local reporters similarly declined to act for the same reason, with the result that the progress of business was stopped for two hours until some one was sent down from London; and also that at the Assizes at Birmingham on Saturday last, after the trials of prisoners had proceeded some time, it was found that no shorthand writer was present and the business had to be suspended; and whether he will take such steps as will result in the provisions of the Court of Criminal Appeal Act being carried out without justice being delayed.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) My attention has been called to these cases, but the appointment of official shorthand writers for the purposes of the Criminal Appeal Act rests with the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief Justice, and I am in communication with them on the subject.

Appointment of Irish-born Customs Preventive Officers.

MR. McKEAN: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in connection with the Customs there are what are called preventive officers, whose appointment is in the gift of the Treasury; and he will furnish a Return showing the number of persons of Irish birth who have obtained such appointments within the past five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) Preventive men are nominated by the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury, but no inquiry is made or record kept of the birthplace of persons so nominated, and the labour involved in procuring the information would not be justified.

Territorial Army—Issue of Wagons and Harness to Supply Columns.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the Secretary of State for War upon what grounds the Ordnance Department have refused to issue to transport and supply columns of the Territorial Army the wagons and harness allotted to them by regulation, and which are indispensable to the carrying out of their necessary duties during the training which is commencing next week.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It has been decided to issue to units for instructional purposes one wagon and harness per transport company. The hon. Member must recollect that this equipment, together with that of other services, takes time to provide.

Athletic Clubs—Facilities for Shooting.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that there are many athletic clubs in Leicestershire the members of which have signified their intention to the commanding officers of the Territorial Forces of their desire to learn to shoot; whether he is aware that the commanding officer, Colonel Sarson, has informed this body through a representative deputation that he can give them no assistance unless they join the Territorial Force, which these clubs decline to do, and claim that subsection of Clause 2 of the Territorial Reserve Forces Act gives power for such a request as theirs being carried out; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I have no knowledge of the particular matters referred to in the Question, but the statement of Colonel Sarson was correct, as it is not in his power to grant facilities for shooting to others than members of the Territorial Forces. As I have already informed the House, there are no funds at my disposal to enable me to assist rifle clubs, but it is just possible that we may be able to do something for them by supplying a certain amount of ammunition at reduced prices. I regret that members of the Leicester athletic clubs do not at present appear to be willing to undergo the training which would make their keenness to shoot of service to their country. It is possible that in future some aid may be given to rifle clubs which can be shown to contribute to our defensive strength if funds become available, but I am unable to make a statement on this point at present.

Working of Patents in Ireland.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the new Patent Law (Amendment) Act, 1907, he would instruct British consuls and agents abroad to bring under the notice of patent holders in the various countries the special advantages which Ireland offers for the working of such patents.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) It would not be practicable for His Majesty's Government to take such action as that proposed by the hon. Member. A brief notice of the terms of the new Patents Act as affecting patent-holders abroad has already been sent to every holder of a British patent, whether in the United Kingdom or abroad, and has also been published in the *Board of Trade Journal.*

Evicted Tenants—Case of Daniel Barry.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Daniel Barry, evicted tenant, of Knockduff, Meelin, County Cork, on the Hastings Twiss Estate, if so, whether they have taken any action in the matter; whether the holding is derelict and in charge of a caretaker under police protection; and whether, in view of all the circumstances of the case, the Commissioners will take steps to acquire it with the object of reinstating the evicted tenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners received an application from Daniel Barry for reinstatement in his former holding. The landlord intimated his willingness to accept for the holding the price estimated by the Commissioners, but Barry refused to sign an agreement to purchase at that price because of a right of way over the holding enjoyed by a neighbouring tenant. As the Commissioners failed to effect a settlement between the parties they do not intend to take any further action in the matter Moverover, the farm is now in the occupation of a new tenant, though at the time of the negotiations referred to it was in charge of a caretaker under police protection.

Restoration of George Crowley on the Beresford Estate.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in restoring George Crowley, an evicted tenant on the Beresford estate, Kilmacthomas Union, County Waterford, to his former holding, seeing that the landlord is selling his estate and seeing that Crowley's farm is on the hands of the landlord.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The holding formerly occupied by Crowley is now worked by the landlord as a home farm in connection with his demesne, and the Estates Commissioners are of opinion that the holding cannot be acquired for the evicted tenant. The Commissioners have offered Crowley another holding on the estate, and have intimated that they would be prepared to make him a grant of £200 to assist him in working it, but Crowley has, through his solicitor, refused the offer.

Restoration of the Murphy Family.

MR. POWER: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in restoring the lands of Shanaclune, Barron estate, Dunhill, County Waterford, to the representatives of the Murphy family, seeing that there is no objection raised to the transaction by the landlord, who is selling his property under the provisions of the Land Act, 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have now received their inspector's scheme for the distribution of the lands in question, and will consider the case of the Murphy family as soon as they are in a position to deal with the scheme.

Belfast Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that since the transfer of certain members of the Royal Irish Constabulary from Belfast it has transpired that many were wrongly punished; and whether, having regard to all the facts, he will cause all unfavourable records to be withdrawn from those officers who deny the charges until a sworn inquiry is held and they are given an opportunity to prove their innocence, or otherwise.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) A year has now passed since the occurrence in Belfast in connection with which certain policemen were transferred to other districts, and the matter cannot now be reopened. The Inspector-General has no reason whatever to believe that any of the men whose transfers were finally decided on have been wrongly punished.

Police Transferred from Belfast.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of police officers of the Royal Irish Constabulary who were transferred from Belfast to counties after the attempted police strike on 27th July, 1907; the number who were reported for attending the meeting at Musgrave Street Barracks on the same date; the number of such officers who denied the charge; and by what authority were such officers punished by receiving unfavourable records for offences denied by them, seeing that no Court of inquiry was held, and in view of the denial of facilities for proving their innocence.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Two head constables, four sergeants, and 228 constables were transferred from Belfast in connection with the occurrences of July, 1907. 224 constables were reported for disobedience of orders by attending the meeting at Musgrave Street Barracks, and of these 97 denied the charge. The Inspector-General found the charge to be proved as regards 208 constables, and allowed the charges to drop in the remaining 16 cases. Courts of inquiry are not held as a matter of course in such cases, but only if the Inspector-General requires the assistance of such Courts to enable him to arrive at a decision. In these cases the evidence was clear, and the Inspector-General required no such assistance. Each case was dealt with separately, and the written statement of the accused was fully considered. It should be stated that, of the transfers referred to in the first part of this Answer, the two head constables, the four sergeants, and nine of the constables were not reported for disobedience of orders, but were subsequently transferred in the interests of the service.

Withholding of Salary of Teacher of Oatquarter National School.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state why £2 17s. 6d., salary due to teacher of Oatquarter National School, Roll No. 14,532, for the quarter ending 31st March, 1907, has been withheld, seeing that a medical certificate of illness was forwarded by the teacher to the National Board, and that a teacher is entitled to a month's salary if ill, while the teacher in question was only absent seven days.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The amount in question was deducted from the salary of the teacher because he closed his school on certain days during the quarter ending 31st March, 1907, without notification to, or permission from, the manager of the school, who declined to certify the justice of the teacher's claim for payment in respect of these days.

Irish Teachers' Salaries—Conditions of Increased Grants.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in making a grant of £114,000 for the increase of teachers' salaries in National Schools, the Treasury have attached the condition that grants to all small schools having an attendance of less than fifteen shall be withdrawn, thus involving the closing of 225 schools, as vacancies occur in the teaching staff whether the Commissioners of National Education have pointed out to the Treasury that a large number of small schools are an absolute necessity owing to the population being scattered over wide areas, and have twice refused to agree to this condition, and have only accepted it under compulsion; whether this action of the Treasury is an invasion of the rights of the Commissioners to decide what schools should be supported by the State, and will involve the closing of all small Protestant schools in the South and West of Ireland, with the result that Protestant children will receive no State education except at schools under Roman Catholic management and carried on by nuns and members of the Roman Catholic orders, and against the will of Protestant parents; and whether, in view of these facts, he will take steps to withdraw this condition attached to the grants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I see no necessity for entering into the subject of the Question, seeing that the original Supplementary Estimate has been withdrawn and that a revised Estimate is to be presented. I would ask the hon. Member to await the appearance of the revised Estimate.

Transfer of Constable Hugh Martin from Belfast.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Constable Hugh Martin, who was transferred from Lisburn Road Barracks, Belfast, on 5th August, 1907, on the ground that he attended an unauthorised meeting in Musgrave Street on 27th July, 1907, was on that date on the sick-list and unable to leave his home; and, in view of this fact and that Constable Martin has witnesses to prove his innocence, he will cause a sworn inquiry to be held in this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General, Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that he was completely satisfied, upon the testimony of senior members of the force, that Constable Martin, was present at the unauthorised meeting referred to. It is not intended to reopen, by sworn inquiry or otherwise, a case which was disposed of nearly a year ago.

Relief of Distress in Belfast.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any portion of the grant-in-aid for relief works in distressed unions in Ireland will be available for works for the relief of those suffering from the present distress in Belfast; and whether any steps have been taken there for the formation of a relief committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The grant was intended for the purpose only of aiding the relief operations under Section 13 of the Local Government Act in districts in which, owing to low valuation, high rates, and the poverty of the ratepayers generally, the resources of the union were insufficient to provide for the prevailing distress. The section quoted has not been in operation in Belfast, and happily no question has arisen in that union as to the financial position of the ratepayers.

Policeman and the Disturbances at Portadown.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a policeman took part in the doings of a mob which paraded the streets of Portadown on the morning of the 13th instant, smashing windows and doors in the houses of Catholics; and whether any notice will be taken of such conduct by the policeman's superiors.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police authorities inform me that full and searching inquiry has been made into this subject, and that not the slightest foundation can be found for the allegation contained in the Question. Moreover, no complaint whatever has been made to the police authorities that any such conduct occurred on the part either of a constable or of a mob.

Disturbances at Portadown.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state why it is that Orange processions and mobs are allowed by the police to march through the Catholic portions of Portadown, when there are other ways by which they could proceed to their destination; and whether, in the interests of the peace of the town, he will direct that they shall not be allowed to proceed through such quarters in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The direct route for Orange processions entering Portadown from the northern portion of County Armagh runs through Obin Street, part of which is a Catholic quarter. There are two other routes by which such processions could enter Portadown, but these routes are circuitous and inconvenient. I am informed by the police that the Orange processions have for generations used the direct route, and it is not considered desirable to interfere with the practice. The police take full precautions for the preservation of the peace on such occasions.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the morning of the 13th instant a band of persons paraded the streets of Portadown, cursing the Pope and smashing the windows in a number of Catholic houses; whether the police made any attempt to interfere with these rowdies; whether an attack was also made on a Catholic house in Marley Street, and the door burst in; whether any arrests have been made in connection with these occurrences; and whether any steps will be taken to prevent them in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police authorities inform me that the streets of Portadown were continually patrolled by the police from 9 p.m. on 12th to 4 a.m. on 13th July, and that no such conduct as is described in the Question came under the notice of the police or could have occurred without their knowledge, and no complaints were made to them. Special police precautions were taken for the preservation of the peace in Portadown during the July anniversaries, with, I am informed, entirely satisfactory results.

Cuiltybo National School.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the National School at Cuiltybo, Claremorris, County Mayo, has been repeatedly condemned by school inspectors in their reports to the Commissioners of National Education as a dilapidated structure, inconveniently situated, in very bad repair, not worth repairing, in danger at any time of falling in over the children's heads, and undeserving of the Board's grants; whether any action has been taken by the Commissioners of National Education on these reports, and, if so, what; and whether, in view of the repeatedly expressed wishes of the parents of the district for a new school, he will draw the attention of the Commissioners to the matter without delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education have sanctioned a grant towards the erection of a new schoolhouse in place of the existing building, and the manager will be furnished with the necessary plans and specifications.

Recognition of Colonial Services.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether, having regard to the political and commercial developments of the greater Colonies, which have outgrown limitations regarded as commensurate when constituted, as well as to the importance of extending appropriate recognition to men who are performing valuable and important services at the outposts of the Empire, whether in commerce or in the services, subjects may be permitted to make their appeals for the recognition through the Premiers of provincial Parliaments, to avoid the present circumlocution and the delay not infrequently occasioned, which now not infrequently amounts to injustice.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) The hon. Member will probably agree with me in thinking that recognition of services rendered to His Majesty the King in any part of His Majesty's dominions should rather be spontaneously recommended by others than solicited by those who have rendered the services. In the self-governing dominions the Premiers make their views on such subjects known to the Governors, who are the King's representatives, and who forward them with an expression of their own opinions, and with their own recommendations, to the Secretary of State. It would, in the opinion of the present Secretary of State, be most undesirable to make a change in this practice, and it is not admitted that it has been the cause of unreasonable delay.

Railway Employees.

Mr. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the number of men employed in connection with the traffic department of tramway undertakings in the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I regret that I have no Returns which enable me to give this information.

Foreign Trade of China.

Earl of RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, if he can give the value of the foreign trade of China for the year 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The following particulars give the information desired by the noble Lord:—

Value of the Foreign Trade of China in 1907.

	£
Imports (total) - - -	69,724,000
Exports:	
Of Chinese produce -	42,962,000
Of Foreign produce -	2,059,000
Grand total	£114,745,000

The above particulars relate to trade which is under the control of the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs, and exclude a small amount of trade, carried on wholly by native vessels, with respect to which no information is available.

Cost of Living in Scotch Towns.

Mr. ERSKINE (Perthshire, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General, whether he is able to state the cost of living index number for the following towns:—Aberfeldy, Auchterarder, Crieff, Dunblane and Pitlochry.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The towns quoted have not yet formed the subject of investigations by the Board of Trade; they are provisionally classed by analogy of other towns.

Increased Pay for Irish Rural Letter Carriers

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether it is proposed to give Irish rural letter-carriers any increase in pay; whether he is aware that some of these carriers work for wages as low as 4s. 6d. a week, 9s. 6d. being the maximum for a man; and whether he will consider the advisability of revising these rates of pay.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I presume the hon. Member is referring to rural auxiliaries employed for a few hours a day. These auxiliaries are paid at varying hourly rates, and there is no fixed maximum of 9s. 6d. a week. The pay of auxiliaries is being revised.

Commissions for Private Students at Keyham.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether twenty-four private students were entered into Keyham in 1904 on the same terms as engineering cadets and under the same Regulations as to discipline, uniform, pay, and leave; and whether, having regard to the good results obtained by some of these students, the Board of Admiralty will offer the most proficient the boon they desire of commissions in the engineer branch of the Royal Navy.]

(*Answered by Mr McKenna.*) Twenty-five private students entered Keyham in 1904. They came in on the understanding that they would be eligible for any unexpected vacancies that might occur for commissions as engineer officers in the Royal Navy. There has only been one vacancy, and this has been offered to the student who came out first on the list.

Line and Trawl-Caught Fish.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the quantity of line-caught fish and trawl-caught fish, respectively, landed in Scotland for each year during the the last ten years, distinguishing line-caught fish secured by steam liners from line-caught fish secured by sailing boats.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The following table shows the quantities of line-caught fish and trawl-caught fish landed in Scotland during the last ten years.

	Line-caught Fish.	Trawl-caught Fish.
	Cwts.	Cwts.
1898 - - - - -	1,050,000	783,000
1899 - - - - -	939,000	983,000
1900 - - - - -	757,000	1,077,000
1901 - - - - -	696,000	1,328,000
1902 - - - - -	608,700	1,467,000
1903 - - - - -	602,600	1,566,000
1904 - - - - -	753,700	1,705,600
1905 - - - - -	735,654	1,745,431
1906 - - - - -	688,057	1,870,517
1907 - - - - -	614,869	2,079,701

The catches of steam liners and sailing liners were not recorded separately previous to 1906. In 1906, 180,119 cwts. were landed by steam liners and 507,938 cwts. by sail liners. In 1907 the figures were 177,328 cwts. and 437,541 cwts., respectively.

Migration of Lewis Cottars.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state whether the landward committee of the Stornoway Parish Council have yet furnished information in regard to Lewis cottars who are willing to migrate; and, seeing that it is six months since a list of upwards of 120 cottars was sent to the Scottish Office, will he state the cause of the delay in obtaining information respecting their qualifications.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Answer is in the negative. No action can be taken by the Congested Districts Board until the landward committee have furnished the information which they are endeavouring to obtain.

Construction of Boat Shelter and Sea Wall at Skigersta.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Congested Districts Board have yet considered the Resolution passed by the people of Ness, Stornoway, Island of Lewis, early in the year, pressing for the construction of a boat shelter and sea wall at Skigersta, such as will enable the people to prosecute the deep-sea line-fishing by means of the larger-sized decked boats; and will he state whether the Board propose to provide a grant in aid of the work.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I do not think this is a practicable proposal, but it is one part only of the large and difficult problem of the condition of the Lewis which is now before me, and I am not at present prepared to make any statement.

Lemstrom Electrification System and the Cultivation of Wheat.

Mr. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether his attention has been called to the success of the experiments made in this country in increasing the yield of wheat by means of the Lemstrom electrification system; and whether he has considered the advisability of having the experiment tried in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The attention of the Department has been called to these experiments, and the matter is being inquired into.

Notification of Tuberculosis.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board in how many cases Parliamentary powers have been given to local authorities in England and Wales enabling them to require the notification of tuberculosis by medical men under penalty; whether such powers have been given in respect of tuberculosis of the lung only, or in respect of any form of tuberculosis; whether such powers have been given in any cases for more than a limited period of time; in how many case have voluntary systems of notification of tuberculosis been adopted; and whether the results obtained under a voluntary system have compared favourably with those obtained under a compulsory system.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Parliamentary powers have been given in two such cases, viz., Sheffield and Bolton. In both cases the powers have been given in respect of tuberculosis of the lung only, and for a limited period. I am aware of about 150 cases in which voluntary systems of notification of tuberculosis have been adopted or tried in England and Wales, and there may possibly be others. It cannot, I think, be expected that under ordinary circumstances a voluntary system of notification will secure as early or complete notification of cases as will a compulsory system, and the preponderant experience in England and Wales appears to confirm this expectation.

London Customs House Accommodation.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether any provision has been made for providing additional accommodation at the Customs House in London; and, if so, what amount is to be expended and what progress has been made with the work.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) No provision has been made in this year's Estimates for additional accommodation. No Estimate can be given of the cost of work at the Custom House, as the requirements are not yet known.

Emigration of British Subjects to Canada and United States.

MR. KING (Cheshire, Knutsford): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state how many British-born subjects have emigrated from these islands to Canada and the United States, respectively, during each of the last ten years and during the first six months of this year; whether he has any information to show in what proportion of cases the enterprise of these emigrants has been rewarded by successful settlement in the land of their adoption, or in what proportion they have returned home within twelve months of the date of their departure; and can he further say to what extent their places in the congested areas of this country have been filled up by immigrants of foreign nationality.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The following statement gives particulars of the movement of British and Irish passengers from the United Kingdom to Canada and the United States of America, and from Canada and the United States of America to the United Kingdom, during each of the years 1898–1907, and during the first five months of the present year. Particulars of the passenger movement for June are not yet compiled. The figures include a number of ordinary passengers as well as prospective settlers. There is no information as to the length of time during which passengers returning to this country remained in Canada and the United States of America, nor as to the number of alien immigrants who had settled in congested areas of this country.

Statement showing the Number of British and Irish Passengers that left or arrived in the United Kingdom for or from British North America and the United States, respectively, in each of the years 1898 to 1907 and during the five months ending 31st May, 1908.

	United States.			British North America.			Total, United States and British North America.		
	Outward.	Inward.	Balance outward.	Outward.	Inward.	Balance outward.	Outward.	Inward.	Balance outward.
1898 - - - -	80,494	50,728	29,766	17,640	9,794	7,846	98,134	60,522	37,612
1899 - - - -	92,482	53,643	38,839	16,410	8,395	8,015	108,892	62,038	46,854
1900 - - - -	102,797	54,819	47,978	18,443	10,640	7,803	121,240	65,459	55,781
1901 - - - -	104,195	58,312	45,883	15,757	8,636	7,121	119,952	66,948	53,004
1902 - - - -	108,498	56,881	51,617	26,293	11,563	14,730	134,971	68,444	66,347
1903 - - - -	123,663	58,271	65,392	59,652	13,786	45,866	183,315	72,057	111,258
1904 . - - -	146,445	79,655	66,790	69,681	18,397	51,284	216,126	98,052	118,074
1905 - - - -	122,370	61,373	60,997	82,437	19,934	62,503	204,807	81,307	123,500
1906 - - - -	144,817	58,876	85,941	114,859	23,596	91,263	259,676	82,472	177,204
1907 - - - -	170,264	70,320	99,944	151,216	33,691	117,525	321,480	104,011	217,469
Five months ending 31st May, 1908 -	40,661	25,867	14,794	41,335	9,684	31,651	81,996	35,551	46,445

Sunday Hotel Licences in Scotland.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the number of six-day hotel licences at present existing in Scotland; and, if not, whether he will procure information as to this.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The number of hotel licences issued in Scotland by the Excise for the year ending 31st March, 1908, under the provisions of Section 43 (4) of the Act 43 and 44 Vict., was 375. But the number of such Excise licences which have been granted upon a justice's or magistrate's certificate for six days is not distinguished in the statistics now available.

Old-Age Pensions in Rural Districts.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to the Estimate of 194,000 persons in the rural districts of the United Kingdom who will receive old-age pensions on the Pensions Bill becoming operative, what is the estimated total number of such rural pensioners in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, respectively; what is the estimated percentage of such rural pensioners in each country to the total rural and urban population of it; and what is the estimated total number of persons in each country who, when the Pensions Bill becomes operative, will be seventy years of age but not entitled to the benefits of the measure.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am afraid that the Estimate of 194,000, which, as I informed the hon. Member on the 17th instant, is approximate only, does not admit of analysis in the manner desired with any degree of accuracy.

Irish Unemployment Grant.

Mr. J. DEVLIN: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state what portion of the £200,000 required under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, will be allocated to Ireland, and how much of it will be available for Belfast.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) It is impossible to answer the hon. Member's inquiry until applications have been received from the Local Government Boards of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the circumstances of each case fully considered.

Earned Incomes.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, if it can be shown that an individual owns all the ordinary shares in a limited company and gives the whole of his time to the management and business of that company, and is dependent for the whole of his income upon the dividends paid by the business, he can claim a reduction upon earned income under the Act of 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Only so much of the profits of a limited company as the articles of association provide as remuneration for services to the company, and as are actually so paid according to the accounts, can be regarded as earned income within Section 19 of the Finance Act, 1907.

Inland Revenue Returns.

Mr. SEARS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the number of returns and accounts required annually at different periods from collectors of Inland Revenue; is he aware that sixty-eight collectors made from 150,000 to 200,000 such annual contributions, and that of these upwards of 35,000 go to the Accountant and Comptroller-General's Department in Somerset House; and will he cause inquiry to be made as to the usefulness of such returns, with a view to prevent unnecessary expenditure of official time and stationery.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I will cause inquiry to be made.

Administration of Old-Age Pensions Scheme.

Mr. SEARS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer in view of the statement that the new Customs and Excise Department would deal with goods only, whether it is intended to restrict certain offices to old-age pension work exclusively; will he state the agency to be employed in collecting intoxicating liquors and other licences; and will he say by what means it is intended to distinguish the pension officer, who is to be a Treasury official, from the licensing officer, who is to hold his commission from the Board of Inland Revenue or Customs.

Mr. SEARS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that, in restricting Customs officers under the amalgamation to dealing with goods only without regard to licences, there will be a number of breweries, certain warehouses, and some distilleries in remote places where it has been found impossible to profitably employ the officers' time without the inclusion of considerable licensing work; and, as the amalgamation will considerably disturb an arrangement that has worked satisfactorily and economically, will he state how it is proposed to deal with this matter so as to avoid employing officers for part time only, and unnecessarily duplicating such officers in certain districts.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Until the amalgamation has actually taken place it would be premature to forecast the details of the necessary arrangements. The old-age pension officer will, as a rule, have revenue duties also.

Gravesend Torpedo Slipway—Arbitration Award.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, through the unauthorised action of local officials at Gravesend, the contractors for the new torpedo slipway have been awarded by arbitration £3,076, instead of the £1,135 for which they contracted to do the work; who was the local official responsible; and how has his case been dealt with.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I must refer my hon. friend to the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, which will shortly be in the hands of hon. Members.

Cost of British South African Garrison.

Mr. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the cost per head of, taking all rank together, but taking each arm of the service separately, maintaining the British garrisons in the Transvaal Orange River Colony, Natal, and Cape Colony respectively; what number of military stations are there at present in each of these Colonies; and what is the number of troops of each arm at each of them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The average effective cost per head (all ranks) of the principal arms in each Colony is as follows:—

	Cape.			Natal.			Orange River Colony.			Transvaal.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s	d.
Cavalry	109	2	9		—		108	3	10	109	8	2
Horse Artillery (on higher establishment)		—			—			—		119	17	3
Field Artillery (on lower establishment)	117	9	3		—		116	4	1	118	1	5
Engineers (field units)		—			—		104	4	5	104	9	5
Infantry	74	5	3	73	17	4	74	4	8	74	4	10

These figures include the cost of horses, but not the cost of staff, schools of instruction, sea transport, carriage of stores, labour establishments, and other items which cannot be appropriated to the several regimental units.

The stations and distribution of the troops at present are as follows :—

South Africa.

	Establishments (all ranks).						
	Cavalry.	R. H. A.	R. F. A.	R. G. A.	R. E.	Infantry.	Departments, &c.
Transvaal :							
Pretoria	594	360	—	—	211	2,451	—
Potchefstroom	1,186	—	136	—	142	—	—
Standerton	—	—	132	—	—	1,042	—
Orange River Colony :							
Bloemfontein	593	—	269	—	142	2,458	—
Harrismith	—	—	132	—	—	1,267	—
Cape Colony :							
Cape Town	—	—	—	114	—	—	—
Middelburg	593	—	132	—	—	817	—
Simonstown	—	—	—	113	127	—	—
Wynberg	—	—	—	—	—	817	—
Natal :							
Pietermaritzburg	—	—	—	—	—	817	—
Departmental Corps, &c. (no separate establishment for each station)	—	—	—	—	147	—	1,421
	2,966	360	801	227	769	9,669	1,421
	16,213						

Transfer of Officers to the Essex Regiment.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can explain why Captain Clutterbuck and Captain Pepys were transferred to the Essex Regiment, now serving in Burmah, Captain Pepys having less service than four captains and nine subalterns now serving in the regiment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) In consequence of the reduction of the battalion of the West India Regiment and Royal Warwickshire Regiment, to which these officers respectively belonged they became supernumerary, and their transfer was imperative. There were about 200 officers similarly situated, and the Army Council decided that when transferred the officers of all the reduced regiments should get the benefit of their seniority, and that these supernumeraries should be distributed as equally as possible throughout the infantry of the Army. Every consideration was given to the comparative age and service of officers transferred with that of the officers over whose heads they went in their new regiment, but it was manifestly impossible in many instances to prevent the supersession of officers older and of longer service.

Straffan Stud Farms and Military Manœuvres.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in direct opposition to the owners of the Straffan Station Stud Farms, important Army manœuvres are to be held on this estate; and, if so whether the Government are prepared to meet claims for any losses which may arise from these manœuvres to the blood stock on these farms.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The hon. Member appears to have been misinformed. The Military Manœuvres Act is not in force for any manœuvres held in Ireland this year, and consequently it is impossible to manœuvre over any land in that country without the consent of the owner or occupier.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Portsmouth Gun Wharf Fire.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether a fire occurred at the Gun Wharf, Portsmouth, on the 2nd January, 1907, causing damage to the extent of a quarter of a million sterling, the camp equipment of an Army Corps being destroyed; and whether the building was owned by the Admiralty.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): In regard to the first part of the Question, I must refer the hon. Member to my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War. The Answer to the latter part of the Question is in the negative.

H.M.S. "Gladiator."

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will state what reasons exist for not using the two steel cylinders or camels which were made to raise the "Montagu" for the purpose of raising the "Gladiator"; and what the price was of these camels, and where they are now.

MR. MCKENNA: There were no cylindrical camels used. Seven of the rectangular camels constructed for the "Montagu" salvage operations are still in existence, having been turned over to the Works Department at Devonport for use at Oreston Quarries. These camels are quite unsuitable for the first operations in the salvage of H.M.S. "Gladiator" and will probably not be suitable for use in the subsequent operations, as the conditions are different from those which existed in the case of H.M.S. "Montagu."

London Engineer Offices.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will sanction pay and separation allowances, according to their former rank in the Volunteers, to those non-commissioned officers in the London Engineers who have transferred their services from the Volunteers to the Territorial Army and have been reduced in rank.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. ACLAND, Yorkshire, Richmond): It is not clear to what unit the hon. Baronet is referring. Under paragraph 79, Part I., Army Order, 18th March, 1908, every non-commissioned officer in a transferred unit is entitled to retain his rank in his own unit, and while he retains his rank he receives the pay of that rank. If the hon. Baronet will give specific instances I will have inquiry made.

Australasian Dissatisfaction with Suez Canal Dues.

MR. MOLTENO (Dumfriesshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction of the Colonies of Australia and New Zealand with the charges levied by the Suez Canal Company on shipping passing between those Colonies and the Mother Country; whether representations have been made by the Governor-General of the Commonwealth to the effect that steamships trading between Australia and Great Britain are deterred from taking the shorter route by reason of the heavy charges levied by the Suez Canal authorities and are compelled to take the longer route round South Africa, involving several days extra steaming; whether the Governor-General has suggested, in view of the dividend of 28 per cent. paid on the Suez Canal shares, a substantial reduction in existing rates and asked, on behalf of Australia as well as of all other British Possessions lying to the East of Egypt, that the influence of the British Government should be used to secure concessions which would have a material effect on inter-Empire trade and upon the volume of traffic which will pass through the canal; whether these representations were strongly reinforced by the Premiers of Australia and New Zealand at the recent Colonial Conference; and whether they are being taken into consideration by His Majesty's Government, together with those to the same effect from British shipowners.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The facts are generally as stated in the Question. The matter is being considered by His Majesty's Government and will not be overlooked.

Transvaal Compensation Fund.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the loss of £41,420 7s. 11d. entailed on the Exchequer through the failure of the Colonial Office to reply to the High Commissioner of South Africa as to the allocation of the charge for the administration of the compensation fund between Great Britain and the Transvaal; whether the responsibility for this loss has been brought home to any particular official; and what action has been taken in the matter.

COLONEL SEELY: The reference is, I presume, to Section 10 of the Second Report of the Public Accounts Committee just laid. It is quite a mistake to suppose that any loss of public money occurred or that any additional charge was thrown upon the Exchequer through the action of the Colonial Office, for whatever may have been the merits of the question whether administrative expenses could properly be charged to the fund, the Colonial Government had unquestionably full power to spend the money in increasing the compensation paid to protected burghers. I would refer my hon. friend as regards this compensation fund to the Report of the Central Judicial Committee printed in Cd. 3028. I must deny that there was improper delay in the matter on the part of the Colonial Office. The money has since been re-voted by Parliament.

Native Labourers' Wages in the Transvaal.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will state the minimum salary per adult for each utilised working day in respect of native labourers for the Transvaal recruited in Portuguese East Africa.

COLONEL SEELY: The average monthly wage earned by natives and Cape boys according to the last Annual Report of the Government Mining Engineer was 52s. 3d., but I have no further information.

Native Labour Pass Regulations.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table the pass regulations in force in the Transvaal mines in connection with the employment of native labourers recruited from Portuguese East Africa and elsewhere.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir. I do not think that the expense of reprinting would be justified. The regulations in question were issued in 1903, with various later modifications, and are made under the authority of the Proclamation No. 37 of 1901, printed in Cd. 904, and an Ordinance of 1903.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: Will the hon. Gentleman put a copy in the Library?

COLONEL SEELY: That would involve reprinting, and I think it hardly reasonable to insist on that. But if the hon. Gentleman and any of his friends will call at the Colonial Office they can get what information they require.

Portuguese Native Labourers.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary for the Colonies what is the opportunity which the curator has of influencing natives from Portuguese East Africa to return to Portuguese territory when their period of contract for the Transvaal mines has ended; and whether the Transvaal Government have any intention of introducing legislation to secure the effectiveness of this contractual obligation.

COLONEL SEELY: The curator's action is only advisory. I am not aware of any intended legislation by the Transvaal.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): But are not the mineowners bound by contract to see that the natives return at the end of their contract, and are not the Government in honour bound to see that the contract is carried out?

COLONEL SEELY: I do not think that that is an accurate description of the state of affairs. In point of fact I am told that a great many of the natives do not return.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: But is it not provided for in the contract, and are the Government and the mineowners to be allowed to evade their responsibility?

COLONEL SEELY: If there is such a clause it is not enforced.

British Government Shares in the Suez Canal Company.

MR. MOLTENO (Dumfriesshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that, although the British Government possesses a number of shares approaching one-half of the existing shares of the Suez Canal Company, its voting power is only equal to that possessed by holders of 250 shares; and whether, in view of this fact and of the fact that the dues on British shipping amount to nearly three-quarters of all the dues received by the Suez Canal Company, he can see his way to secure a representation for the British Government more in accord with its actual holding of shares, and also more in accord with the proportion of dues paid by British shipping.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. Any alteration in the existing system of voting would involve an amendment of the Statutes of the company, which cannot be effected without the consent of two-thirds of the shareholders, and I cannot say that an alteration would be feasible.

Suez Canal Dues—British Shipowners' Dissatisfaction.

MR. MOLTENO: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction which exists among British shipowners in regard to the dues charged by the Suez Canal Company; whether he is aware that an agreement was made in 1883 between M. Charles de Lesseps and the representatives of English shipowners, which provided that the dividend might rise from 17 per cent. until it reached 25 per cent., after which the surplus profits were to be used in reduction of the dues until they reached five francs per ton; whether this agreement was duly signed by the parties and subsequently ratified at a shareholders' meeting of the Suez Canal Company in Paris; whether the canal company have refused to carry out the agreement, though the dividend rose to 26 per cent. in 1904, and has been 28 per cent. since 1906; and whether he can see his way to using the influence of the British Government to assist in securing the observance of that agreement.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am aware of some dissatisfaction among owners of cargo vessels and of the agreement between Monsieur Charles de Lesseps and the members of the association of steamship owners trading to the East as well as of its submission to the shareholders. The agreement was, however, subsequently modified by the successors of the original parties to it, and it is not in the power of the British Government to have it altered.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Is it not the fact that these dues are an advantage to this country, which holds a large number of shares?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Of course we get the benefit.

Russian Loan in Great Britain.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it has come to his knowledge that the Russian Government contemplate issuing a loan in Great Britain.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information to the effect suggested by the hon. Member.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) asked whether this was a matter in which the Government could interfere, if people were willing to lend their money?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Of course, borrowing in the open market is no affair of ours. I presume the Question was put to ascertain facts.

Turco-Persian Frontier Negotiations.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state the present position of the negotiations for the delimitation of the Turco-Persian frontier; and whether the Turkish troops have been withdrawn from Passovah.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The frontier negotiations appear to be very much *in statu quo ante*; I have no definite information as to the situation at Passovah at the present time, but on June 23rd the Grand Vizier promised the British and Russian representatives at Constantinople that orders should at once be sent for the withdrawal of any troops that might have advanced beyond the "neutral" zone, and this would include Passovah if occupied by Ottoman troops.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. LYNCH—

SIR EDWARD GREY said we had a consul in the neighbourhood from whom information was obtained.

Khedivial School of Agriculture at Cairo.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how many pupils now attend the Khedivial School of Agriculture at Cairo, and what are their nationalities; whether any and what amount of instruction is now given in the Arabic language; and what is the annual cost of the upkeep of the school.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The information asked for, down to as late as last December, is given in pages 40 and 41 of Sir Eldon Gorst's Annual Report. I will make inquiry as to the rest of the Question.

Mortgage Bank in Egypt.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Egyptian Government has knowledge of a proposal by Sir Ernest Cassel to establish a new mortgage bank in Egypt, and whether he will state for the information of the House the conditions under which such banks can be established.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer is in the negative. I will inquire whether any conditions have been laid down, and if so what they are.

Macedonian Reforms.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when he expects to receive the replies of the other Powers signatory of the Berlin Treaty to the proposals agreed upon between His Majesty's Government and that of Russia for reform in Macedonia; and can he state whether the whole of these proposals, or only a portion of them, have yet been submitted to the Powers.

SIR EDWARD GREY: A portion only of the proposals has been submitted to the Powers, and it is hoped that the reply to these may be received at no distant date.

Macedonian Bands.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have invited, or propose to invite, the Sultan of Turkey to organise mobile columns to suppress the Macedonian bands.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Proposals of the nature indicated are under the consideration of the Powers, but it would be premature to make any statement at present till their opinion is known.

Disorders at Tabriz.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will communicate to the House the substance of any information which he may have received on the subject of the disorders in the city and province of Tabriz from His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabriz; and are any, and, if so, what, steps being taken by His Majesty's Government, in conjunction with that of Russia, to bring about a speedy settlement of the differences between the Shah and the Constitutional Party.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have received various reports to the effect that fighting has been in progress at Tabriz between the supporters of the Shah and the popular party. According to the latest information in my possession, the Shah's party, which was defended by Government horsemen, was attacked again on 20th July by the popular party. The Government horsemen were defeated, and withdrew to their second line of defence. The reactionary Enjumen, or political club, was occupied by the popular party, which pulled down the white flag hoisted there by the clergy. The clergy and Acting-Governor-General are said to have hidden. It is reported in the Press that there has been further fighting, which is exceedingly probable, though I have not yet heard the result of it. With regard to the last part of the hon. Member's Question, the Russian and British Governments are of one opinion as to the necessity of strict abstention from any forcible interference on their part in the internal affairs of the country.

MR. LYNCH: In view of the serious news just received to the effect that the telegraph wires have been cut, will the right hon. Gentleman give the House any assurance as to the measures that have been taken to secure the safety of the British Consul-General?

SIR EDWARD GREY: So far, in this Persian trouble, there has been no danger to foreigners. As for the rest, Persia must look after herself.

MR. ASHLEY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether there are any Russian officers now serving with the Shah's troops?

SIR EDWARD GREY: So far as I am aware, there are no Russian officers at Tabriz or at Teheran.

*MR. REES: Is there any record that at any time Europeans have been molested during popular disturbances in Persia?

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer to that Question would require a great deal of historical research.

Death Duties.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the amounts assessed as death duties for the last financial year in England, Ireland, and Scotland, respectively.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The net receipt of death duties in the United Kingdom during the year ended 31st March, 1908, is as follows—England, £16,571,384; Scotland, £1,847,018; Ireland, £689,854; United Kingdom, £19,108,256.

Supplementary Civil Service Estimates.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Supplementary Civil Service Estimates issued on the 22nd of June and the 15th July include sums, aggregating £378,000, for which no provision was made in the Budget; whether he is aware that the balance provided in the Budget for contingencies was £241,000; and whether he anticipates that the yield of the revenue will exceed the Budget Estimates, and, if not, from what source he proposes to meet the additional charge of £137,000.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It has frequently happened in the past that the Estimates voted by Parliament for the service of a particular year have exceeded the Revenue available for meeting them, as estimated in the Budget. In such cases the Ways and Means required for the Supplementary Votes may be provided either by surplus Revenue, or by savings under other heads of expenditure which were included in the Budget.

Scotland and the Income-tax.

MR. R. DUNCAN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the proportion which the income-tax assessment, on which taxes were contributed by Scotland, bears to that of England, or of England and Wales combined, for the years 1906–7 and 1907–8.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The respective amounts of income-tax contributed by England and Wales and by Scotland must necessarily be a matter of speculation; but, calculated on the basis of the estimate shown in Return No. 245 [Revenue and Expenditure (England, Scotland and Ireland) 1906–7], they would be as follows:—

Year.	England and Wales.	Scotland.	Percentage of contribution by Scotland.
	£.	£.	
1906–7 -	27,271,000	3,106,000	11·39
1907–8 -	27,246,000	3,110,000	11·41

Cost of Old-age Pensions.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what he estimates will be the full total of the moneys that will have to be provided by Parliament during the whole of 1909 to meet the payment of all the old-age pensions contained in the Old-age Pensions Bill after it had been read a third time in this House.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The concessions made in Committee are estimated to increase the cost of the scheme in 1909 by approximately £500,000. This was originally estimated at about £6,000,000. So the total cost of the scheme as amended, for the first complete year of its operation, may be expected to amount to about £6,500,000. Any estimate must, however, at the present stage and until practical experience of its working has been obtained, be highly conjectural.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): What will the expenditure for 1910 be approximately?

MR. CLOUGH: Are we to understand, then, that Lord Rosebery's forecast of ten millions was altogether overdrawn?

*MR. SPEAKER: It is very undesirable to refer to debates in another place in connection with a Question in this House.

Royal Warrant Holders and the Factory Laws.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what is the nature of the representations, if any, which he has made, and to whom such representations were made, in respect of the observance or contravention of the factory and health laws by firms enjoying the Royal Warrant and of firms applying for the Royal Warrant.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): In accordance with the promise made by the Under-Secretary on the 30th April last, I communicated the hon. Member's suggestions to the heads of the various departments of the Royal Household through which warrants are granted, namely, the Lord Chamberlain, the Lord Steward, the Master of the Horse, and the Keeper of the Privy Purse.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Have any answers been received?

MR. GLADSTONE: I believe, no.

Fish Curing Inquiry.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the

Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the inquiry into the fish-curing industry, promised in the debate on the Home Office Vote last year, was held; and, if so, when the Report may be expected; and whether any statement with regard to it can be made before the debate on the Home Office Vote.

MR. GLADSTONE: The promised inquiry has been made by the Chief Inspector, who has investigated on the spot the conditions existing in the different branches of this widely spread industry, and his Report has been embodied by him in his General Report for 1907 just issued. The subject is a very difficult one, and will require careful consideration, and I am not in a position to make any statement with regard to it at present.

Truck in the Potteries.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to the statements with regard to truck in the Potteries on pages 197, 198 of the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops; and if he will inquire of the Chairman of the Departmental Committee on Truck if the practices there referred to, involving customary payments and stoppages, are being dealt with by the Departmental Committee.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir; I am aware of the statements to which my right hon. friend refers; and I understand that the points raised have been under the consideration of the Departmental Committee on Truck.

Child Beggars.

MR. WILES (Islington, S): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the fact that Frederick M'Ghee and his wife were sentenced each to one month's hard labour at the West London Police Court on Monday last on the charge of begging, and that nothing previous had been known against the couple, and that the husband had served in the late South African War, he will cause inquiries to be made with a view to reducing their sentences.

MR. GLADSTONE: I understand that the object the magistrate had in view when passing sentence was to deter persons from using their children in the streets for the purpose of obtaining alms, and that he had found lighter punishments ineffective for this purpose. I am making some further inquiry, but on the information at present before me I see no ground for advising any interference with the sentences.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Would it not be better to take the children away from their parents in these cases?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am considering that.

Hamstead Colliery Disaster—Rewards for Bravery.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is now in a position to state to the House that he is prepared to recognise in a substantial form the brave action of those who risked and in cases lost their lives in the attempt at rescue in the Hamstead Colliery disaster.

MR. GLADSTONE: Five of the men engaged in the rescue operations have been awarded Edward medals of the first class, and one the medal of the second class. The medals were presented to the recipients by His Majesty at the investure on Tuesday last. The medal of the first class has also been awarded to the widow of John Welsby, a member of the Altofts rescue party, who lost his life in the attempt to rescue the men in the mine.

The Imprisoned Suffragists.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that the ladies now in prison for making demonstrations against the Government are, in default of finding sureties, suffering a heavier penalty than could have been inflicted if they had actually been found guilty of sedition, in view of the fact that by the Prisons Act of 1898 a person imprisoned for sedition or seditious libel must be treated as a first-class misdemeanant; and whether, in view of this circumstance, he will recommend the transference from the second division to the first of the ladies now in prison on account of their having made political demonstrations.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Persons found guilty of sedition are liable to imprisonment for two years, and must by Statute be placed in the first division. As regards the prison treatment of these ladies, I must refer my hon. friend to my numerous previous Answers upon this subject.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) asked the right hon. Gentleman if he did not think that the punishment was quite unsuited to the offence. Had he not power to "make the punishment fit the crime ?"

Mr. GLADSTONE: I can add nothing to the Answer I have already given to the Question.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) asked the reason for the different treatment of Dr. Jameson and his fellow offenders. They were treated as first-class misdemeanants, while these ladies, who had committed no crime whatever in comparison with these impure fellows, had to associate with ordinary criminals.

Mr. GLADSTONE said he had already explained.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) asked had not a sufficient time elapsed, had not the prisoners suffered enough, could not the right hon. Gentleman let them out ?

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said those who did not know the right hon. Gentleman would think him vindictive.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am very sorry for it, but I cannot help it.

The Suffragists.

Mr. BRODIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that a deputation of thirteen women proposing to visit the Prime Minister last March were arrested outside the Caxton Hall and sentenced to six weeks imprisonment, whereas on a more recent occasion a similar deputation with the same object were given a police escort to the Houses of Parliament, and what is the reason of the different treatment of the two deputations; whether the women agitating for votes for women arrested on 30th June were prosecuted before Mr. Francis under Section 2 of The Prevention of Crimes Amendment Act, 1885, the maximum penalty on conviction under which Act is a fine of £5, or imprisonment for two months in default; and will he say under what Act proceedings were taken against those persons who were imprisoned for three months in default of finding sureties.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The deputation of last February headed a procession from Caxton Hall to the Houses of Parliament, which was illegal and could not be permitted, and as they would not desist, the procession was broken up and arrests were made. On the second occasion there was no procession. All those present in Caxton Hall were asked to remain quietly, and the deputation proceeded alone, and were assisted in their progress by the police. The ladies who were arrested on the 30th June were charged under the statute mentioned by the hon. Member, but the learned magistrate, in his discretion, dealt with the defendants under the general powers vested in him by law in virtue of his commission, and required them to find sureties to be of good behaviour. I see no reason to doubt that the action taken was warranted by law, and was justified by the circumstances with which the magistrate had to deal.

Fenchurch Street Station Accident.

Mr. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that an accident occurred to a point cleaner at Fenchurch Street Station, Great Eastern Railway, on 9th March, 1908; that a Board of Trade inquiry was held into the matter on 15th April, 1908, when it was elicited that the point cleaner was working at this busy spot without a look-out man; whether he is aware that a look-out man was appointed after the inquiry; that the victim of the accident was removed from Fenchurch Street a week after the inquiry and a new point cleaner substituted without a look-out man; and will he say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Churchill, Dundee): The Board of Trade are informed by the railway company that it is not the case that a look-out man was appointed after the inquiry to which my hon. friend refers. The company also state that the new point cleaner (like his predecessor) prefers to work without a look-out man, and the company consider that to appoint such a man would probably increase the danger. The Board as at present advised are not convinced that this opinion is sound and propose to communicate again with the company.

Port of London Bill.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the total number of representations and petitions received by the Government objecting to or making suggestions in respect of the clauses of the Port of London Bill which relate to the Thames above Teddington; what are the names of the persons or bodies making such representations; and what alterations in the Port of London Bill are asked for by the persons and authorities making such representations and suggestions.

MR. CHURCHILL: A great number of such representations and petitions have been received. The particulars are too lengthy to be conveniently given in reply to a Question, but I will send them to my hon. friend. I may add that many of the suggestions contained in the communications have been met by Amendments in the Bill.

Glaunvarane Foreshore.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware of the proceedings taken by Mr. James Perry Howe, at Ballinspittal Petty Sessions, County Cork, on the 26th May, 1908, against John Mahony, jun., for trespass on the foreshore of Glaunvarane Strand; if Mr. Howe has a patent or grant from the Crown of this strand; and, if not, what steps will be taken to protect the Crown rights to the foreshore.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am aware of the proceedings taken by Mr. Howe against John Mahony for trespass on foreshore at Glaunvarane Strand, by attempting to take seaweed therefrom. Mr. Howe bases his claim to the foreshore in question on prescriptive rights, not on any patent or grant from the Crown, and the matter is under the consideration of the Board of Trade.

Labour and the Port of London Authority.

MR. W. BENN (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what Amendment to the Port of London Bill has been proposed by the Government to give effect to the promise of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that labour should be represented on the new authority.

MR. CHURCHILL: A clause has been inserted in the Bill by the Joint Committee at the instance of the Board of Trade in the following terms:—"(6a) With a view to providing for the representation of labour on the Port Authority one of the members of the Port Authority appointed by the Board of Trade shall be appointed by the Board after consultation with such organisations representative of labour as the Board think best qualified to advise them upon the matter.

MR. W. BENN: Will the right hon. Gentleman provide that one of the County Council nominees shall be a representative of labour

Mr. CHURCHILL said the matter had been very carefully considered already, and he did not think the Board of Trade could interfere.

MR. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe) asked whether, in view of the fact that the Port Authority would have very strong powers for dealing with labour through the labour exchanges, the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the point.

MR. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Chancellor of the Exchequer when introducing the Bill spoke of two or three labour representatives, and will he be able to do something with regard to influencing the London County Council to nominate as one of their representatives a representative of labour?

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not think it is in the power of the Board of Trade to influence a body having the right to nominate representatives as to the decision to which they should come.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) asked what methods the Board of Trade proposed to put into operation for consulting the organised workers in the Port of London.

MR. CHURCHILL said the Board of Trade had a good many means of making inquiries as to who were really representatives of the opinion of labour, and they proposed to use all the means at their disposal.

MR. B. S. STRAUS: Does the right hon. Gentleman remember the promise of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that labour should have two or three representatives?

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to say that his attention had not been called to that promise, but he would certainly search for it. He would, however, point out that the Port Authority must be kept within reasonable limits.

Price of Beef and the Beef Trust.

MR. HOWARD (Cumberland, Eskdale): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he proposes to take any steps to inquire into the operations of trusts for the supply, price, and distribution of meat in the United Kingdom.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am appointing a Departmental Committee to inquire how far and in what manner the general supply, distribution, and price of meat in the United Kingdom are controlled or affected by any combination of firms or companies. The noble Lord the Member for Marylebone has consented to act as Chairman of the Committee. I have further invited my hon. friends the Member for the Elland Division and the Members for Southampton and Deptford to be members, and I also propose to appoint representatives of the Board of Trade and Board of Agriculture, together with a gentleman possessing expert knowledge of the meat trade. The Board of Agriculture will be represented by Sir Thomas Elliot, K.C.B., the Secretary to the Board.

County Boroughs.

MR. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state what boroughs showing an estimated population of over 50,000 have, since the passing of the Local Government Act, 1888, been refused by the Local Government Board their applications to be created county boroughs.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): As respects three boroughs the Board have either refused the application or for special reasons deferred the consideration of it, viz., Hornsey, East Ham and Eastbourne.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what is the number of exemption certificates received by vaccination officers during the year 1907.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The number is 57,675.

Metropolitan Water Board Clerks.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Metropolitan Water Board have now 100 clerks more than were formerly employed by all the water companies whose concerns were absorbed by that Board; and whether the Metropolitan Water Board proposes shortly to make a call upon the rates for a contribution, whereas the water companies under the same conditions were able to pay their proprietors good dividends.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The facts are as stated in the first part of the Question. The increase in the number of officers of the Water Board is said to be due partly to extra clerical work, partly to the setting up of a department for the examination of water as required by the Metropolis Water Act, 1902, and partly to the fact that the staff of the Water Board now perform the legal and surveying work for which the companies employed outside firms. I understand, however, that the total annual amount of the salaries at present paid by the Water Board is about £5,000 less than that paid by the companies. I am not informed as to whether the Water Board propose to make a call upon the rates for a contribution.

Government Hospitality.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to provide any official hospitality for the delegates who have been appointed by Foreign Governments, on the invitation conveyed to them by our Foreign Office from the British Committee, to attend the Third International Congress for the Development of Drawing and Art Teaching and their Application to Industries, to be held in London during the present month.

*THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. L. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): The Prime Minister has asked me to deal with this Question, and I hope my hon. friend will not think me wanting in courtesy if I decline to give him any detailed Answer to it. My colleagues in making me responsible for Government hospitality have imposed on me a task which is very onerous and very delicate—a task for which I confess I feel myself wholly unfitted—but one which I can only perform at all if I am happy enough to command the confidence of both sides of this House. National hospitality would lose half its utility and all its grace if the reasons for which it was proffered or withheld were to become a matter of Question and Answer in Parliament. I would not for a moment suggest that this House should be debarred from criticising my administration of the fund when the necessary Vote comes up for discussion. They will then be entitled to condemn my conduct of it or to suspend or cancel the policy itself. But even on such a debate I should not be prepared to defend myself by stating the grounds on which I had abstained from offering hospitality to any individuals or delegations, for I am convinced that such a course would absolutely destroy the aim of international comity which is the basis and object of this new departure. I can therefore only ask for the generous indulgence and confidence of the House during the commencement of this experiment and until in their opinion I have ceased to deserve it.

Cattle Disease in Canada.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, when the last cases of foot-and-mouth disease and anthrax occurred among cattle in Canada; and whether he has received advices that there is no disease now existing among Canadian cattle.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The Board are unable to reply to the first part of the Question without reference to the Canadian Government. The reply to the second part of the Question is in the negative.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Did not the right hon. Gentleman say the other day that disease did exist in Canada?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes; but there is a question as to the date when the last case was reported.

MR. FELL: Why not cable for the information?

Provincial Homes Investment Company.

SIR F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been called to a case tried before Mr. Judge Parry in Manchester, in which a woman named Pointon recovered £37 10s. from a company called the Provincial Homes Investment Company; whether he is aware that the learned Judge described the representations which had been made by the said company as fraudulent, and whether he is aware that a large number of comparatively poor people have been induced to place their savings with this company; and whether the Public Prosecutor proposes to take any steps to enable these people to get their money back, and to prevent the Provincial Homes Investment Company from obtaining money from others under false pretences.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said he had inquired into this matter, and had ascertained that morning that the case was under appeal, and, in those circumstances, he thought it better to defer any statement as to any action that might be advisable.

SIR F. CAWLEY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that there are other similar companies that are taking poor people's money and defrauding them?

SIR W. ROBSON said that there had been a Report by a Committee of the House which indicated that there were many such companies in existence, but he thought this particular company had the good fortune to be left out of that Report as being free from the evils attributed to other companies.

MR. BYLES asked whether the hon. Gentleman would bring the matter to the attention of the Board of Trade in order to stop these businesses.

SIR W. ROBSON said he had made full and careful personal inquiries into the matter, but it was an extremely difficult one to deal with. The law on the subject was not very strong to enable him to deal with such cases.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.) asked whether the hon. Gentleman was aware that there was a very full list of such doubtful traders and fraudulent companies, and would he ask the Home Office to supply it to the public.

SIR W. ROBSON said he was not aware of that, but he would be very careful how he advised a public department to publish a black list of that character.

Superannuation of Edward Lynam.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether an inspector under the Board of Works, named Edward Lynam, was superannuated in December last; and whether the pension allowed him was much less than he was entitled to after a service of twenty-five years, and, if so, will he recommend that the proper amount shall be given.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The case referred to in the Question is one which fell within the provisions of Section 9 of the Superannuation Act, 1859, and the deduction (which the Treasury is unable to reconsider) was made by the Treasury under the powers conferred upon them by that section.

Scottish Fishery Cruisers.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has had under his consideration for a year or more the provision of a fishery cruiser for Scotland, and what provision has been made in this year's Estimates for providing such a fishery cruiser; whether any plans have been prepared for the building of such a ship; and, if not, what steps he proposes to take to expedite matters.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The hon. Gentleman seems to be under some misapprehension upon this subject. The expenses will be met out of the funds accumulating in the Board's Marine Deposit Account, and the funds available were not such as to justify the Fishery Board taking up the matter until 1st April last. Plans have now been prepared for the building of a cruiser, and tenders have been invited.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the cruiser will be completed?

MR. SINCLAIR: No, Sir.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Has the right hon. Gentleman no idea?

MR. SINCLAIR: No, Sir.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Where is the cruiser being built?

MR. SINCLAIR: That is not yet determined.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: How many cruisers are there at the disposal of the Fishery Board?

MR. SINCLAIR: Speaking from recollection, I think four. They are provided from Scottish funds.

Departmental Committee on Truck.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate when the Report of the Departmental Committee on Truck, last promised for Easter, may be expected.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): I hope, Sir, in November. The task of the Committee, as my right hon. friend knows, has proved very laborious.

Irish Cattle-Drives—The Use of Firearms.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the case of the King *v.* Patrick M'Dermot was not proceeded with at the Assizes, which commenced in Sligo on the 7th July, by the direction of the Law Officers of the Crown; whether the Crown refused to prosecute because Patrick M'Dermot was following the course of action which was recommended to him and other graziers by the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant in using firearms to prevent cattle-driving; and whether it is the intention of the Government to allow the use of firearms in future for this purpose without interference by the authorities.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. The case to which the hon. and gallant Member refers was not a Crown prosecution at all. It was commenced by a private prosecutor, and the case was returned for trial at the instance of the private prosecutor alone. He afterwards discontinued the prosecution on his own responsibility. I cannot undertake in answer to a Question to define in what circumstances any person is or is not justified in using firearms in defence of his person or property. The Government have no power to make any regulations on the subject, but must leave each particular case which arises to be determined according to law.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): Is it not the fact that there was no question of a cattle-drive in this particular case?

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Were not the Crown asked to take up this case and refused because of the advice given by the right hon. Gentleman himself as to the course to be pursued in these matters?

MR. CHERRY: I cannot add to my Answer. I will inquire as to the point raised by the hon. Member for South Sligo.

Irish Ranch Grabbers.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he will explain why cattle-drivers are being prosecuted day after day, while the sons of non-residential ranch-grabbers, returned for trial on the charge of deliberately firing on harmless crowds, are not prosecuted by the Crown, notwithstanding the fact that both local and resident magistrates agreed in their return for trial.

MR. CHERRY: I am sorry that I cannot undertake in answer to a Question to give the hon. Member a general explanation of my action as Attorney-General in directing or not directing prosecutions on behalf of the Crown, but if he will kindly direct my attention to the circumstances of any particular case I will, so far as the interests of justice will allow, explain to him the reasons for my action in that case.

Lough Gara Drainage Board.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, owing to the negligence of the Lough Gara and Mantua Drainage Board, whose area of operation comprises the district of Killaraght, situated near Boyle, County Roscommon, the crops of many of the farmers residing within this area are being periodically destroyed by floods; and, if so, whether, seeing that this Board has been in existence for forty years, during which period no effort has been made by them to keep the main drains, which empty into the lake, in order, the consequence being the destruction, in wet seasons, of the crops of the people who are heavily taxed for the maintenance of this Board, an inspector will be sent down to have the whole matter inquired into.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. J. A. PEASE, Essex, Saffron Walden): I am informed by the Board of Works that only a portion of the Killaraght district is situated within the Lough Gara and Mantua Drainage district. No complaint of flooding of the district of Killaraght, near Boyle, in consequence of the neglect of the trustees of the drainage district, has been received by the Board, and consequently the Board are unable to say whether the area in which it is stated flooding has taken place, is within the jurisdiction of the trustees. The Lough Gara and Mantua Drainage district was constituted in 1858, but the present Board of Trustees was elected in 1906, and the Commissioners of Public Works have no reason to suppose that they are neglecting their duty in maintaining the district.

MR. O'DOWD: Is it not the fact that for the last forty years nothing has been done either in Sligo or Roscommon to improve matters?

MR. J. A. PEASE: Up to the present the Board have received no complaint. The matter should be brought to their attention.

MR. O'DOWD: I want an inspector sent down.

Winn Estate, Glenbeigh, Kerry.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the tenants on the Winn estate, Glenbeigh, County Kerry, will be entitled to pay interest on the purchase money, seeing that it is nearly three years since the estate was purchased by the Congested Districts Board.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N): The Congested Districts Board are arranging to apply for interest on the purchase money in lieu of rent at their next collection on the Winn estate.

Kerry Evicted Tenants.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the number of evicted tenants in Kerry reinstated under the provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act, the number reinstated by landlords, the number reinstated on purchase of the estates in which their farms were situated; the total number reinstated under all heads; and the total number of applications received from evicted tenants in the county.

MR. BIRRELL: Up to 31st May last the number of applications received from County Kerry was 957, of which the Estates Commissioners have rejected 359. The number reinstated by the landlord is 215, and by the Estates Commissioners 39, making a total of 254 reinstated in the county. No tenants have yet been restored in the county under the compulsory provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act, but the Commissioners have commenced proceedings for the acquisition of certain lands under that Act.

Assistant Irish National School Teachers Salaries.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the initial and maximum salaries which are payable to assistant teachers in Irish National Schools; how many years does it take before an assistant reaches this maximum; how many assistants have given ten years efficient service; and what is the estimated cost of giving those assistants second grade salary.

MR. BIRRELL: I gave the figures asked for in the first two parts of this Question in my Answer to the hon. Member's similar Question on the 14th instant. As regards the remainder of the Question the Commissioners of National Education inform me that the information asked for could not be furnished without an investigation of the careers of all the assistant teachers concerned and of the reports on their schools, and this would involve considerable labour and expense.

Stokestown Grazing Land.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state why it is that the Estates Commissioners are not taking action to acquire that part of the grazing lands of Monedarrah or Stokestown, offered to them by Mr. James W. Bond, D.L., Farragh, County Longford; if he can state the number of applications received for a share of this land; and will he request the Commissioners to proceed with the matter as soon as possible.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that, so far as they can trace, the lands in question have not been offered for sale to them, nor have they had any correspondence on the subject.

MR. J. P. FARRELL suggested to the right hon. Gentleman that he should repeat his inquiry about the correspondence.

Dease Estates, North Longford.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the agreements for the sale of the Dease estate, at Cloneen, in North Longford, have yet been lodged; whether he is aware that irritation exists amongst the tenants on account of an alleged unfair division of the bog by the landlord; and will he direct the attention of the Estates Commissioners to this estate with a view to their making a scheme, under Section 21 of the Land Act of 1903, in reference to the bog.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that no purchase agreements in respect of this estate have yet been lodged with them. They have no information as to the division of the turbary, and can take no steps in the matter until the estate comes before them to be dealt with.

Rathcline Evicted Tenants.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to state the grounds upon which the Estates Commissioners have declined to provide Bridget and Joseph Mullooly, of Rathcline, County Longford, with equivalent holdings to those from which they were evicted; will he say whether they were evicted within the period named in the Evicted Tenants Act; whether they applied in due time; and whether, seeing that they are farmers willing to work the land, he will ask them to reconsider this case.

Mr. BIRRELL: The applicants were evicted within the period named in the Evicted Tenants Act, and their applications were received within the time limited by the Act. The Estates Commissioners have declined to take any action upon the applications because they are of opinion that the Mullooly family already have sufficient land. They occupy a holding of 100 acres which has been purchased under the Land Acts.

Richardson Estate, Granard.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any petition has been received by the Estates Commissioners asking them to purchase the Richardson estate at Ballynulty, Granard, so as to resell to the tenants who are anxious to buy their holdings; and will he ask the Estates Commissioners to communicate with the agent, Colonel J. H. Dopping, on the subject.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received the petition referred to, and will communicate with the agent of the estate as suggested in the Question.

Chief Land Commission Assessor.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when Mr. Boyd, of the Chief Land Commission, was appointed to his present office, what experience had he of land valuing before his appointment; and what examination, if any, did he pass before being appointed.

Mr. BIRRELL: Mr. Boyd was appointed an assessor upon the passing of the Irish Land Act, 1903, pursuant to the eighty-ninth section of that Act. He had been an Assistant-Commissioner since January, 1889, and his qualifications when appointed to that office are stated in the House of Commons Return No. 151 of 1902. When Mr. Boyd was appointed there was no examination for the post, nor is there now.

Irish County Councils and Compulsory Education.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the county councils in Ireland that have adopted the compulsory Education Act; what is the annual expense and the poundage rate incurred in each country in carrying out the Act; and what is the increase in the average attendance as compared with the average for the past five years for these counties.

Mr. BIRRELL: The compulsory attendance provisions of the Act of 1892 are in force in rural districts in the following counties: Antrim, Armagh, Carlow, Clare, Donegal, Down, Dublin, Fermanagh, Galway, Kerry, Kildare, Kilkenny, King's, Limerick, Derry, Longford, Louth, Meath, Tipperary, Tyrone, Wexford and Wicklow. In some of these counties the Act is in force throughout the county and in other cases in portions only of the county. The expense of carrying out the Act could only be ascertained by reference to the local authorities and this would take some time. No figures are available showing the increase in the average attendance in each county as compared with the average for the past five years. In most of the counties mentioned the Act has been in force for more than five years. The centesimal proportion of the average attendance to the average number of pupils on the rolls for the year 1907 in the rural districts with school attendance committees was 67·3, and in those without such committees, 61·8.

Queen's College, Belfast.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Graduates' Association of the Queen's College at Belfast, in public meeting at Wellington Hall, Belfast, joined itself to the protest of the General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church against the separation of Belfast from the Royal University, and in condemnation of a merely local University, as entirely hostile to the wishes and interests of Ulster and Belfast; whether he is aware that this meeting was presided over by two elected senators of the Royal University and attended by a number of the most influential laity; and whether he will lay upon the Table the Resolutions of this meeting of graduates, who are deeply concerned by the change in the value of their degrees.

MR. BIRRELL: The Resolutions referred to in the Question have already received due publicity through the medium of the Press, and I do not propose to lay them on the Table.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: Is it necessary in order to set up a Catholic University in Dublin that the right hon. Gentleman should run against the whole Presbyterian opinion?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of argument.

Belfast New University.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state, taking into consideration the fact that half the population of Ulster and one-third of the population of Belfast are Catholics, how many Catholics he proposes to appoint out of the thirty-four members of the Senate of the new University of Belfast, which in future will be the only foundation for University education afforded to Ulster Catholics.

MR. BIRRELL: The names of the persons whom it is proposed to appoint upon the first Senate of the Belfast University are given in the amended draft Charter which is now before the House. I understand that five of these persons are Catholics.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: Does the right hon. Gentleman think that one-sixth part of the Senate is a sufficient proportion?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion.

Irish University Degrees.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any public or academic body in Ireland has expressed approval of those provisions of the Irish Universities Bill which exclude non-resident or extern students from the advantage of taking a degree, now secured to them in the Royal University and in Trinity College; whether the Convocation of the Royal University and the Association of Catholic Graduates, in public meeting assembled, have by Resolution condemned this exclusion; and whether he will lay upon the Table these Resolutions; and if he can state any special reason for excluding poor young Irishmen from advantages given to poor young Englishmen by the University of London and other Universities in England.

MR. BIRRELL: The question whether extern students should or should not be admitted to degrees is one of a highly argumentative nature which I do not propose to discuss by way of Question and Answer. The hon. Member will have full opportunity of raising this question in the debate upon the Report stage to-day or to-morrow.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it possible adequately to discuss this question in the course of the two days allowed?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, Sir.

Catholic Students in the Royal University.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the number of students, over 4,000, attending the Royal University last year was larger than the attendance at the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Manchester, or Aberystwyth, in fact larger than at any University in the United Kingdom, except London; and how many of these, over 4,000, students were Catholics; and whether any University in Europe had a larger attendance of Catholics.

MR. BIRRELL: The number of candidates at the examinations of the Royal University last year was 4,115. The secretaries of the University inform me that no record is kept of the religious persuasion of the candidates. I do not think it necessary to make any inquiry as to the number of students at other Universities, British or Continental.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it necessary to withdraw from this very successful University the colleges that are to be assigned?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order. That, again, is a matter of opinion.

De Blaquiere Estate, County Clare.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the De Blaquiere estate, near Tubber, County Clare, has been purchased by the Estates Commissioners; did the estate comprise untenanted land, and how much; and will he state how many tenants and tenants' sons are going to benefit from the purchase.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have made an offer to purchase the estate in question, which includes 400 acres of untenanted land, and the owner has accepted the offer. The untenanted land has been allotted to fifteen persons, of whom fourteen are tenants on or in the neighbourhood of the estate, and one is the son of a tenant on the estate.

MR. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Thomas Hanley, of Tubber, County Clare, is a small tenant on the De Blaquiere estate, holding an acre and a half of land; whether he applied to the Commissioners for an increase of his holding out of the untenanted lands on the estate purchased by the Commissioners; and will he explain the reasons which induced the inspector to the Commissioners to refuse the claim of this small holder to more land.

MR. BIRRELL: The application of Thomas Hanley is under the consideration of the Estates Commissioners, who have referred the matter to their inspector for inquiry and report.

Lewis Estate Evicted Tenants, Galway.

MR. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether negotiations are going on between the Estates Commissioners and Mrs. Lewis, of Balinagar, Woodford, County Galway, in respect of the reinstatement of the Lewis evicted tenants; and whether, in view of the large number of uneconomic holdings on this estate, he will advise the Commissioners to acquire possession of all the untenanted land on this property in the interest of a general settlement.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have recently published notice of their intention to acquire compulsorily, under the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907, some 350 acres of untenanted land on the estate in question.

Belfast Workhouses.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many Protestant and Roman Catholic inmates there are at present in the Belfast workhouse; and how many belonging to Ulster, Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, respectively.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that it would take the officials of the Belfast Workhouse a considerable time to make the search through the workhouse books which would be involved in answering this Question, and, in view of the pressure of work now upon the officials owing to the approach of the holiday season, the Local Government Board would be glad to spare them this labour for the present if possible.

MR. J. DEVLIN: How far has Dunville's contributed to bring people—both Protestants and Catholics—into Belfast Workhouse?

MR. BIRRELL: That is too subtle a Question for my intelligence.

Castletown Cattle Drive.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a drive on an extensive scale recently occurred on the lands of Castletown, owned by Captain R. H. Fowler, Rahinstown, Enfield; whether this is the sixth drive which has taken place off Captain Fowler's lands in that district; whether on the occasion referred to about twenty-eight head of cattle were driven off, some of which were recovered at Ardanew, near Longwood, six or seven miles distant, after having been driven over a fence with three rows of wire on top, then through a river out on to the public road; and how many arrests have been made and what sentences have been passed on the perpetrators of the outrage.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed by the police authorities that the facts are substantially as stated in the Question. The drive took place at night. The offenders are unknown, and consequently no arrests have been made.

General Taylor's Clonlara Estate.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether an agreement has been entered into for the purchase by the tenants of the estate of General Taylor, at or near Clonlara, County Clare; does this estate carry fishery rights on the River Shannon, and, if so, are those rights to go with the sale of the estate; whether the Abbey fishermen of Limerick have paid a rental for this fishery for over 200 years; and whether, seeing that there are over forty families of those fishermen depending for a living on this fishery, and having rented it for so many years, the Estates Commissioners will take care, before sanctioning the sale, that the rights of the Abbey fishermen are so safeguarded that they will not be disturbed, but will be confirmed either by purchase or by a fair rent which those men are willing to pay.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that no purchase agreements in respect of this estate have been lodged with them. If such agreements should be lodged the Commissioners will consider any representations which may be made to them on the subject of fishery rights.

MR. JOYCE: Will a deputation on this subject be received in the near future by the Estates Commissioners?

MR. BIRRELL: I have no control as to what deputations the Commissioners may receive, but I have very little doubt they will consider any communication or representation that may be made on behalf of these persons.

Grehan Estate, Kildorrery, County Cork.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the agreement entered into between John Therry, agent of the Grehan estate, Kildorrery, County Cork, and his son John

Therry, of Mooresfort, County Tipperary, whereby the latter was given a judicial tenancy in the holdings of the evicted tenants on the estate, was made after the passage of the Land Purchase Act, 1903, to prevent these tenants from being reinstated in their old holdings; and whether the Estates Commissioners will have a full inquiry made into all the circumstances of this case with the view of bringing about the restoration of these evicted tenants to their old homes.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the judicial agreement referred to was entered into on 4th November, 1903. This was subsequent to the passing of the Irish Land Act of that year, but it was long before the passing of the Evicted Tenants Act of 1907, which alone has any bearing upon the compulsory acquisition of lands for the reinstatement of evicted tenants. The Commissioners are of opinion that nothing would be gained by making further inquiries into the cases of the evicted tenants. They will, as I have already informed the hon. Member, consider the evicted tenants' applications in connection with the distribution of any untenanted land which they may acquire in the locality.

Kearney Estate, Ardfert, Kerry.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Kearney estate, Ardfert, County Kerry, was offered for sale under Section 6 in 1904; whether it was inspected and valued in June, 1907; what is the cause of the delay in completing the sale; and whether the inspector's valuation has been communicated to the tenants; whether, since inspection, the tenants have been served with writs for rent, including hanging gale, although they are ready to accept the valuation of the Estates Commission inspector; whether an ejectment is pending against another tenant for old arrears; and whether steps will be taken to put a stop to compulsion of this kind against tenants.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are unable to identify any proceedings as having been instituted before them in respect of the estate referred to. If the hon. Member will furnish the full name of the owner the Commissioners will make further inquiries.

Donegal Assize Grand Jury.

Mr. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the recent Assizes for the County of Donegal not a single Roman Catholic was included by the High Sheriff when summoning the Grand Jury; whether he is aware that for many years past no Catholic has ever been so summoned, although the great majority of the people of the county are Catholics; and whether he can take any steps to put an end to the exclusion of Catholics from the Grand Jury.

Mr. BIRRELL: Grand Juries are empanelled by High Sheriffs under the provisions of the Grand Jury Acts. The High Sheriff of County Donegal informs me that one Roman Catholic was on the Grand Jury at the recent Spring Assizes, and that he himself is a Roman Catholic and was lately summoned but did not attend. I understand that in making out the panel the senior grand jurors or their representatives are taken in the first instance, and if a sufficient number of these intimate their intention to attend there is no necessity to summon others. I am assured that there is no exclusion of qualified Catholics.

Irish Local Government Auditors.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he received a copy of a Resolution passed by the No. 1 Limerick Rural District Council requesting that in future auditors be appointed by competitive examination, and stating that the present appointment of auditors goes by favouritism; and whether he intends to take any steps to throw open to the people of Ireland these appointments.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Resolution has been received. It is not intended to throw open to public competition the appointment of auditor under the Local Government Board. Very special qualifications are necessary, and the Board invariably select persons who in their opinion possess these qualifications in the highest degree. The persons selected have in all cases to satisfy the Civil Service Commissioners as to their literary and expert qualifications.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: What qualifications are necessary for an auditor?

MR. BIRRELL: I should say a clear head, a great knowledge of figures, and perfect indifference to public opinion.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Have all the auditors under the Local Government Board these qualifications?

MR. BIRRELL: I am afraid not.

Labourers (Ireland) Act Agreement.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that statutory declarations, contractors' building agreements, and bonds in connection with schemes under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts are still liable to stamp duty; whether it was intended that under the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1906, no stamp duty whatever would be payable from the commencement to the end of a scheme in order to cheapen the procedure; and whether he will take steps to afford relief to the ratepayers from this tax.

MR. BIRRELL: I understand that when the Labourers Bill of 1906 was before Parliament the question of exempting from stamp duty such documents as are referred to in the Question was fully considered and was decided in the negative. Section 23 of the Act, which remits stamp duty on agreements for the acquisition of land, makes no reference to the kind of instrument referred to in the Question. I do not propose to take any steps in the matter.

Irish Teachers and the Education Grant.

MR. HUGH LAW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is intended that transition teachers shall share equally with other teachers in the allocation of the additional grant for Irish primary education (teachers' salaries).

MR. BIRRELL: It is intended that all classes of teachers shall benefit by the new grant for education.

Tulrahan Farm, Mayo.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the price offered by the chief land inspector of the Congested Districts Board to Mr. Treston for the purchase of Tulrahan farm, in the County of Mayo; and whether he will state the price it is proposed to give to the person who is now the owner of the Tulrahan farm.

MR. BIRRELL: The price offered to Mr. Treston by the chief land Inspector, subject to the approval of the Congested Districts Board, was £600, and it is understood that the present owner of the farm purchased it at this price. The owner has offered to sell the farm to the Board at the same price as soon as they are in a position to purchase.

Derrycassan Evicted Tenant.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the cause of the delay in reinstating the evicted tenants on the Derrycassan estate, Major Dopping owner; and if he is aware that the landlord is willing and anxious to see these tenants reinstated without delay.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have instructed their inspector to place the evicted tenants in the holdings allotted to them as soon as they have signed the necessary undertakings.

Australian Commonwealth Arms

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can yet make a statement as to the standing of Lyon King-at-Arms in matters of imperial heraldry and the decision in regard to the new design for the arms of the Commonwealth of Australia.

MR. GLADSTONE: I beg leave to answer this Question. The question of the jurisdiction of the Kings at Arms is now under consideration, and I am not prepared to make any statement on the subject. As regards the design for the Arms of the Commonwealth of Australia, I understand that the usual course was followed of asking Garter King at Arms to prepare a design, based on a drawing furnished by the Commonwealth Government. The Arms have already been submitted to and approved by His Majesty.

MR. R. DUNCAN: Was Lyon King-at-Arms consulted?

MR. GLADSTONE asked for notice.

War Office Administration.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, since his acceptance of the office of First Lord of the Treasury and that of Prime Minister, Ministers, other than the Secretary of State for War, have attended at the War Office, called for Departmental Papers and examined officers and officials under the control of the Secretary of State; what Ministers have been so employed, and whether they carried out their investigations with or without the presence of the Secretary of State for War; whether these visits were concluded prior to the pledge given by the Secretary of State for War that no further reductions of the infantry of the line were in contemplation; and whether he can give a pledge that the administration of the War Department will in future be conducted by the Ministers enjoying the powers conferred on the Secretary for War by the Royal Sign-manual.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): There is no foundation in fact for any of the allegations or suggestions contained in this Question.

Supplementary Estimate.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what opportunity the House will have of discussing the Supplementary Estimate for £1,464,491, issued on the 15th July.

MR. ASQUITH: The Supplementary Estimates are on to-day's Paper, and will continue to appear every day in the hope that the House may find an opportunity to discuss them. If no such opportunity is found the time at our disposal does not admit of special facilities being given. I may add that the subject-matter of the largest item of the Supplementary Estimates (£1,200,000 for old-age pensions) has already been discussed in the debates on the Budget and on the Old-Age Pensions Bill, and that the item of next importance (£200,000 for the unemployed) can, I should suppose, be discussed in connection with the Vote for the Local Government Board.

Motor Car Act.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill; and whether the House will have an opportunity of discussing the inclusion within that Bill of the Motor Car Act.

MR. ASQUITH: I hope that the Second Reading of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill may be taken at the conclusion either of to-morrow's or Saturday's sitting. I understand that it is not competent to discuss the merits of the particular Acts included in the Schedule.

Licensing Bill Debate.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in the event of the new clauses to the Licensing Bill not being disposed of on the eighteenth allotted day, he will consent to their being carried forward to the nineteenth day, to be taken after schedules and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion.

MR. ASQUITH: The House has decided in the schedule to the Resolution on the allocation of time for the Committee stage of the Licensing Bill that all new clauses shall be discussed before 10.30 p.m. on the eighteenth allotted day. The hon. Member's suggestion would involve a reconsideration of the Order of the House, for which, as at present advised, I see no necessity.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked as to the arrangements for business for the rest of the session.

Mr. ASQUITH said he was afraid it would be necessary to have a sitting on Saturday, which it would be proposed should be at ten o'clock in the morning. The Third Reading of the Irish Universities Bill and the Third Reading of the Finance Bill would be taken. On Monday, Supply would be put down. The first half of the sitting would be given to Army Vote No. 3, at the suggestion of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and the sitting after eight o'clock to the Foreign Office Vote, Secretary of State's salary. On Tuesday the Colonial Vote, Secretary of State's salary, would be taken, and, if time permitted, Class 4, Vote 7, Universities, Colleges, and Intermediate Education in Wales, and the Board of Trade. On Wednesday the Votes would be those for the Local Government Board and the Home Office. On Thursday the Second Reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill would be taken, on the Friday following the Motion for the adjournment for the holidays, and on the Saturday the Third Reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C. (in respect of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill: Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda) and Mr. Carlile; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. William Edwin Harvey and Mr. Parkes.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee C.: Mr. Hall.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Third Report brought up, and read, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 253.]

COMPANIES CONSOLIDATION BILL [LORDS], POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [LORDS], AND STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [LORDS].

Report from the Joint Committee in respect of Companies Consolidation Bill [Lords] pending in the Lords, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 252.]

CRAN MEASURES BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 341.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Ordered, That the proceedings on the Irish Universities Bill have precedence this day of the Business of Supply.—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.) moved to omit Clause 1, in order, he said, to elicit from the Chief Secretary a statement as to whether he was fully aware of the great change which he was making in higher education in Ireland. Clause 1 was the clause which started off the two new Universities which he proposed to establish, but he would ask the House to say whether, even at that late hour, they would not take the course of omitting the clause and thus throwing out this very obnoxious scheme. When the Bill was introduced they were told that it was to be purely undenominational, and the two new Universities which it was proposed to set up, they were told, solved the mystery of undenominational teaching in the Universities in Ireland. In the course of the debates in Committee, and as anyone could judge in reading the Bill, they found that the scheme of the Chief Secretary was entirely denominational from beginning to end, and that the whole aspect of the question had been changed. Clause 1 destroyed the old Royal University of Ireland and changed the aspect of Queen's College, Belfast. There had been no desire whatever expressed by those chiefly interested in higher education in the North of Irleand for this change in the *status* of Queen's College, Belfast. Everybody in Ireland who had taken an interest in higher education amongst the Protestants of the country had denounced the scheme. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland met immediately the Bill was proposed and passed a strong resolution condemning the system proposed to be set up. The next move was on behalf of the various educational associations, and they too condemned the scheme on the ground that it was purely denominational. The whole of the governing body of Orangemen in Ireland, which covered all the denominations of Protestants, condemned the scheme also, and they who represented the Ulster constituencies, he believed, had never received one single letter or memorial in favour of the Bill; anyhow, he had not, and he believed none of his friends on that side of the House had received a scratch of the pen from a soul in Ireland in approbation of the Bill. In Committee, they found that the Bill had been submitted to no Protestant body in Ireland for consideration, but in every instance to the Roman Catholic hierarchy. It was proposed by Clause 1 to take away the undenominational system of the Royal University of Ireland and to set up in its place Universities segregated into two camps—Protestants in the north and Roman Catholics in the south. How, under those circumstances, could they ever hope to bring the people together, which they were all anxious to do? The Bill ruined that idea and went back centuries in the system of training the youth of the country. The Chief Secretary had admitted that he hoped the large University to be set up in Dublin, and its affiliated colleges, would draw the youth of the country to them. He and his colleagues had no objection to the youth of the country being educated; why should they throw cold water on a scheme which was to teach the people of Ireland? But what they objected to so much was that under the scheme of the Chief Secretary, and the wily way in which it had been brought forward, there were three separate bodies. For two years a body of Commissioners was set up to carry out the scheme, and after those Commissioners had done their work another body was brought forward for five years, and then, when they had done their work, the crucial question arose as to who were to be the permanent governing bodies of these Universities. No one could deny that the governing bodies of the Universities, when it came to the third stage of the drama, would be on the one hand the Roman Catholic clergy in the south, and on the other hand the Presbyterian clergy in the north. Of that there could be no doubt, and he did not think anyone now ventured to deny it. Was that the class of education they were anxious to have in Ireland? It was going back one hundred years to destroy the Royal University, which threw its cloak over all classes of the community, Protestants and Catholics alike, which allowed extern students, and which allowed people to come and take degrees without fear or favour. Then there were the colleges of Cork, Galway, and Belfast, every one of which had, so far as he knew, met with general approbation. Clause 1 destroyed them; it changed their aspect and at extraordinary cost. He believed £2,700,000 was to be voted by Parliament for the erection in Dublin of a Roman Catholic University, and for giving a certain amount of money to Belfast. The idea of a University for Belfast never would have been heard of had it not been that the Government thought if they catered openly and only for the Roman Catholics in Dublin, the Bill would not get through Parliament. The Chief Secretary had said that they who lived in the North of Ireland ought to be glad to see the Queen's College raised to the *status* of a University, and receive a little more money. But if Belfast was left alone it was doing good work. They had repeatedly asked for more money in order to be able to do better work, but they could not get it from any Government. A mere handful of gentlemen within the College, an unrepresentative body in the truest sense of the word, were in favour of raising the *status* of the College, but no one else, and in spite of the fact that there had been no desire whatever amongst Protestants in the

North of Ireland to have this, it had been thrust upon them. If they cut the Bill in two, and left Belfast on one side altogether, the Chief Secretary could not get his Roman Catholic University for Dublin. It was only the fact that this piece of treachery was tacked on to the Belfast end of it that enabled the right hon. Gentleman to get the Bill through when the majority of his supporters were Nonconformists. On the First and Second Reading of the Bill the people did not understand it. With the greatest haste it was smuggled upstairs to Committee, and now they were allowed two days and a bit of Saturday to discuss the whole organisation of higher education in Ireland. They were told that it was a Bill which would satisfy the people of Ireland. It would satisfy the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. But did anyone imagine for a moment that if the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland held up its finger and said, "We will not have it," the Bill would go through, or that when the Bill did go through, if the Roman Catholic hierarchy, as they had done in regard to the Queen's College, held up their finger, they could not compel every Roman Catholic in the country to stay outside the walls of the University? It depended on that alone. They must give them a University, but whether it would ever be of the slightest use or not to the country depended not on the right hon. Gentleman or his successors in office, but entirely on the attitude adopted by the archbishops and the bishops in Dublin. He would like to see higher education in Ireland carried to the very best pitch, but under lay control and lay management. They had urged in Committee and outside the House that the Bill might change its aspect entirely, that the new Universities should have cut out of them every word of denominationalism and be absolutely free from the contamination of what went on in Dublin Castle, and that they should be allowed a free hand to run an undenominational University for the use of the laity, who would be encouraged to go to it, and allowed to manage it themselves. If that were done, the House would be wise in not stopping at £2,700,000, but if necessary giving £5,000,000 to have such a scheme carried into full effect. Clause 1 touched the whole matter which had been discussed so far by the Chief Secretary. Had any improvement been made in the Bill since it went to the Committee? Far from it. It was true that some of the Party to which he belonged were in favour of the Bill because they were in favour of denominational education, and of having Irish Catholics educated in a University by themselves. But was that the attitude taken up by the great Nonconformist party? If so, let them pass the Bill, but do not let them have any more of this humbug of saying they were in favour of undenominational teaching when the English Bill was before the House, and then on the Irish Bill saying the more denominational the Bill was made the better. The Bill he thought would put a stop once for all to a considerable amount of the nonsense that was talked by Nonconformists on the other side of the House. This clause was the keystone of the arch. The Chief Secretary was doing harm to Ireland and to people who left Ireland for other parts of the world. He had understood the question about as little as he understood the Irish nature, and the country over which he was Chief Secretary The problem there was to mix up the Roman Catholics and the Protestants as much as they could. He earnestly implored the Government, if it was not too late, to strike out of the Bill everything which was going to Archbishop this and Bishop somebody else, and all the Presbyterian clergymen in the North. Although he was a Presbyterian himself, he would allow none of them to have anything to do with the Bill. He had fought in Committee, and done all he possibly could to try and make the Bill less denominational. He had fought hard and conscientiously for what he held to be the best interests of the people. The Bill, he supposed, must go through, but in the meantime he begged to move to leave out Clause 1.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) agreed that the first clause and the machinery which it provided, the abolition of existing universities, and the creation of a new one, really went to the root of the whole matter. He wished to point out what an extraordinary position the right hon. Gentleman and his friends were in, because the position they had invariably taken up in matters of education was that State money was not to be used for denominational purposes. No one had recognised the pinch of that more than the Chief Secretary himself, because from start to finish he had pictured this scheme as undenominational. But now, with the Amendment which had been accepted, from whichever quarter they came as long as they were in a denominational direction, the Bill was not of the same colour or complexion that it was when it passed Second Reading, although they had always contended that the original intention had only become more apparent by the proceedings in Committee. It was always there. He rejoiced to find that this had become more and more appreciated in the ranks of the Party opposite. They were continually receiving from representative associations and organisations which professed the political faith of hon. Members opposite protests against the Bill. Only the previous day he had received a circular signed by the Rev. John Hirst Hollowell of Rochdale, a clergyman of some standing in the religious and political world, in which he said—

> "In view of this and the other doubtful features of the Bill, which are opposed to the traditional policy of the Liberal Party, and which will accentuate existing religious differences in Ireland instead of providing a national settlement of this important question, the executive committee earnestly recommends the postponement of the Bill with a view to its Amendment on lines analagous to those of the Manchester University."

When it was suggested that this new University should be analogous to the Manchester University, the fact remained that the present scheme was like nothing in the whole history of University creation, either in the heavens above, the earth below, or the waters beneath. There was not a single Roman Catholic University in Europe founded or established on lines of this sort. It was true they had a Roman Catholic University in Belgium, but the Catholics found the money for it, and therefore they were entitled to control it. The State found the money for Universities in Germany and Austria, but the State preserved a superior control. There was not a vestige of control in the State in regard to the money which was being provided under this Bill for a University of a denominational character. Could anyone deny that these new Universities, from the very moment of their inception, would be absolutely denominational, and yet all this was being done with State money. Mr. Hirst Hollowell denounced the proposal in no unmeasured terms. The House was being kept in the dark as to what the names of these new Universities were to be. The Third Reading was to take place on Saturday, and up to the present no suggestion whatever had been made in regard to the name. The clause said it would be determined by His Majesty the King, and the Chief Secretary said it would be determined by the governing body after they had been called into existence. The reason he was anxious upon this point was that they had in Dublin the University of Dublin or Trinity College, and he was anxious that in the christening of the new University there would be no interference in title by the adoption of anything that would conflict with the well-known name of the University of Dublin. He knew that the Chief Secretary had given him an undertaking on this point, but if the choice of the name was to be left to the senate they ought clearly to understand that the new title was not to conflict with the recognised University of Dublin and Trinity College. The Bill had gone out of its way to destroy the Royal University, which was still a flourishing institution. He noticed that within the last month over a thousand persons had passed examinations in that institution. Therefore it was still an active working concern. At the Royal University they could get a degree by passing examinations, and nothing more was required, in consequence of their holding extern students' classes. He thought provision should be made for these extern students who desired to improve their education, young clergymen from the country, national school teachers, and people in the smaller country towns. It would be hard on these people to have their existing privileges and rights swept away while no provision was otherwise made for them.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the clause, to the word 'two,' in page 1, line 8, stand part of the Bill."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) congratulated the House on being able to discuss the Bill free from the menace of the guillotine, and pointed out that hon. Gentlemen had referred in their speeches to many questions that would ultimately come up for consideration on particular Amendments. The clause had no reference to anything of a denominational or undenominational character. It simply proposed to establish two Universities in Ireland and the extinction of the Royal University. It would be impossible, however, to create two Universities in Ireland and leave the Royal University alone. The subject of extern students was important, but it would be discussed hereafter on an Amendment raising the question. He repeated the assurance which he had given already that His Majesty would in no circumstances allow either of the Univerities in Belfast or Dublin to take any name which should interfere with Trinity College under the name of the University of Dublin. Whatever would be the name chosen it would not be the University of Dublin, neither would it make any use of the name of Trinity College. The clearest possible distinction would be made between these two Universities, so that a student in Ireland would be under no mistake as to which University he was going to attend. If Clause 1 were omitted from the Bill the House might as well go home. He admired the way in which hon. Members opposite had fought this Bill in Committee upstairs—their courage, tenacity, and good temper; but it was impossible for him at this stage to cut out a clause on which everything else in the Bill was founded. The Government were anxious to establish in Ireland a teaching University, and they wanted to associate degrees in Ireland with other characteristics than those merely of examination. This point had been argued over and over again. As to the University of Belfast, he had been very much exposed during the last year to demands from the people of Belfast having this University in their minds. Personally he could not undertake to distinguish between the inhabitants of Belfast, though the hon. Member opposite admitted that there were some influential classes on the side of the Chief Secretary. The Nationalist Member for Belfast was also in favour of the proposal, and he represented a certain amount of opinion in the city. He was animated by the same spirit and by the same hope as the hon. and gallant Member in wishing to see all sections of opinion brought together in support of religious peace, and he was encouraged in holding that hope by what he heard of the desires and intentions of the Roman Catholic population of Belfast and neighbourhood to avail themselves of the benefits of education within the walls of the old Queen's College, which had become a University. Indeed, he was encouraged to believe that he might live long enough to see the time arrive when there would be numbers of Roman Catholic students within the walls of the University of Belfast and when the ideas of the hon. Member and others of his way of thinking would be gloriously realised.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) expressed his profound disappointment with the character of the Bill. From the outset of his Parliamentary career he had been a supporter of a Roman Catholic University in Ireland What he contemplated then was a denominational University, not a theological seminary. When they looked further into the way in which the powers conferred by this clause were exercised, when they looked at the constitution of the governing body—the right hon. Gentleman had stated that it possessed an enormous majority of Roman Catholics on it—they saw that this was not a Roman Catholic University in which clergy and laity might work together freely in the advancement of learning, but an institution which would be wholly and solely under the government of priests of the higher order.

MR. BIRRELL: No.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the right hon. Gentleman would carry it out in the way by which it was alleged the Act of Union was carried. He would buy everybody who was worth buying either by money or by influence. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh! Oh!"] He only asked hon. Members who said "Oh! Oh!" to look at the schedule of the Bill which contained the financial provisions, the provisions about affiliation, the admission of outside societies to the government of this Roman Catholic University, in order to see what he meant. He said without fear of contradiction that the right hon. Gentleman had bought everybody it was necessary to buy. Under these circumstances what was his object in describing this as an undenominational measure? What was his object in putting in a clause forbidding a test for teachers? What would the right hon. Gentleman say of an Education Bill for England in which there was a specific clause forbidding any test for teachers, but in which the management of the schools or Universities was carefully secured to the various denominations? What chance would a Protestant have of obtaining an appointment in a Roman Catholic college or University?

MR. BIRRELL: Plenty.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The right hon. Gentleman said "Plenty"; he was not so trustful of English boards of management in connection with English schools. [AN HON. MEMBER: "They were not elected."] Nor are these. The right hon. Gentleman had unfortunately been entrusted with the introduction of two Education Bills, and when one looked at the essentially undenominational character of the Bill of 1906, and the essentially denominational character of the Bill of 1908, he could only congratulate him on an exhibition of political dexterity.

MR. BIRRELL: Have you read Clause 4 in the Bill of 1906?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the right hon. Gentleman had repeatedly described that clause as a denominational clause in an undenominational Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said that the merit of it was that it was there at all, and he minimised it to an extent which made it practically useless for a great denomination to which education in this country owed so much. He rose only to express his profound disappointment in this matter. He could not vote for the rejection of the first clause of the Bill.

MR. BIRRELL: Why not?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he would tell the right hon. Gentleman. He thought it was essential that the highest education available should be at the service of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, as they could best procure it. He would gladly have seen the Bill so framed that the advancement of learning and the opportunities of study might be equally available for the clergy and the laity of the Roman Catholic Church, but he did not believe that any University, the main purpose of which was the advancement of learning, could discharge that purpose rightly which was under clerical domination, whether that domination was of a Nonconformist, Anglican, or Roman Catholic character. Such as it was, he accepted the Bill for what it was worth, but he thought the House and the country ought to realise the character of the Bill they were passing, the extraordinary contradiction in the action of the Government in regard to education in Ireland and in England, and the fact that they were passing a frankly denominational measure which placed education in Ireland in the hands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

MR. HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said he desired to make one other protest against the root principle of the Bill. The hon. Baronet had concluded his speech by referring to this Bill as frankly denominational. He had always taken that view, and he did not think his right hon. friend could blame him for having done so, and for voting against the Bill on that ground. Clause 1 had been specially advocated on four grounds, namely, that the Universities were too free, non-federal, residential, and undenominational. All those four defences of the clause were absolutely unsound. He did not think, in the first instance, that the new Dublin University could be regarded as free. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of it as a University that would be entirely under clerical control. [Cries of "Oh! oh!"] That was met by cries of "Oh! oh!" but there were two strongly opposed opinions in regard to the matter, and to meet these views his right hon. friend had introduced in the schedule many checks and counter checks to get this kind of influence and the other kind of influence to work. When that was the case, the Government could not claim that they had carried out the promise that the University was to be residential. His right hon. friend could not justify that claim. Two small colleges were to be recognised—the Magee and the Maynooth—and there would be opportunities for the same kind of treatment to a large number of other kinds of colleges which had a large number of students. That might be good, bad, or indifferent, but it was not a residential University. He did not think the proposal could be commended on the ground that the University was free and residential. They had had the justification placed before them that these Universities were non-federal. It had been said that Universities with federated colleges at great distances from one another were bad in principle and must not be adopted in future. The glory of the Bill which they were passing was that it was free from old principles, and that it established Universities on a new principle. What was to happen was the establishment of a University with three colleges—one in Dublin, one in Cork, and one in Galway. It was a curious thing that the college to be established in Belfast was to be omitted from that University. They were going to have in Belfast a University separately established. Was that the sole reason why it was omitted? It seemed to him obvious that the reason was that they were going to get three colleges of a similar and homogeneous denominational type in connection with the new Dublin University. That was perfectly obvious on the face of it. In Dublin they would have two colleges side by side—one Trinity, and another the name of which he did not know. The Government were seeking to establish three denominational colleges, and not to abolish the federal system. They could have made arrangements with Trinity, a Parliamentary representative of Dublin University having made certain offers on behalf of that college with the view to the demands of the Roman Catholics being met. If the right hon. Gentleman had taken those offers as a basis, he did not think there would have been much difficulty in the long run of establishing a college where both Protestants and Roman Catholics would have been able to go. What was now proposed might be right or wrong, but he maintained that it was not an undenominational University. What would have been said if the Leader of the Opposition had introduced such a Bill as that now before the House? He doubted whether the Conservative Party, in view of the feeling in these days, would ever have dared to bring in such a Bill.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said no one would be surprised at the action of the mover and seconder of the Amendment nor at the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. That speech was only interesting to him for one observation. The hon. Member seemed to think that it would have been a more reasonable proceeding if the circumstances of the Catholics of Ireland had been dealt with in conjunction with Trinity College. Of course he knew that the proposal to deal with that grievance by putting a second college in the University of Dublin was denounced and rejected by Trinity College. That was not what he meant. He meant that the Catholic grievance should be met by building a Catholic chapel in Trinity College. That was interesting as coming from him, and when the question arose later as to the building of denominational chapels within the precincts of these Universities he hoped the action of the hon. Gentleman would be consistent with the declaration he had now made.

MR. HUTTON: What I said was that in a frankly denominational University I saw no objection to a denominational chapel.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he had not risen merely for the purpose of arguing that matter with the hon. Gentleman, whose views were perfectly well known as those of a perfectly frank and consistent opponent of this Bill on every possible occasion when a vital Amendment had been proposed. Nor had he risen for the purpose of arguing with the hon. Gentlemen who moved and seconded the rejection of the clause, but he had risen in consequence of what he must describe as the extraordinary speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University. That hon. Gentleman commenced his speech by reminding the House that he had always been in favour of what he called a Catholic University for Ireland, and that even when his own party did not share that view and were opposed to that course as impracticable he voted in favour of a Catholic University for Ireland, and yet he proceeded to criticise this Bill on the utterly false ground that it was a denominational Bill and that it created a Catholic University. The attitude of the hon. Gentleman was utterly inconsistent, and he could not understand how an hon. Gentleman whom they always understood to be a friend to a fair settlement of the question and who had on more than one occasion made very broad-minded and friendly speeches on the matter, should have put into his remarks that afternoon such apparently bitter hostility. It was all very well to tell them that he was in favour of a settlement of the question which was impracticable. But here was a practicable settlement of the question which had a chance of passing, and the hon. Gentleman seized the opportunity of delivering what one might almost call a cruel and malignant attack on the Bill. [Cries of "Oh."] Perhaps he ought not to use the word "malignant," he had no desire to be offensive, but he could not understand the haste with which the hon. Gentleman had rushed into the fray against this practical effort, excusing himself by saying that in the past he had supported measures then impossible to carry out. What was the argument of the hon. Gentleman? He said that these were denominational Universities, because they were governed and controlled by the hierarchy in Ireland or because the one in Dublin, at all events, would be controlled by the hierarchy in Ireland. How did he make that out? The University in Dublin would be governed by a Senate nominated by the Crown for the first five years. That Senate consisted of about forty members of whom only four or five were clergymen. Their names were before the House, and how anyone reading these names could say that for the first five years, at any rate, those Universities were to be controlled by the hierarchy passed his understanding. At the end of five years the University would be governed by a freely-elected Senate on which no single clergyman of any denomination—bishop or priest—would have a seat *ex-officio*. No man could sit on that new Senate after five years unless he was elected, with the single exception of those nominated by the Crown. Let him remind the House how the Senate was to be constituted. It was a Senate of thirty-five members. The Chancellor of the University, one; the Presidents of the Constituent Colleges, three; persons nominated by His Majesty, of whom at least one should be a woman, four; elected by the governing body of the new College having its seat in Dublin, three; at least being members of an Academic Council in the College, six; elected by the governing body of Queen's College, Cork, and two being members of the Academic Council of the College, four; elected by the governing body of Queen's College, Galway, two being members of the Academic Council of the College, four; the Registrar, one; elected by Convocation, eight; and four co-opted —total, thirty-five. That would be a freely elected body. It was little short of absurd for anybody to say that in the future this University would be governed or controlled by the hierarchy or anybody except the body forming the University just in the same way as all other Universities in the country. The second argument the hon. Gentleman used was as to the power of affiliation, to which he apparently strongly objected. The power of affiliation which was contained in the Bill was a proposal almost the same as the power of affiliation to be found in the charters of every one of the newly created Universities in this country, such as Manchester, Leeds, and Sheffield. The hon. Gentleman had utterly failed to adduce any sound argument to show that his contention that this would be a clerically governed University was right. He hoped the Amendment would be rejected at once, and that the House would proceed with the consideration of the Bill in detail.

*MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) said he had increasing admiration for the facility of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford for forgetting very obvious facts. During the Committee stage of the Bill there was an important Amendment in the name of his hon. friend the Member for the Cambridge University. That Amendment, if it had gone to a division in the ordinary way, would have been carried against the Government. The Chief Secretary felt that he would prefer that a division should not take place on that occasion. And why? Because he was not personally in sympathy with that Amendment which gave power to the Roman Catholic authorities to build a chapel within the precincts of the University College in Dublin. What happened? That Amendment was referred to the hierarchy in the hope—[Cries of "No."] He made the statement on his own responsibility. That Amendment was referred to the hierarchy.

MR. BIRRELL: By whom?

*MR. BARRIE: By the Chief Secretary.

MR. BIRRELL: Nothing of the sort.

*MR. BARRIE; Not directly but indirectly.

MR. BIRRELL: Not directly nor indirectly. I utterly deny it.

*MR. BARRIE: The Chief Secretary admitted he did not like it. This Amendment was finally inserted in the Bill.

MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University): May I make one thing clear? The Amendment alluded to was my Amendment, and it is stated that it was referred, by someone unknown, to the hierarchy. I did not communicate with any single priest or bishop. If it was communicated to the hierarchy I had nothing to do with it.

MR. BIRRELL: Nor I.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Who did it?

*MR. BARRIE: It was communicated to the hierarchy. All I said was that it was communicated by someone. I did not refer to the hon. Member for Cambridge University.

MR. BIRRELL: No, no. The hon. Member is entirely mistaken. The Amendment relating to the chapel question was never so communicated. On the chapel question there was never any meeting of the bishops. The thing the hon. Member has in mind is probably a meeting of the bishops at Maynooth with reference to an Amendment of the Member for Cambridge University imposing conditions of residence.

*MR. BARRIE: With all respect I say that what I have stated actually took place—[Cries of "Name"]—and after that the Amendment was reluctantly accepted by the Chief Secretary.

MR. BIRRELL: Not a bit. That is absolutely untrue. There was no communication with any bishop whatever with reference to the question of the chapel—absolutely none.

*MR. BARRIE: I fully accept the Chief Secretary's assurance, while still saying, with all respect and asking the House to accept this statement, that the fact remains that the opinion of the Irish bishops was taken on this important Amendment, and that their opinion prevailed.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: By whom?

*MR. BARRIE: And that serious alteration was made in the Bill.

MR. BIRRELL: Not at all.

*MR. BARRIE: Said it was well known that the hierarchy had shaped this Bill from beginning to end. He was sorry that some of his Nonconformist friends—he spoke as a Nonconformist himself—seemed to accept this repudiation by the Chief Secretary. He was sorry he was unable to do so. He still believed that the policy of the hierarchy was the policy of this whole Bill. He would have had the greatest sympathy with the Government if they had come to the House and said frankly, "We wish to endow a Roman Catholic University in Ireland." He thought that many friends of higher education would have said that the Government would be able to make out a strong case for it; but he had no sympathy, on the contrary, he had the greatest contempt for intriguing and wire-pulling which had finally brought them to the stage they had arrived at that afternoon. In the Chief Secretary's brief contribution to the debate he had again asserted, what he had previously asserted in the Committee upstairs, that he had the people of Belfast behind him in planting a University in that city.

MR. BIRRELL: I did not say anything of the kind. I said a good many people in Belfast.

*MR. BARRIE said he accepted the qualification but did not think that they were very much further advanced. They knew that the professorial classes in Belfast were in sympathy with this movement, but that all the public bodies who had met since the Bill was introduced and during the intervening months had repudiated this settlement of the higher education question. As bearing out what he had said he might be allowed to quote the latest deliverance of the Higher Education Committee of the Presbyterian Church. They had spoken in terms which even the Chief Secretary could not minimise as to what their opinion of the Bill was, and this was an opinion expressed on the Bill since it came out of Committee—

> "The Commission of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, having full power to speak in the name of the Church, has observed with gravest concern that in the progress of the Irish Universities Bill through Committee of the House of Commons, the sectarian character and tendencies of the constitution of his proposed new University and college for Roman Catholics so strongly condemned at the special meeting of the General Assembly in April last, had been seriously increased, all Amendments designed to make the new institutions less denominational having been systematically rejected.
>
> "As a result, if the measure as amended in Committee passes into law a denominational University with denominational constituent colleges will, in contravention of the settled policy of the past forty years be irrevocably established in this country."

He left it there. Even the Chief Secretary knew the numbers and the influence of the Presbyterian Church. That was the opinion of that body and he agreed with it.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he largely agreed with the views expressed on the Bill by hon. Members behind him. It had been said by the hon. Member for the Morley division that if they (the Opposition) had proposed a Bill anything like this the opposition offered to it would have been very different from that which was now being offered to it in that House. The Leader of the Opposition had held the office of Leader of the Unionist Party for a longer period than any other leader for many years. He enjoyed the confidence and support of his party to a degree that could never be exceeded, and he was a strong and powerful advocate of the extension of University education in Ireland. But notwithstanding that fact, even his great weight, and ability had been insufficient to enable the party to bring in a measure of the kind. No one could wonder that hon. Members behind him renewed the protests they made on the Second Reading, because it must be remembered that the Government were inviting the House to agree to a departure of the gravest possible kind, which might be of the utmost moment not only to the education of Ireland but to the cause of education elsewhere. This momentous step was being taken at the fag end of a session, and the time alloted for the consideration of the Amendments on the Paper were of the briefest kind. But whether they liked the Bill or not, the Second Reading had been passed by an overwhelming majority of the House and the Bill had gone through Committee. But during its progress it had been materially altered, in what he and others considered a wrong direction. No one who examined the Bill on its merits now could but say that it was in a very much larger degree a purely denominational Bill than when it was read a second time. An impartial man would find it difficult to recognise in it the measure which the Chief Secretary asked leave to introduce, and all that could be expected now was that Amendments might be inserted on the Report Stage which would improve the measure, especially with regard to the control that was going to be exercised over the Universities. He would, therefore, suggest to his hon. friends that having expressed their views they should proceed with the Amendments with a view to improving the measure.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim S.) said the question asked by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford as to how it could be contended for a moment that the Universities to be set up by this Bill could be controlled by the Roman Catholic hierarchy was best answered by another question, which was how had the present Queen's Colleges in Ireland been controlled and practically ruined by the Roman Catholic hierarchy and priesthood. Everybody knew that the reason this Bill was introduced was that the Roman Catholic hierarchy was not satisfied with the present University education provided. Forty or fifty years ago a meeting of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland discussed whether it was right of Roman Catholic parents to allow their children to attend the Queen's Colleges. By a majority of one it was decided it was not. They described the Queen's Colleges as godless institutions, and said that parents allowing their children to attend incurred grave responsibility, and the effect was that these institutions from that time had been practically starved out of existence. In like manner could the Roman Catholic hierarchy destroy the usefulness of the Dublin University now proposed to be set up. The Roman Catholic hierarchy claimed absolute control in the domain of education as they did in that of religion, and if that was the case it was perfectly plain that they would control these new institutions. Whether it was a question of primary, secondary, or University education, the Roman Catholic hierarchy would be the final judges. The whole question of affiliation was bound up with denominationalism. It simply meant affiliation of Maynooth and possibly of Magee College in the North of Ireland. The importance of this question would be realised by the House when he reminded them that Maynooth was a very large institution, and that the number of students who would take advantage of the right of affiliation proposed to be given to the institution would probably out-number students in any one, and possibly in any two, of the constituent colleges in the University. To give those students all the rights and privileges of the parent University was a very important proposal, when they remembered that the institution existed entirely for the education of persons for the Roman Catholic priesthood. When they remembered further that all those students could take a degree at this new University and *ipso facto* became members of the ultimate governing body of the University—[AN HON. MEMBER: They only get votes for Convocation.]—He said "ultimate governing body," because Convocation would appoint the actual governing body of the University, and it did not take much calculation to realise that in a very short time the Convocation in Dublin would be composed very largely—he did not say they would be the majority—of priests of the Roman Catholic Church. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?] Those who were in favour of the Bill said—"Why should that not be so?" But they who opposed it said the reason it should not be so was because they wanted to see education in Ireland developed on undenominational lines. He submitted that it was absolutely futile to contend any longer that the proposals of this Bill were unsectarian and undenominational. They were nothing of the sort; and if the Chief Secretary would once and for all give up that line of argument, and frankly admit what practically everybody knew, that this was a denominational proposal, he did not pretend to say that they would vote for the Bills, but he could assure the right hon. Member that a great many of the arguments which would be used in reference to the various proposals would be omitted. If the right hon. Gentleman once for all admitted that this was a denominational Bill he would be simply telling them that which everybody in his heart of hearts knew perfectly well to be the fact. Those who shared his views were absolutely opposed to these proposals, believing that they would work a good deal of harm and that, far from bringing Roman Catholics and Protestants together, as the right hon. Gentleman said he devoutly hoped they would, they would have the opposite effect. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that he was animated by the hope that even in his lifetime he would see that the effect of these Universities would be to bring Roman Catholics and Protestants together. That, to his mind, was the vainest and most ridiculous hope that could possibly be entertained by any man in that House. The effect of the Bill was bound to be the very reverse. It had been the reverse in the case of elementary education, and how could they possibly expect that it would be different in the case of University education? It seemed to him to be against all logic and common sense to say that they were going to bring two great religious denominations together by providing every facility for their keeping apart. Surely, if they wanted to bring the denominations together they should do it at the stage of elementary education, and keep them together from that time onward. till their education was completed. Of course, he recognised it was impossible now to have any hope of making primary education undenominational in Ireland; that hope had long past; but the people of the North of Ireland had hoped that at any rate University education would be saved from this denominationalising process which he was sorry to say might, he would not say ruin, but seriously disfigure education in Ireland. He protested against the statement so often made by the Chief Secretary that the Bill was undenominational, and he protested against hon. Members opposite—when it was remembered how they had acted for the last four or five years on the educational question in England—offering to them in Ireland a new system of University education based on the very foundation which they themselves for years past had been decrying and endeavouring to root up in this country.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 231; Noes, 31. (Division List No 213.)

AYES.

Abraham,William(Cork, N.E.)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T.C.R.
Allen, A.Acland(Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Belloc,Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Burnes, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert Jn.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hills J. W.
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Water
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kerry, Earl of
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Francis E.(Leitrim,N.)
Meehan,Patrick A.(Queen's Co.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend,
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Percy, Earl
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hon. Sir Alex. F.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Clark, George Smith
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Oddy, John James
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Moore.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth) moved an Amendment to Clause 1, which would have had the effect of authorising the foundation of only one new University, with its seat in Dublin. He said that he addressed himself to the Bill because he was the only graduate of the Royal University on that side of the House and the Royal University was being destroyed by this Bill. The remarkable point about the Bill was that it created two Universities. The demand from Ireland had never been for two but for one extra University, a Catholic University in Dublin, and the point of his Amendment was that if it was necessary to create a Catholic University, and the demand had been made by numbers of venerable and educated men, men whose opinion ought to be listened to, surely the demand might be granted without destroying the University which already existed. The whole basis of the Bill was the inaccurate assertion that the Royal University had been a failure. The Queen's University last year had more than 4,000 students on its list, a larger number than any other University in the three Kingdoms except London. It would strike one as the natural course for the Government to take under the circumstances was to deal with the particular demand and to create a Catholic University, because Gentlemen opposite, who represented extreme Protestant opinion, had said they would consider favourably the creation of a Catholic University, and he held that it was the feeling of a very large number of Protestants in Ireland. But it did not at all necessitate the destruction of the existing University. It was alleged that the Royal University had been a failure because Catholics were prevented from going to it by their clerical superiors, but it had not only been attended by this large body of students but had also been remarkably successful. Professors, members of the Bar, and crowds of medical men had gone through the Arts course and he believed there were four distinguished Judges who were graduates of the Royal University. Two members of it had reached the House of Lords. He could not, therefore, understand what the position taken by the Government in this matter was. It was an entirely illiberal proposal to destroy a successful unsectarian University. It was very good of hon. Gentlemen opposite to accept the measure, but he was afraid they did not remember that while conciliating one part of Ireland they were doing a very appreciable wrong to another part. The province of Ulster ought to be considered. They had no right to force on the North of Ireland a system which they would not have in the South of Ireland. He proposed his Amendment as a protest on behalf of the Royal University which he thought was being extremely badly used. Its Convocation had passed resolutions hostile to the measure and they had been treated with absolute disregard. He did not know that Convocation was even consulted by the Chief Secretary. That was not the way to go to work. It was entitled to be treated with some degree of respect, but it had been thrown aside —for what motive he would not say. If they already had an undenominational University why should they have a second when nobody had asked for it? The only plan was to create a denominational University in Dublin.

MR. MOORE seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out from the word 'found' to end of the subsection, and to insert the words 'one new University in Ireland, having its seat at Dublin.'"—(*Mr. C. J. O'Donnell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part."

MR. BIRRELL said the hon. Member would realise that it was undesirable for him to argue the whole question over again, and to state why they had found it necessary to substitute for the Royal University a University of another character. The hon. Member naturally attached importance to the old Royal University, and he had never denied that as an examining body, and as far as an examining body could be a University at all, it fulfilled its duty well. The 4,000 students who the hon. Member said attended it had only attended the examination hall. Ireland was discontented at being confined to the existing colleges. He did not think he could usefully occupy the time of the House further.

Amendment negatived.

CAPTAIN CRAIG moved an Amendment to the clause providing that the names of the two Universities should be the Royal University, Dublin, and the Queen's University, Belfast. He said it was desired that the new Universities should be called by names which would assure that as far as Dublin was concerned the new University there should not clash with Trinity. Some of them were convinced that they could not possibly have a better name for the Belfast University than the Queen's. It was well known, for he could not tell how many years, as the Queen's College, Belfast, and Queen's University before it, and the name had carried weight throughout the world. In regard to Dublin they thought it would meet with the approval of everyone in Ireland that it should be called the Royal University. As the right hon. Gentleman had given up all hope of being able to find a name himself and intended to shelve it on to other shoulders, they had taken the bold step of perpetuating the name which at present existed, though he feared the new college would compare very unfavourably with the old.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out from the word 'corporate,' to the word 'and,' in line 13, and to insert the words 'named the Royal University,' Dublin, and the 'Queen's University,' Belfast, respectively."—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL said he was rather surprised that the hon. Gentlemen should be so anxious to be godfathers to these two colleges. The responsibility was too great to be thrown upon him to determine by what name they should be called, The question was under careful consideration, and so far as Belfast was concerned, the general feeling was in favour of its being called Queen's University. But he was not in a position to assert that that would be the title, because it was an important subject on which a great number of people would like to be consulted, and it was a matter of the Royal prerogative. He thought Queen's University, Belfast, would at all events receive the support of a very large number of persons who were likely to be connected with it. In regard to the University in Dublin, that was a matter in which the Senate and also the general opinion amongst those who were likely to frequent the University and who were interested in its success were entitled to be consulted, and he was certainly not in a position now to declare what the name of the University was to be. He could only repeat what he had said over and over again, that His Majesty would certainly not consent to any name which would in any way be liable to be confused with the University of Dublin and Trinity College. At present he was not in a position to go further.

MR. WALTER LONG thought the right hon. Gentleman's assurance might be accepted as satisfactory. He was, however, rather surprised, having regard to the great questions which he had been able to solve without much regard to the feelings of many people in Ireland, that he had not been able to solve the minor question of the name of the Universities. He might very well have taken the decision of the question into his own hands. However, they were entirely in his hands, and he thought they might rest satisfied.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked leave to withdraw his Amendment after the assurances given by the right hon. Gentleman.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. MOORE moved an Amendment designed to secure that there should be a permanent lay majority on the governing body. The Chief Secretary had told them that this was to be an absolutely free and unfettered governing body, in no way subject to clerical control. To enable the Chief Secretary to carry out that intention it was very desirable that the statute should contain what was a very reasonable provision to secure that when this new University was set up there should at least be a lay majority on the governing body. He could not see what objection the Chief Secretary could have to his proposal. A very customary argument against this Amendment in Committee was that it was an insult to limit the clergy to a possible one fourth of the governing body. He moved this Amendment for the real benefit of University education, and at the risk of being described as "insulting" he would persist in it. He had no wish to say anything insolent in regard to the ministers connected with any church; he considered his action in this matter and the action of those who supported him in limiting the number of clergy would not by any means be so insulting as the proposal of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford which disqualified clergymen under the Local Government Act. He wished to disclaim any such sinister or malignant intention, but he desired the House to see that a rational and reasonable safeguard was put into the Bill, because charters might be altered or modified. He hoped the House would see that the governing bodies of these institutions which would have the control of State funds were free from clerical control and that would be secured by the adoption of this Amendment.

MR. BARRIE, in seconding, said he had been reading the statute of the great University at Sydney where the clergy were not allowed to form more than one-third of the Senate. He thought that amply justified this Amendment, which, upon other grounds as well, they were anxious to have inserted. He would have the same objection to Presbyterian clergymen on the governing body of the Belfast University, because he thought the clerical element should be kept in a minority. He begged leave to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 18, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided that any governing body under this Act shall be composed as to three-fourths thereof of laymen.'"—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he could not be a party to placing a permanent disqualification upon an educational matter upon persons who were trained divines either of one Church or another. Personally, he would much sooner deal with a cleric than with a clerically-minded layman. If they were going to exclude the clergy on educational grounds they were practically declaring that the electorate were incapable of choosing their own governing body. He thought that would be inflicting upon the electorate something approaching an insult, because they would practically be saying that they were not fit to elect the persons to represent them on the governing body, and they would only be allowing them to elect their representatives subject to the condition that they should not have more than one-fourth of the governing body clergymen. On this matter they must stand for freedom, and it must be left to the people to select the persons who were best qualified. To his astonishment — he would not say admiration — the hon. Members representing the North of Ireland were advocating undenominationalism. The Amendment, however, imposed upon the electorate of the University a condition which declared their incapacity to elect persons they might think best fitted. He thought the proposal was unreasonable. If they wanted a University at all they must place some measure of confidence in the graduates and the professors to chose their own governing body.

MR. WALTER LONG said the views expressed in the Amendment at one time found general acceptance on the opposite side of the House, but now Liberal Members heard, in what they had proudly proclaimed to be the greatest Nonconformist Parliament ever elected, a member of the Government express his astonishment at an Amendment which he had entirely misdescribed but which simply asked Parliament to lay down the governing principle of these institutions instead of leaving it to the bodies themselves. The Chief Secretary said it was a monstrous thing to impose these disabilities upon the clergy. The right hon. Gentleman was one of the most distinguished authorities on history, and surely he could not believe that this Amendment was imposing the disability upon the clergy for the first time. What about elections to the House of Commons? Was it an insult to say that there should be a majority of laymen on these governing bodies when it was a fact that a clergyman could not be elected a Member of that House whilst he was in Holy Orders? The Amendment simply meant that in the government of these great educational institutions, the control should rest in the hands of the laity, and not in the hands of the clergy in any Church. Many of them disbelieved in Universities being governed by the clergy, whether Protestant or Catholic, and he would vote as consistenly and with as much confidence against a proposal to vest powers of this kind in the clergy of his own Church as he would in regard to any other Church, not because he was wanting in respect to the clergy or did not believe in their capacity or fairness, but because he believed that the clergy of any Church were governed by rules and conditions—and their vision was frequently narrowed—which made it undesirable that they should exercise the far-reaching duties attaching to members of governing bodies. The Chief Secretary had said that the Amendment imposed a disability upon the electorate of the Universities; but it did nothing of the kind; all it did was to lay down that Parliament should decide the principle. The question was frequently argued as if it arose out of the bigoted views of his hon. friends towards the Catholic Church, but it was nothing of the kind. It was now proposed to create a University which it was believed would be largely dominated by Catholic influences in the South of Ireland, but by other influences in the North of Ireland. The Amendment simply meant that Parliament should decide that there should be a majority of laymen on the governing body. They were voting a large sum of public money for the endowment of these Universities. He was a believer in toleration in regard to all religion, and he hoped that this was only the beginning of a general settlement, although he had his doubts. But when they were voting large sums of money and taking it out of the pockets of the people of this country, surely Parliament was not only entitled to lay down what should be the governing principle, but it was also the duty of the House to see that a start was made in the right direction. The Amendment was a perfectly fair and just one, and four or five years ago it would have found almost universal acceptance from the supporters of the Government. Whatever might have made hon. Gentlemen opposite change their views, he and his friends had not changed theirs. They adhered still to the policy which they consistently advocated, and they would certainly vote for the Amendment.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the House might assume that the governing bodies which the Chief Secretary proposed to set up to watch over and direct the destinies of these Universities during the first five years were, more or less, in the right hon. Gentleman's opinion ideal bodies. The first senate of the University of Dublin was to be composed of thirty-nine persons, of whom about one-sixth were clergymen. In the case of Belfast University the first senate was to consist of thirty-three or thirty-four persons, of whom two were clergymen. That being so, he did not think anybody could say that the proposal of his hon. friend to limit at all times the number of clergymen on the Senates of those Universities to one-fourth was unreasonable. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman would be able to contend that it would be impossible to get three-fourths of the members without going to the churches for them. Both in Dublin and Belfast it would be perfectly easy to get the whole number without going to the churches. There was, he believed, a feeling in all parts of the House that the control of these new Universities should be, as far as possible, in the hands of the laity, and that safeguards should be introduced to prevent the control from being gradually, or possibly suddenly, taken out of the hands of the laity and handed over to the clergymen. The Amendment proposed by his hon. friend might be safely and advantageously adopted.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 71; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 214.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barnes, G. N.
Beck, A. Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bull, Sir William James
Cave, George
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clark, George Smith
Clough, William
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Fell, Arthur
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Kerry, Earl of
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Oddy, John James
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Moore and Mr. Hugh Barrie.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Chance, Frederick William

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrington, Timothy
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert

Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Menzies, Walter
Middlebrook, William
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs.
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

*MR. BARRIE moved an Amendment to provide that Queen's College, Belfast, should not be dissolved. He explained that this Amendment should be read in conjunction with an Amendment on Clause 2 of which he had given notice with the object of making Queen's College, Belfast, and

Magee College, Londonderry, "constituent colleges of the new University having its seat at Belfast." He found it necessary to move the Amendment in order to bring before the House the case of Magee College, Londonderry, which for many years had been doing excellent work for higher education in Ireland. It was the only educational institution in Ireland which, as he hoped to show, would suffer seriously under the Bill as now before the House. He thought it necessary, the matter being of the greatest and most urgent importance to this institution to go into considerable details. The matter had only come before him in a complete shape this week, when he received a letter from the President of Magee College asking him to place the facts before the House on the Report stage of the Bill. He proposed to read a few extracts from the correspondence, premising his remarks by saying that an important deputation waited on the Chief Secretary in December last year when the right hon. Gentleman made the statement referred to:—

> "He would not allow Magee College to be placed in a worse position than it was in at present under the Royal University."

It was fully expected when the Bill was introduced that that promise would be fulfilled; but he was sorry to say that it was not. Immediately after the introduction of the Bill, Dr. Leebody wrote to the Chief Secretary as follows:—

> "Dear Sir,
>
> Will you pardon me if I express to you my keen disappointment (which is I believe shared by all my colleagues) on learning that Magee College is not formally recognised in your University Bill. I can understand the difficulty of giving formal recognition to Maynooth, which is a purely ecclesiastical college, but since the founding of the Royal University the essential difference between Magee College and Maynooth has been admitted, and we have enjoyed the same status in the University as the Queen's Colleges,"

and he went on to repeat the case for Magee College, which was pretty well covered in his letter. The next letter in the correspondence was from the Chief Secretary, or rather from the private secretary of the Chief Secretary and was as follows—

> "Mr. Birrell asks me to say that he should have acknowledged your recent letter to him about the position of Magee College. He desires me now to say that he hopes that by a discussion of the question the matters at issue could be fairly adjusted, and with that object he would be glad to have a Conference in Dublin with yourself and Mr. Cooke and the President of Queen's College, and Sir James Dougherty would be available for giving the help in the matter that his special knowledge of the situation enables him to render. Mr. Birrell has to leave Dublin for Easter, but will be back on Tuesday, and will be able to meet you on Wednesday, Thursday or Friday. Sir James Dougherty is in communication with Mr. Cooke and Dr. Hamilton and will write to you when he is in a position to make a definite engagement. If you have anything to suggest as to the day Mr. Birrell will be glad if you will write to Sir James direct."

The correspondence showed that the Conference took place in the Castle, on Thursday, 23rd April. There were present Mr. Birrell, Sir James Dougherty, Dr. Hamilton, Professer Dill, Mr. Cooke, and Dr. Leebody. Mr. Birrell submitted a new clause which he proposed to introduce into the Charter of the Belfast University and this clause was accepted by the representatives of Queen's College, Belfast, and Magee College. The clause was as follows—

> "The Literary and Scientific Department of Magee College, Londonderry,should be entitled to be affiliated to the University, subject to the provisions of this our Charter, and to the Statutes and Regulations of the University; and the Professors therein who should be engaged in teaching Matriculated Students of the University, in the approved courses of the University shall be members of the several faculties concerned with the subjects which they teach of the General Board of Studies and school, subject to the provisions of this our Charter, and to the Statutes and Regulations of the University, take part in the examinations held by the University; and the students of the Literary and Scientific Department of Magee College, when matriculated in the University, should enjoy all the privileges of students of the University.
>
> "Provided always that the Literary and Scientific Department shall be entitled to affiliate so long only as it is open to students of all denominations, without distinction of religious belief."

On 27th April, Dr. Leebody received from the Chief Secretary's office a printed copy of the Draft Charter of the proposed Belfast University, with this note appended to it—

> "It should be observed that this Draft will require modification as a result of the arrangement come to at the meeting at the Castle on Thursday, 25th April, 1908."

When the clause of the Bill relating to the affiliation of colleges was under discussion in Committee objections were made to the provision for the affiliation of Magee College being included in the

Belfast Charter. On reading the report of the Committee proceedings in the Press, Dr. Leebody addressed the following letter to the Chief Secretary—

> "I observe that a strong attempt is being made to induce you to withdraw your promise to provide for the affiliation of Magee College by Charter. It is not difficult to guess by whom this movement has been engineered. Nothing as they well know can prevent the affiliation of Maynooth except a direct prohibition of its affiliation by Charter, and this would involve the unanimous hostility of the hierarchy. Whether, therefore, the affiliation of Maynooth be provided for by Charter, or left to the decision of the University, makes no difference to Maynooth. Provision for affiliation by Charter is the only hope of justice for Magee. I trust you will pardon this letter, but the matter is one of vital importance to our college."

No acknowledgment of this letter was received.

MR. JOHN REDMOND, on a point of order, said that the whole of the hon. Gentleman's argument was as to the question of affiliation of colleges. That did not arise on this Amendment which dealt with making certain colleges constituent colleges.

***MR. SPEAKER**: I am afraid I do not quite appreciate the difference between constituent and affiliated colleges for the purpose of this Amendment.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that in the one case the University was to consist of constituent colleges, while in the other the University was to have the power of affiliating other colleges on conditions. The argument of the hon Gentleman was that Magee College ought to be one of the colleges so affiliated, but the Amendment before the House dealt with the question that it should be a constituent college.

***MR. SPEAKER**: The hon. Member must confine himself to the question that Magee College should be one of the constituent colleges.

***MR. BARRIE** said he desired to give his reason why Magee should be a constituent college rather than an affiliated college.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that the whole question of affiliation would be discussed later on another Amendment, and there was no use discussing it now.

***MR. BARRIE** said that he was almost finished. At the close of the Committee meeting on June 1st, the Chief Secretary was reported as having said:—"If Magee College does not want affiliation the matter is closed so far as I am concerned." On noticing this in the newspapers Dr. Leebody at once wired to the Chief Secretary that he was under an entire misapprehension as to the attitude of Magee College, and addressed to him the following letter on June 2nd—

> "I was greatly concerned to see from the reports of yesterday's Committee meeting that you were under the impression that the authorities of Magee College did not wish the College to be affiliated by Charter to the Belfast University. Nothing could be further from the truth. Of course all its friends would prefer that it should be made a constituent college, but many, as well as myself, see the very serious difficulties in the way. All, however, recognise the vital importance of the boon you promised to Mr Cooke and me in Dublin being granted. We rely on your not withholding this. It would be a pity that a measure which it is to be hoped will be a great and lasting benefit to Ireland should needlessly involve the destruction of an institution which has been built up without State aid, and is certain to do good work if not crushed by the State. Failure to provide for our affiliation by charter will inflict on us a deadly blow, for reasons of which you are aware."

Neither the telegram nor the letter of 2nd June had been acknowledged by the Chief Secretary, who was generally conspicuous for his courtesy. He expressed his personal regret that the head of Magee College should have been so treated. He was there as representing a constituency immediately adjoining the site of the college, and, seeing the Chief Secretary had shown no intention or desire to fulfil his promise from which he had never been absolved, to plead for this college. Entirely out of private resources provided by members of the Presbyterian Church, this college had done for forty years something for higher education in the North-West of Ireland in a manner which the Chief Secretary himself had acknowledged the value of. Subject to a life charge a very substantial provision would accrue to the college in a few years, and the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church were anxious to do everything in their power to promote higher education in that part of Ireland. The general assembly had recently offered that the teaching of theology should be removed from Magee College so that no restriction should stand in the way of the Chief Secretary acting generously by it. He held that the case for making Magee College a constituent college was incontestably strong, and if the Chief Secretary persisted in the course he apparently desired to take, he would, in the name of benefiting higher education in other parts of Ireland be striking a very serious blow at higher education in the North-West of Ireland. They must not forget that this was the only institution within 100 miles of Belfast and 160 miles of Dublin which was doing anything for the benefit of higher education in the whole of the North-West. The task of the Chief Secretary had been a more than usually difficult one. They knew the influences which had been tying his hands, but he asked him now even at the eleventh hour not to strike this unjust and undeserved blow at higher education in the North-West of Ireland.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out the words 'and Queen's College, Belfast.' "—(*Mr. Hugh Barrie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. BIRRELL said that his conscience was clear in this matter. During the prolonged discussions they had had he considered it his duty to see to it that Magee College was in no way injured or destroyed by the cessation of the Royal University. He had endeavoured in every way he possibly could to prevail upon Magee College to confine its claim to one of affiliation, and he was prepared to do all he could to secure that it got that affiliation. For that purpose he got its principals, Dr. Hamilton and Dr. Bell, to meet him at Dublin Castle. They then put forward a demand that Magee College should be a constituent college. He said that could not possibly be. They also made a claim for further endowment, which he met with a forbidding attitude. Dr. Hamilton, to his surprise, produced from his pocket a written proposal of his own, suggesting that Magee College should be affiliated by Charter—that was to say, that the discretion should no longer be vested in the Senate of the Belfast University, but that its affiliation should be put in the charter, and various other arrangements with regard to securing them the advantages of an examiner. Those gentlemen went away with that document and from that moment he had never received any assurance from them or from any person connected with the governing body of the Magee College that they stood by that—that they gave up their claim—a claim which he could not possibly accept—that they should be a constituent college, and they should be affiliated by charter, which he was prepared if he could do it to secure. From the very first they had assumed a hostile attitude towards the Bill. In the Committee a proposal was moved that they should be a constituent college, and the hon. Member himself said that they would never by any possibility agree to forego the claim of that college to be a constituent college. It was absolutely impossible for him to adhere to the bargain because the bargain was never struck. The offer was made to them, but they never accepted it. All through the attitude of Magee College put aside altogether the way out of the difficulty which Dr. Hamilton suggested at Dublin Castle, and they fought the Bill at every step, mostly on the right that Magee College should be a constituent college. Accordingly it became quite impossible for him, after they had been beaten on the point of becoming a constituent college, to fall back upon the arrangement which they had never agreed to that they should be affiliated by charter. This was a matter in which discretion should be given to the governing body of the University. He, therefore, considered himself relieved not from the bargain, because there never was a bargain, but from the proposals made by Dr. Hamilton. If the principal of Magee College had written to him saying that he withdrew his claim for the college to be made a constituent college, he would have supported at any cost the proposal that it should be affiliated by charter. But they never did. He did not know if the hon. Gentleman opposite was entitled at what he called the eleventh hour to make any proposal. The time had gone by and the opportunity had been lost, although he would do all he could to see that the claim of Magee College was fully and frankly considered by the Belfast Senate, and he could hardly doubt that Dr. Hamilton also would do his best to secure the recognition of Magee College, if it was brought up to the proper University standard and was a college where students might reside. To say that Magee College was entitled to complain of his not carrying out a bargain which they never accepted was, he thought, a little too much.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) hoped his hon. friend would not press the Amendment to a division. Everybody recognised that the work done by Magee College was good, but having regard to the number of students in attendance and to the fact that it had no facilities for science studies he did not think it had a claim to become a constituent college. He scarcely thought that the Chief Secretary was wise in entering into any arrangement with respect to the affiliation by charter of Magee College. He thought that the question should be left either to the statutory Commissioners, or after the termination of their labours to the Senate of the Belfast University. Having regard to the excellent work done by the Arts faculty of that college the affiliation of that faculty alone was likely to take place.

MR. BUTCHER had considerable sympathy with Magee College in this matter, because he thought there had been some real misunderstanding between them and the Chief Secretary. At the same time, he did not think that Magee College could reasonably make a claim to become a constituent college. Until very recently Magee College was essentially a denominational body, and on one side was still a seminary for the training of Presbyterian ministers. They proposed to alter its trusts so as to detach its Art faculty from the denominational college, but the college was very small. It had only between 55 and 60 students, the greater number of whom were preparing for the ministry; there was only a very small residum of Art students who were not going in for the ministry. The chief claim of Magee College to receive any recognition under this Bill was the good work it had done for women's education in the North of Ireland. If they were to affiliate at all colleges of that type, then the Magee College would come in as an affiliated college.

*MR. BARRIE said the Chief Secretary had asked if he was an accredited representative of Magee College. He desired to say that since he had received the letters from the President which he had quoted he considered he was. In the Committee he acted entirely as a private Member. There seemed to him to be no failure of acceptance on the part of the Magee College of the terms arranged with the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. BIRRELL: Then what right had they afterwards to demand to be made a constituent college?

*MR. BARRIE: They did not do so officially. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was hardly quite fair in saying what he did. It seemed to him it was the duty of the friends of Magee College to point out that they had serious cause of complaint regarding the way in which the Chief Secretary had carried out his part of the bargain. That bargain was duly made, and a distinct breach of faith had taken place. He would go further and say that nothing they had heard from the Chief Secretary gave any encouragement to the friends of Magee College. As Member for a constituency greatly interested in Magee College, he much regretted the manner in which the Chief Secretary had acted, and the gross injustice which had been perpetrated.

THE MARQUESS OF HAMILTON (Londonderry) asked the right hon. Gentleman whether, if he could not see his way to making Magee College a constituent college of Belfast University, it could be affiliated by Charter.

MR. BIRRELL: I do not think I can.

THE MARQUESS OF HAMILTON said he had the copy of a letter from Dr. Leebody, of Magee College, dated 2nd June, and addressed to the Chief Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman said he had received no communication from Magee College as to affiliation. This was the letter—

> "I was greatly concerned to see from the reports of yesterday's committee meeting that you were under the impression that the authorities of Magee College did not wish the college to be affiliated by charter to the Belfast University. Nothing could be further from the truth. Of course all its friends would prefer that it should be made a constituent college, but many, as well as myself, see the very serious difficulties in the way. All, however, recognise the vital importance of the boon you promised to Mr. Cooke and me in Dublin being granted. We rely on your not withholding this. It would be a pity that a measure which, it is to be hoped, will be a great and lasting benefit to Ireland, should needlessly involve the destruction of an institution which has been built up without State aid, and is certain to do good work if not crushed by the State. Failure to provide for our affiliation by charter will inflict upon us a deadly blow, for reasons of which you are aware."

MR. BIRRELL said his position was this. If Magee College had accepted Dr. Hamilton's proposal, he would have striven by his own vote and support to have got Magee College affiliated by charter. He would certainly have done that, but then he had never had any assurance from the time of the meeting in Dublin Castle to the time of the letter of 2nd June, when the Committee stage had begun, that Magee accepted those terms. On the contrary, he had seen in the newspapers that they were still striving to become a constituent college, either of the new University or of Trinity College, Dublin, with whom they had some negotiations. Therefore, it was impossible for him while the Bill was going through Committee, and while he had all these difficulties to consider in relation to Maynooth and other places, to adhere to the bargain, unless he was satisfied that Magee accepted it. But that they had not done. The hon. Member had got up and said that Magee did not feel itself bound by the bargain, and claimed to be a constituent college.

*MR. BARRIE said, in justice to himself, he ought to explain that he could not possibly have made the remark which the right hon. Gentleman attributed to him, because he had not been authorised to make it. What he had said was that he understood—and he was speaking as a private Member—that the offer had been made to affiliate, but he claimed that Magee should be made a constituent college.

MR. JOHN REDMOND expressed the hope that the right hon. Gentleman would not listen at this stage to the suggestion that Magee College should now be affiliated by Charter. The feeling amongst all who knew anything at all about Magee College was one of friendliness, and he would be the last in the world to do anything injurious to that college. He thought the most Magee College could say was that they should be put on the same footing as every other college in Ireland outside the constituent colleges. If Magee was to be affiliated to the University by charter, it would be a fatal course to pursue, because naturally every other college in Ireland who thought they had a claim, would come forward and seek to put pressure on the right hon. Gentleman to affiliate them by charter. With regard to Maynooth, Magee, or any other college, the one ground which the right hon. Gentleman had taken was to leave the question to be decided by the Senate of the University. He hoped, therefore, under the circumstances, that the right hon. Gentleman would not dream of acceding at this stage to the proposal. When first it was brought forward, he thought the right hon. Gentleman had made a great mistake in making the offer which he did. He was now relieved from the consequences of that mistake, and he could leave Magee College, like every other college in Ireland, to be dealt with by the Senate of the University.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) said that although this question was not one of supreme importance to the Bill, it was one of considerable importance to Magee College. He regretted himself that Magee College should have imagined that this question was going to be settled as a matter of bargain between this or that college and the Chief Secretary. He did not think that it mattered in the least now whether or not there had been a misunderstanding in Committee between the college and the right hon. Gentleman. He could not see what that had to do with the question. The sole question was whether it was right or not to make it a constituent college. Personally, looking at this Bill, he did not think that they ought to decide any of these points on small grounds. On the other hand, the Chief Secretary would not in the least blame Magee College for having done their best to be made a constituent college. They had fought it to the last. It was to Magee a much more important question than anything else. He thought they had been perfectly right to fight it out to the last, and he did not think that they could take what had occurred in Committee as any reason for saying that the time had now lapsed, and that they could not deal with it. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory than to give that kind of answer to the college. Magee College was in very considerable difficulties; it had done a great work for a particular part of the community in the past; and he gathered from the Chief Secretary, he might be wrong, that at some stage of the proceedings he would have been willing to affiliate the college by charter to Belfast University. If he had been of that opinion why had he changed it, and why should he not attempt to do it now? He understood that the hon. Gentleman who had moved this Amendment, and the noble Lord who had supported it—both, of course, understood a great deal about the matter—were in a position to say that Magee College desired to be affiliated by charter. If that were so, then there should be some real answer, without these references to what had taken place in Committee. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Leader of the Irish Party had said that Magee College ought to be left in the same position as Maynooth. That sounded a very excellent argument to anybody who did not know the reality of the case, but they must look at the circumstances. Everybody knew that just as surely as the Bill passed, the Dublin University must necessarily affiliate Maynooth. Nobody for a moment could put forward any pretext for saying that it would not. Naturally Maynooth would be affiliated when there was power to affiliate in the new University. He did not in the least object, if it was desired by both parties that it should be done. But would anybody say that the circumstances were the same as regarded Magee College and Belfast University? It was exactly the other way. Everybody knew that if left alone Magee would not be affiliated. The Senate of the new Belfast University had not the least intention of affiliating Magee College. He had heard a good deal about it, and that was the actual state of affairs; therefore, there was no use in telling them that the two cases stood on the same lines. He had never been connected with Magee College, which was in a part of Ireland about which he did not profess to know a great deal. His acquaintance lay with a less law-abiding part of the country. But all along, in any observations which he had made on the Bill, he had expressed a wish that a settlement should be come to with as little friction, and leaving behind as little bad feeling as possible, giving to all parties in the matter a real good start. On these grounds he hoped that there would be some other answer than that which had already been put forward for refusing to have this college affiliated.

MR. BIRRELL said that if he looked back to what had taken place on this subject, he found that the proposal for affiliation by charter had never been put forward on his part. It was a proposal which emanated, not from him, but from Dr. Hamilton. He knew that when they met round the table he had never any intention whatever of suggesting the affiliation of Magee by charter. It was not in his thoughts. Dr. Hamilton produced out of his pocket, rather to his surprise, a written document, to which, he was bound to say, the representatives of Magee, being more concerned to defend their case from becoming a constituent college, did not pay that close and particular attention that they might have done. They took it away, and were prepared to consider it. From that time forth until the letter referred to in June, and when the Committee had got into full existence, he heard nothing more from them. The difficulty was the course the debate took in Committee. It was perfectly plain that the Committee would not have consented, and he did not believe that the proposal for the affiliation of Magee College would have passed. He did not consider himself in any sense bound. Having regard to the course which Magee had followed, if they had withdrawn their opposition on all other grounds, he certainly should have felt himself bound to exercise his influence in favour of affiliation and would have voted for it. But what would have happened he did not know. He did not think it would have passed. The thing had, however, gone past the stage where it was any longer possible to go back on that position, and he had the satisfaction of thinking that Magee College might have put him into a different position, and forced him to take that course.

*Mr. C. J. O'DONNELL said the speech of the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University had decided this question. He had told them that it was not the intention of the Senate of Belfast University to affiliate Magee College. [Cries of "No, no."] It was proposed to override the Senate. He did not believe that the House would sanction such interference.

Amendment negatived.

Captain CRAIG moved an Amendment providing that His Majesty may, if pleased to do so, by charter, found a new "undenominational" college to have its seat at Dublin. He said he wished to insert the word "undenominational" because they had had from time to time pledges given by the Government that no money voted by Parliament should be spent for denominational purposes. Although promises made by Ministers were binding on them they were not binding on those who came after them. Could anything be fairer than to ask the large body of Nonconformists in the House to erect an undenominational college in Dublin? It was fair and it accorded with the traditions of the great Liberal Party as pronounced prior to the last general election. The Chief Secretary and others had been attempting to legislate for education in England in the direction of undenominationalism, and he was now asking the great Liberal Party and the Nonconformist conscience to go with him into the lobby and vote for undenominationalism about which they shouted so loudly outside the House, and he was sure they would jump at this early opportunity of being able to vote for it.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'new,' to insert the word 'undenominational.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'undenominational' be there inserted."

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) suggested that it would be an improvement on the word "undenominational" if the hon. and gallant Member put in the word "un-Christian."

Captain CRAIG: I am afraid I could not give way in that matter. I prefer the word "undenominational."

Mr. BIRRELL said the wording of several of the clauses, and particularly of the very remarkable Clause 3, justified, in his opinion, the statement that this was as undenominational a University as any law could make any body of men undenominational. They were often told that these words counted for nothing, that it did not matter that they said anybody could go to the Universities, that nobody was to be met at their thresholds by any test requiring them to say what religion they belonged to or to produce a certificate of baptism, that it was no use to say that every prize, every exhibition, and every scholarship was open, that there were no restrictions of any kind, and that the governing body after the first five years were to be elected by professors and graduates. All that, in the opinion of the hon. and gallant Gentleman was not worth the paper it was written on, and the University would be denominational. And yet now he, in rhetorical manner and in striking tones bade them put in the word "undenominational," and then he said all would be well. He did not attach the importance to words which the hon. and gallant Gentleman did. But hon. Members could form their own opinion of this Bill, not from a word here or a word there, but from the general nature of its contents and the provisions they had inserted in it, and he did not think the addition of this word would be of any use whatever.

MR. WALTER LONG said the right hon. Gentleman had indulged, as he was very fond of doing, in the very art which he criticised so strongly when anybody else ventured to follow in his footsteps. He had found great fault with his hon. and gallant friend for his rhetorical display, but the Chief Secretary was by no means unproficient in the art of rhetorical display and those who might be inclined harshly to criticise his action would say that rhetoric frequently took the place of argument. In his opinion, ninety-nine people out of 100 who knew anything of Ireland and of the question of higher education in Ireland believed that the ultimate result would be that these Universities would be very largely favoured in a denominational manner. The right hon. Gentleman's defence was that he had done everything already in the Bill to give these Universities an undenominational character. If that was his object and if that would be the result of the provisions of the Bill, why on earth did he refuse to accept one word which would make it perfectly clear, and that the intention of the Government was that not only should the Bill be drafted and carried through Parliament so as to make it undenominational, but that something more should be done, that every obstacle that Parliament could fairly put in the way of turning this into a denominational measure should be put there. Surely that was not unfair if it really was the intention of the Government that this should be an undenominational University. He wondered at this persistent refusal to accept Amendments, the only object of which was to carry out what the Government were never tired of declaring was their intention.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) suggested that the word "untruthful" should be substituted for the word "undenominational." After listening to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down it was quite clear that in the opinion of everybody the word "undenominational" would be an untruthful description of the University, and he should vote against any attempt to make these Universities by phraseology what they were not going to be in practice. He thought it far better to take up a consistent attitude whichever side of the question their inclination might be on.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he entirely agreed with the hon. Gentleman opposite. His hon. friend desired that the Bill should be an undenominational Bill, and hoped to effect that by introducing the word "undenominational" in the second clause. His hon. friend must know perfectly well that the introduction of the word "undenominational" would be only an expression of a pious intention —of his intention. But it was not the intention of the Government or of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, and it was not his intention. He quite admitted that he did not like the Bill in its present form. His dislike to it was, put shortly, that he thought it far too clerical. His objection was not that it was denominational. The whole object of the Bill was to provide education which would meet the requirements of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland. What was the use of calling that anything but denominational, and what was the use of the Government coming forward and pointing to Clause 3 or Clause 4 and saying they did not mean to have a denominational Bill? If the Government did not mean to have a denominational Bill, they did not mean to have a Bill which would carry out the object of the hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, who desired higher education to be given to Roman Catholics, two-thirds of the Irish people. It was only by making this a denominational University that they would attain that object. He did not mean by that, that they must have a system of tests or exclude Protestants or put all the disqualifications with which Clause 3 dealt. What he meant was that the intention of the Government from the beginning had plainly been to create a University which was denominational, and he suggested to his hon. and gallant friend that he should not press his Amendment, because he could not really conceive why they should put on the face of the Bill something so obviously mendacious as was implied in the use of this word.

If this was not a denominational Bill it had no *raison d'etre,* and to put "undenominational" in big characters in the second clause was not to make it undenominational, but to make it hypocritical. If his hon. and gallant friend went to a division, which he hoped he would not, he should be compelled in the interests of veracity and sincerity to vote against him.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said he very much wished those who had repeatedly and emphatically declared that this Bill set up a denominational University in Ireland would take the trouble to define what they meant by denominational. The Universities would be no more denominational than those of Manchester, Liverpool, Oxford, Cambridge, or Edinburgh, and less denominational than Trinity College, Dublin. How could hon. Members, with any sense of justice or fair play, call this a denominational University, when they made no proposal to alter the constitution of Trinity College, which was far more denominational ? Were the other Universities denominational ?

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said the University of Liverpool would not admit theology within its walls.

MR. DILLON said that the University set up under this Bill would be free. When the hon. Member opposite spoke of the Liverpool University did he know what the University of Dublin did at the present time ? Was he aware that they had theology and theological professors who had the same standing as other professors ? Did he know that they had a chapel in the University ? Yet hon. Members got up and said that the Universities proposed to be set up under this Bill were denominational. He asked the hon. Member for the Morley division of Yorkshire, who opposed this Bill on its Second Reading, to explain what he meant by a denominational University, and he said he meant a University where the professors and students were overwhelmingly of one denomination. What University in the world could be free from that charge ? He contended that the proposed Universities were no more denominational than any other University in this country, and they would be less denominational than the University of Edinburgh. The new Universities would be less denominational than the University of Dublin was at the present time, and it was not true to state that no scheme could be brought forward to meet the requirements of the Catholics of Ireland which was not based upon the denominational principle. It was true that the great majority of the governing body and professors might be Catholic, because the Bill was intended to serve the needs of a Catholic people. He hoped hon. Members would have the common fairness, before calling the new institutions in Ireland denominational, to define for the enlightenment of the public what they meant by denominational.

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

MR. HUTTON said that having listened to all the demands made in years gone by by Catholics upon one Government and another, he could not understand when a Bill was brought forward to meet the demands of Catholics for a denominational University why it should be called undenominational. The hon. Member for East Mayo had said that it was not proposed to set up a denominational University and that it was not meant in that sense. If that was the case why were the Catholics dissatisfied with the present Queen's Colleges ? If a college or University which was free and undenominational would content hon. Gentlemen opposite and their friends, why could they not be content with the present Queen's Colleges in Galway and Cork, and with the opportunity of securing degrees through the Royal University ? The hon. Member for East Mayo had asked him to define what he meant by a denominational University, and he had quoted him as stating that it meant a University where the majority of the professors and students belonged to one denomination. He doubted very much whether he ever said that. The hon. Member had said that the new University would not be so denominational in its character as Trinity College; but the Catholics objected to Trinity College because it was denominational, and that was why Catholic students did not frequent it. The Chief Secretary for Ireland was going to supply three colleges in which Catholics would have no fear of meeting the Episcopalian or Presbyterian influence. The right hon. Gentleman had described this Bill as one which was trying to set up the lowest common denominator, but it seemed to him that he was going to set up three denominational Universities. He could quite understand the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and his intervention was not surprising, because the whole Tory Party were going to support an Amendment to create a great undenominational University. Under those circumstances he was not surprised that the right hon. Gentleman desired the withdrawal of this Amendment.

MR. GWYNN (Galway) said that what they were asking for in Ireland was not a denominational, but a free University. They had been asked why they were not content with Queen's Colleges. They were discontented with those colleges because they had no freedom, because their professors were Crown nominees, and suffered under disabilities as Civil servants, and because the teaching in those colleges was restricted and hampered in a way which was unknown in any other University. If it were true that the University of Liverpool had debarred its professors from teaching theology, it was not a free University. The Irish Party had asked over and over again not for a Catholic University but for a national democratic University, and in this Bill there was the making of a free University, and for that reason they accepted it. English Liberals could label it denominational or not, as they liked. There was, however, one denominational feature in the Bill, and it was that a test was imposed upon the professors, and to that extent they did not possess unlimited freedom. What he meant was that there was a limitation imposed upon the freedom of the teachers, because it was suggested that their teaching should not offend religious susceptibilities, and in that sense it was a negative test. What did "undenominational" mean in Ireland? When hon. Members understood that they would understand the zeal of the Ulster Party for undenominationalism. The majority of the people of Ireland were Catholics, and when a Board was called undenominational it meant that it consisted of an equal number of Catholics and Protestants, and therefore it meant a strict religious test. It came to this, that the Protestant minority had guaranteed to them more than their fair proportion of jobs. That was the true account of the zeal for undenominationalism which had signalised the Liberal Party. For these reasons he would vote against the Amendment.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said it appeared to him that there was a test in this matter which was worth considering. What was Oxford University fifty years ago? He thought there was only one reply. It was a thoroughly denominational University. Since the abolition of tests it had become undenominational. Only half a century ago Oxford University was fettered by tests, and it was proposed to set up these new Universities in Ireland unfettered by denominational tests such as had been known in days gone by. In taking that course they were keeping to the new model and not the old.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) said he served on the Committee upstairs on this Bill, and, so far as he could, he had worked for the establishment in Ireland of a University which would be compatible with what was called an undenominational settlement of this question. He did not think it very much mattered whether the word "undenominational" was inserted here or not. The question was not what they called it, but what they were going to make it. He was bound to confess that during the progress of the Bill through Committee it appeared to him the Bill had suffered in its title to be regarded as undenominational, because amongst other things an addition was made to Clause 3 whereby the prohibition of tests was not to apply to theological professors. Allusion has been made by the hon. Member for East Mayo to the University of Liverpool, and other recently created Universities. The question he said was not so much whether this new University was denominational or undenominational, but whether it was as undenominational as some of the new Universities in the north of England. The Charter of Liverpool University contained the following—

> "It is a fundamental condition of the constitution of the University that no religious test shall be imposed upon any person in order to entitle him to be admitted as a member, professor, teacher, or student of the University, or

to hold office therein, or to graduate thereat, or to hold any advantage or privilege thereof, and that no theological teaching shall be given by or under the authority of the University."

Clearly, therefore, the proposed new University in Dublin differed to some extent from the model of the University of Liverpool. It also differed from the University of Manchester. The University of London was the only one in the United Kingdom which owed its constitution entirely to Act of Parliament. The Act laid down that—

> " No religious test shall be adopted or imposed, and no applicant for a University appointment shall be at any disadvantage on the ground of religious opinions."

There was no reservation in the Act in regard to the appointment of theological professors. The extent to which the prohibition of tests was removed in the case of the Irish Universities in regard to theological professors was not in accordance with the undenominational character of the Universities which had received their Charters or had been created by Act of Parliament in recent years. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill would be prepared to remove that objection to the measure. The more they tried to make the Universities free, democratic and undenominational the more likely they were to be acceptable to the Irish people.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL objected to breaking up the young men of Ireland into three sectarian groups. Such a policy was un-national, and he feared this Bill would do more injury to Home Rule than anything which had ever occurred in Ireland.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is really not necessary to discuss the whole Bill on this Amendment. The hon. Member must confine himself to the Amendment.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL said he had no wish to transgress against that ruling, but he was merely replying to statements which had been made in the course of the discussion.

MR. MOORE said that many hon. Members had treated this as merely a question of description, and had used the argument that it made very little difference whether they applied a particular name to a particular University or not. The majority of hon. Members appeared to admit, notwithstanding what the hon. Member for East Mayo had said, that whatever they called the new University, the fact was that it would be what the Chief Secretary was most anxious to disavow, namely, a real denominational University. It was not a mere matter of description, for this reason. It was not like Oxford or Cambridge, supported entirely from private endowments. It was a University for which that House was to find the money, and it would be liable to the ordinary control of the Courts in Ireland with respect to the misapplication of funds. If the Bill contained a statement that a college was undenominational, and it was found that funds voted by that House were being applied to denominational purposes, that would at once give groundwork for the intervention of the Court of Chancery by injunction or otherwise to restrain such application of the money. That could not be done unless it was the intention of the Bill to make the University undenominational. That was why he attached a great deal of value to the Amendment proposed by his hon. and gallant friend. He thought that all those who were interested in seeing that the money was applied to the needs of the new University and in accordance with the feelings and wishes of the people, and who did not wish to see clericalism triumphant, should support the Amendment.

CAPTAIN CRAIG said that he attached so much importance to the Amendment that he would be obliged to go to a division. He could not see why anyone who desired the establishment of an undenominational University in Dublin should have the slightest hesitation in voting for the Amendment. He understood that the hon. Member for East Mayo looked upon the new University as undenominational, and therefore he hoped to find him in the same lobby as himself. He thought they must have consistency somewhere. If the House was to vote money on the distinct understanding that not a penny of it was to go to denominationalism, let them back up that view in the division lobby, and say that the Bill would be made, as far as possible, undenominational.

*MR. MASSIE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said that the outcome of this part of the debate seemed to him to be that denominationalism or undenominationalism was a question of management. If a University was managed by Protestants, then it might be undenominational; if it was managed by Catholics, then it could not be. The logical issue of this attitude of mind was that, if every man in Ireland was a Catholic, then it would be wrong to give Ireland any University at all. If a University was to be suited to the population, it must be managed by the population, or it would not be democratic. The population of Ireland being in its large majority Catholic, one University at least should be managed by Catholics. If a Catholic country was to have a University, then the University constituted by the Bill, if not absolutely undenominational, was as undenominational as an Act of Parliament could make it. This was the intention of the Government, and as to the particular Amendment, it did not matter so much what they called the University, as whether the University was likely to turn out what the Government intended it to be.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 32; Noes, 273. (Division List No. 215.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T.(Londonderry,N.)
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clark, George Smith
Cochrane, Hon. Thos.H.A.E.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Fell, Arthur
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hill, Sir Clement
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J.MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Oddy, John James
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Rawlinson,John FrederickPee
Roberts, S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Charles Craig.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F. L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSir J.T(Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert Jn.

Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffiths, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazelton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Menzies, Walter
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (D'ncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Percy, Earl
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs.
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
White, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

CAPTAIN CRAIG moved an Amendment to provide that the governing body of the new college to be established in Dublin should be constituted of laymen. On looking through the Charter it appeared to him that there were far too many rev. gentlemen upon the governing body, and a limit should be put on that somewhere. Hon. Members below the gangway said that this was a democratic Bill, but he would like to know where there was any more autocratic body in the whole world than the Church to which they belonged. Were those hon. Members going to maintain the same position they had done in Committee upstairs? The hon. Member for Mayo there stated that he himself had felt the pressure which was brought to bear upon him by the Church to which he belonged, and that he was not able to take the Arts course in the college at his own home, and that all he could do was to join the college for the sake of seeing the books in the library. That was an intolerable state of affairs. Of course, he quite understood that the hon. Member for East Tyrone would be one of those mentioned in the schedule as belonging to the governing body, and that he would like to have as many as possible of his own clerical friends with him.

*MR. KETTLE said that he had suggested that the hon. and gallant Gentleman should try to have the governing body composed of undenominational laymen.

CAPTAIN CRAIG said that as the charter at present stood there would be six clergymen in connection with the governing body of the college, and he did not quite know the necessity there was for them at all. He was not objecting in any sense of the word to Roman Catholics being properly educated. All that he said was that they should be kept as far as possible from the clerical element, and that the University should be run by laymen. It was evident that, although the Bill was claimed to be undenominational it was being made as denominational as could be—undenominational being meant for consumption outside.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member was replying on the whole of the debate, but must confine himself to the Amendment.

CAPTAIN CRAIG said he was sorry, but he felt so very strongly on the Bill that he had been carried away. He hoped that the House, even at the last moment, would say that the governing body of this new college in Dublin should be composed of laymen. There were many good Roman Catholic laymen in Ireland; he had had many good friends amongst them; and there was no reason why Roman Catholic laymen should not manage the college, just as much as the University. He would trust these men if the Government would let them have a trial; and the Liberal Party would never regret it. He begged to move.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'constituted,' to insert the words 'of laymen.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'of laymen' be there inserted."

MR. MOORE said that this was a somewhat similar Amendment to that dealing with the governing body of the University which had been debated at an earlier stage, and he did not feel at liberty to repeat any of the arguments he had used on that Amendment. But it was their duty at every stage to enter a protest against the provisions in the Bill which left the governing body, either of the University or of the college, at the mercy of a potential majority of clerics as opposed to laymen. The Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend was simply a struggle for supremacy between the lay and the clerical element, and he was sure that if the party whip were taken off, the House would decide that laymen, as men of the world, should have control of the college. If his hon. and gallant friend went to a division he would vote with him as a protest against the Bill as it was drawn, which allowed the clerical element to predominate.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS said he desired to dissociate himself from all the attempts that were being made to disqualify the clergy from taking part in the government of the Universities.

Amendment negatived.

*MR. BUTCHER said the object of the Amendment he now proposed and of the consequential Amendment lower down on the Paper was to get the constitution of the governing bodies of the three constituent colleges of the University of Dublin out of the charter into the Bill. Already the Bill contained the constitution of the governing bodies of the two Universities, and surely it was equally important that they should be able to debate in the House the constitution of the governing bodies of the three constituent colleges of the new University at Dublin. He would remind the House that these colleges would exercise a very powerful influence on the University itself. No less than seventeen of the members of the governing body of the University of Dublin were to be appointed by the constituent colleges of Dublin, Cork, and Galway. More than half the non-co-opted members of the Senate of the new University were appointed by the governing bodies of these three constituent colleges. It was therefore perfectly plain that these colleges would have a vital influence on the policy and government of the new University as a whole. Moreover, it must be remembered that these colleges virtually appointed their own professors, for they selected three names to be submitted to the Senate. He would not now go into the detailed differences between the schedule he had put down as an Amendment and the schedule of the Bill. He would only say that the main difference, almost the only difference, between them lay in the representation they respectively proposed to give to the municipal and county bodies. In the case of the college at Dublin, out of thirty-four members the charter proposed to give ten representatives to local bodies. Out of the twenty-eight for the College of Cork these were given eight, and in the case of the College of Galway out of twenty-six seven were to be representatives of local bodies. If the academic element were compared with the local or civic element, it would be found that in the governing body of the college at Dublin the academic element, including the President, the persons nominated by the Senate, the representatives of professors and graduates, amounted to sixteen, and that the civic or local element numbered ten. In Cork the academic element was sixteen and the civic eight; in Galway the academic element was twelve and the civic seven. It was right, he thought, to stimulate local interest and generosity by putting some representatives on the governing bodies of these constituent colleges. But it was obvious that the proportion in the charters overdid the representation of the civic element; nobody would maintain for a moment that members of the county councils of Ireland were persons to whom should be entrusted the difficult duty of choosing candidates for various professorial chairs. It might of course be urged that the local element was not in the majority, but when it came to a divided vote it was perfectly clear that so large a representation as ten representatives of one particular interest might turn the scale, with the result that the best men would not be elected, but the second or third best. Without going further into details he asked the Chief Secretary to recognise the great importance of having the bodies constituted in such a way that the colleges themselves would be academic in principle and in policy. Edinburgh University was an instance of what he had in mind. For some centuries the College of Edinburgh, founded by the city, was governed by the town. It was only within comparatively recent years that it became an entirely independent and self-governing university. If ever there was a case in which, both from its history, from the generosity shown by the citizens, and from the interest taken in that University by the neighbouring counties, local representation was right and necessary, it was the case of Edinburgh. But how did it stand? The governing body of the University of Edinburgh contained only one representative of the civic element in the Lord Provost. His proposal was that each of the governing bodies in Ireland should have at least two representatives of the civic element in place of ten, eight and seven which were given them by the charter.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, to leave out the word 'charter,' and to insert the words 'Schedule to this Act entitled, "Constitution of Governing Bodies of Constituent Colleges."' "—(*Mr. Butcher.*)

Question proposed, "that the word 'charter' stand part."

MR. BIRRELL said the hon Member's point seemed to be two-fold, viz., that the governing bodies of these colleges should be inserted in the Act, and that the bodies as they appeared in the charter were unsatisfactory. The reason he was not disposed to put the governing bodies in the Act was that he thought it was best to proceed experimentally with regard to them and see how far they worked well. The bodies as constituted in the charters contained a liberal proportion of the civic element which he was anxious indeed to encourage. He would be very sorry to see the proposed limit restricting the civic element, or to see his own more liberal measure stereotyped into an Act of Parliament. If that were done it would require another Act of Parliament to modify or alter it. It was much preferable to proceed experimentally by charter which could be modified. The bodies as constituted by the charters had been known for some time and any alteration they had undergone had been in the direction of increasing the academic representation. He took the College of Dublin. What the hon. Gentleman had said was true. The body consisted of twenty purely academic persons. The hon. Gentleman asked what right they had to include four Crown nominees as academic persons. The Crown, in exercising its rights, would see to it that the representatives it selected were persons of academic character and who would give academic weight to the governing body. It was not likely that the Crown would go into the highways and byways and select county councillors and other persons of whom the hon. Gentleman seemed to be a little suspicious. He imagined that the governing body would be very careful in exercising its right of co-option to choose persons of academic character. At any rate, leaving them out of the question, they had twenty academic persons as against ten civic persons. He attached very great importance in Ireland to enlisting the interest and support of the civic authorities. It had become very necessary in England in the administration of endowed schools and the like. People were no longer content to stand by—great municipalities and authorities—and see old grammar schools and other places where the children of their towns were educated entirely arranged by academic persons without civic authority or control. He had very frequently had to deal with that question, and experience had shown that the introduction of a liberal number of civic people into the governing bodies of secondary schools and colleges did a great deal of good. He did not think the case of Edinburgh was exactly in point. The University of Edinburgh was celebrated, ancient, and known throughout Europe. It did not require to be nursed and protected by the Lord Provost and Corporation, and, therefore, it might very well be that the City of Edinburgh was content to allow its civic representation on the governing body of that great University to be confined to the Lord Provost. But this was a very different affair. Here they had a struggling and new university, not only poor in its financial resources, but poor having regard to the character of the young men and women who were to attend it. They would require all the support they could get from bursaries and the like, and from the rates; and he thought it would be very foolish indeed in this great matter to be slow to recognise civic authority. He quite agreed that in the recent observations which he made he had not in his mind at the moment the proportion which would exist between the academically selected body and the civic authorities. He knew that civic authorities would have to be there in a limited form in the proposed schedule, but he had not these particular figures in his mind. He thought, however, on the whole that twenty academic persons as against ten civic persons was a fair proportion. He did not pretend to have the intimate acquaintance with Ireland which belonged to people born and bred there, but really he had sufficient confidence in their good sense and in the good sense of the civic authorities to imagine that they would not be hostile or interfere with the election of professors of Greek, of languages, or of philosophy; he did not think that they would seek to thrust some one man among the three to be selected by the governing body, and to be adjudicated upon by the supreme Senate of the federated Universities. In regard to a professor of agriculture they might have ideas of their own, and he dared say that they were entitled to have ideas of their own on that subject. But that was not a very difficult subject to determine. Therefore, he did not think it ought to be brought up against these persons that they would seek to adjudicate on the appointment of professors. He thought that their influence could be usefully employed for the advantage of the college, and he did not suppose for a moment that they would ever interfere in the selection of professors of Greek, languages, or philosophy. If they did they were in a permanent minority, and it might be relied upon that those who were elected by the academic council to the colleges and the Universities were as much likely to be present at the selection as were the members representing the county councils. At all events, he was willing to give the matter a fair trial. They had all said that the thing was to be democratic. He did not know exactly what it meant in all its branches, but it certainly did mean that the governing body should be wisely selected, and should be based not merely on the academic side, but also upon the popular and civic side of the locality where the University was situate. He was, therefore, very much disposed, although he did not like the part of haggling over one portion more than another, to think the final proportion—a body of thirty-four for Dublin, would be better than his hon. friend's schedule, which would reduce the thirty-four to twenty-five, and would only allow the civic authorities to have two representatives—the Lord Mayor of the City of Dublin, and a person representing the council. There would be only two civic representatives out of a body of thirty-four. He thought, on the whole, it would be better to have the larger body of thirty-four, in which there would be an enormous majority on the academic side. He thought eight or ten representatives of the civic authorities was better than two, which alone the hon. Member would give them. In the same way at Cork, he proposed to have a body of twenty-eight, whereas the hon. Member proposed to have one of twenty-three.

MR. BUTCHER: It is twenty-four. That is a mistake.

MR. BIRRELL said the hon. Gentleman confined the civic authority to the Lord Mayor or other person representing the County Council of Cork, whereas he had himself gone carefully into this matter in conjunction with the hon. Member for Cork, and the President, who attached the very greatest importance to the co-operation of the Lord Mayor of Cork, the Mayor of Limerick, the Mayor of Waterford, and the chairmen or other persons representing the County Councils of Cork, Waterford, Kerry, and Limerick. They wanted to enlist the support of those persons in order that the people in those districts might feel that they had a voice in the representation. He thought, therefore, that it was better to have the larger body of twenty-eight rather than his hon. friend's smaller body of twenty-four, and instead of having two they would have eight representatives of civic authorities. Galway was a very difficult case indeed. The fortunes of that college largely depended upon their being able to enlist the interest of the locality round about Roscommon, Sligo, and other towns. Unless they could make these representative bodies of the localities feel that they had a University within reach of Galway he was afraid the institution might have a stiff time before it, whereas, if they really could under the new constitution make the people in all these towns surrounding Galway feel that they had a University of their own the institution would feel a beneficial effect. To do that it would be better to have twenty-six, including seven civic representatives. After all, there again the civic representatives would be in a permanent minority. On the whole, therefore, he thought they were bound to give those places a chance, and for his part he would not be in the least frightened of their behaving in an unreasonable manner, or interfering with matters in regard to which they obviously did not possess the necessary knowledge. He thought, on the other hand, they would take a great part in the future development of the colleges. He would not care to say that those figures, made after elaborate consultation and enormous correspondence, were final. He preferred to leave it to experiment, and after a few years they might possibly make some alteration in the direction suggested by the hon. Member. He could not accept the Amendment.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork) said he was glad to hear the Chief Secretary's reply to the hon. Gentleman, who, he hoped, would not further press his Amendment. Though the hon. Member was a distinguished and worthy academic authority, yet he was perhaps not so well acquainted as men of the world with all the necessities of the case. The hon. Gentleman had very frankly admitted that his object was to cut down the popular representation to the minimum and to flood the governing bodies with professorial and academic dignities. To do that would, in his opinion, destroy one of the healthiest principles of this Bill, which was that these Universities were to be the people's Universities, to which representatives of the people were expected to contribute, and in whose management consequently the representatives of the people would be entitled to have a voice. He did not share the alarm of the hon. Gentleman that the academic element on those governing bodies would be weakened. He thought the danger was rather the other way. It might be too predominant, and it might be that these academic personages would fall into a condition of sleepiness and inertia unless they had a healthy public opinion behind them. He thought the Chief Secretary was absolutely right in anticipating that these terrible lord mayors and county councillors would really have no ambition to teach Greek or physical science. So far as Cork College was concerned, at all events, he thought they would rather act in the direction followed by Birmingham University of encouraging local initiative, with a view to the development of special local industries and the practical means of life. With that object, in his opinion, the presence on these head bodies of local business men of capacity, skilled agriculturists, and others, was quite as essential an ingredient of success as the presence of more learned professors would be. The Chief Secretary had pointed out that the effect of this consequential Amendment would be that outside Cork no corporation or county council would have any representation whatever, and the result would be to deprive Cork of any reasonable claim it might have for the assistance of other counties. There was really no earthly reason that he could understand why the desire of these popular bodies to give a helping hand to the great work of Cork College should be deliberately cut out. In every matter connected with the Bill they would really have to trust people, and the more influence they gave to sturdy democratic opinion the surer they might be of the success of these Universities in an academic and every other way.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he gave this proposal his hearty support. The position which the Chief Secretary had taken up was to a very large extent different from that which he took up on the First Reading. He said then, speaking, it was true of the Senate of the Universities, and not of the governing bodies of the colleges, that the Senates would be academically elected bodies, and anybody who had the honour of finding himself a member thereafter of either of these Senates would be so because he had received the votes of the professors and graduates of the Universities. The same idea ran through his whole speech when dealing with the question of the governing bodies, and he said it was thought three years would be sufficient as the period of nomination, and after these three years they also would be academically elected bodies. The impression left on his mind from the Chief Secretary's speech was totally different from the impression which he obtained from reading the Charter himself. The case of the Dublin college was nearer perfection than either of the other two, although it was still a long way from perfection, but he found that taking those who were nominated by the Crown as academic members, which of course did not necessarily follow, there were on a board of thirty-four fourteen members who were not academic members. The duties which fell on the governing body of a college were purely academic duties, so technical that a person who had not gone through a University himself would be very ill-adapted to carry them out. In the case of Galway and Cork the proportion was still more gross. In the case of Cork they had twelve unacademic members of the governing body, and sixteen academic members. In that case they were almost approaching the point where the unacademic equalled the academic members. In the case of Galway it was even worse. There was an assortment of ten persons drawn from counties all around Galway, to sixteen academically appointed members. The Chief Secretary gave it as a reason for the appointment of these non-academic members that without interesting the counties the Universities would be a failure. He begged to differ altogether on that point. If the Universities could only be made a success by allowing the counties of Leitrim, Mayo, Roscommon, Sligo, and Clare as well as Galway, to elect representatives to the governing body of the colleges, and if it was necessary to resort to these means of exciting public interest in the college, it was not likely to be a success under any circumstances. On the contrary, just as he believed Queen's College, Galway, would have been a success long ago had it not been for the ban of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and would at present be a thriving and a highly useful institution, so would the new college which had the approval of the hierarchy be a success so far as numbers were concerned. The same thing applied to Cork. He had not the slightest doubt that under the new scheme proposed by the Bill, both Galway and Cork, when the edict went forth that Roman Catholics might make use of them, would be filled in a very short time. It was a great deal better, in his view, that purely academic and purely technical University affairs connected with the colleges should be left in the hands of men who had themselves gone through a University, and who knew something about its management. Such persons were obviously better fitted to manage the University than persons who would be sent there by various municipal and county authorities outside. He had had some small experience in the management of a hospital and he was on the governing body of a large hospital in Belfast, and his experience there was that on technical questions the whole tendency was to leave the settlement in the hands of those members of the governing body who happened to be doctors. The same thing would happen in this case, and the locally elected members of the governing body would have to leave the management of purely technical affairs to the academic part of the council, and it would be much better that local representation should be minimised as much as possible. He had also found that the professional part of the governing body in the case of the hospital he had spoken of was always very much less liable to be influenced by outside pressure. If a new doctor was to be appointed very great pressure was brought to bear on the members of the governing body who were not professional men. That pressure was much more seldom brought to bear on the doctors, and even if it was they were always inclined to look at the thing much more from a purely professional point of view than were the outside members of the governing body, and precisely the same thing would happen in the case of the governing bodies of the colleges. In Galway he could quite imagine, when the question came up of the appointment of a professor, there would be an enormous number of outsiders who really knew very little about the qualifications of the applicants, and he was quite sure these various representatives in the seven or eight counties would be liable to a very great deal of pressure, and the chances of the wrong man being elected would be very much greater in the case of a body formed as it was under the Chief Secretary's scheme than it would be under the scheme which his hon. friend proposed. This was a purely technical point, into which the question of denominationalism or undenominationalism did not enter very much, but he thought it a most important one, and he hoped the House would very seriously consider it before they rejected the proposal.

MR. MOORE said they had heard a great deal in the course of the argument about the desirability of giving these civic bodies representation. He thought as much interest would be taken by local people in the local University whether members of the county councils were on the governing body or not. All this proceeded from the mistaken application of the theory that where there was a contribution coming from a local body, the local body was entitled to representation. But it was not suggested here that there was any contribution from local bodies, and they had no right to be represented. If they put people who were themselves elected into a position of responsibility on the governing bodies, they would be exposing those people to very severe pressure from their own electors. He did not think the members would value it at all. They knew very well in local government administration the intense pressure, in some cases bribery, he was sorry to say, especially in the south and west of Ireland. [Cries of "No."] It was quite easy to say "No," but cases were in the public knowledge—charges, at any rate, had been made and tried. If this happened in local administration, he fancied the local administrators who were placed on these bodies would be exposed to very much the same influences, and he did not think it was to their good, or that it added anything to the stability of the University. They would canvass for the election of professors just as they would for the appointment of a charwoman or a gate porter. But there were many more important points to deal with. The proposal in the Bill was that the entire constitution of the governing body of the three local colleges was to be carried out by charter. As a matter of fact they knew that a charter was the act of the Sovereign and it was only by the courtesy of the Chief Secretary that they had been able to see the draft charter. The House had no power to control the issue to-morrow of another revised draft charter in entirely different terms. When these colleges had been in existence six months and the money had been voted, there was nothing to prevent another charter being issued, and the House would have no control whatsoever over the governing bodies of those colleges, and the whole face of their creation could be changed without the intervention of the House. Surely this was a case in which it was both possible and desirable that the constitution of the governing bodies should be laid down by statute. The Bill itself contained the constitution of the governing bodies of the Universities. That was provided for by statute, and when the Chief Secretary said that he did not want a stereotyped form that was his way of altering by charter what did not suit him. He thought that argument would apply equally to creating the governing body of the University by charter, but the right hon. Gentleman had not done that and he could not see any reason why the constitution of the colleges should not be controlled by the House. Why was it not done in this case, because that was the popular tendency? London University was controlled by Act of Parliament, and surely it was right that where Parliament voted money it should impose conditions which could only be altered by the consent of Parliament. Notwithstanding this the Chief Secretary said that he was not going to put the constitution of these colleges into a Bill on account of the inconvenience of having them altered by Parliament. The moment he said that he gave the whole of his case away. Those who were jealous of the privileges of the House ought to insist that the rights and the power to control the collges now being created should be protected in this way. He thought his hon. friend had done a valuable service in drawing the attention of the House to this kind of interference by charter, because they were losing by this procedure all control of the governing bodies of these three colleges. Unless some reason was given for differentiating the treatment between the Universities and these three colleges, he hoped the House in defence of its own interests and in accordance with more recent developments would vote for the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON thought this was a matter of very great importance and he regretted that the Chief Secretary had been obliged to leave the House. The question was not whether the schedule of his hon. friend or that of the Chief Secretary was the better. Local authorities played a large part in the schedules of the Chief Secretary, and he would be the last person to contest the right of local authorities to be represented on the governing bodies and institutions to which they made contributions or in which they were necessarily locally interested. He knew the value of the assistance which local authorities had given in education in this country too well to doubt that in Ireland they would be efficient and desirous of promoting education in the areas over which they presided. He did not wish to raise any question of the merits of these two governing bodies proposed respectively by the Chief Secretary and the Member for Cambridge University. What he wished was to impress upon the House that after a large sum of money had been allocated by Parliament, it was not right that the House should be debarred from considering what was to be the constitution of the bodies by whom the money was going to be spent. It seemed to him that to leave this matter to be dealt with by charter was quite contrary to the spirit in which they had been in the habit of dealing with such matters. He was not speaking with any hostility to the measure before them, and there was no question of denominationalism or undenominationalism in the matter. He simply wanted to insist upon the right of the House of Commons to determine the constitution of bodies which were going to spend a large sum of public money, and as he had not heard a single argument against that point from the other side he should support the Amendment of his hon. friend.

*Mr. BUTCHER said he would like to reply to one or two of the speeches. The Chief Secretary had said that the constitution of these colleges was entirely experimental and, therefore, ought to be put in the charter rather than in the Act. But if the constitution of the colleges was experimental, so, too, was the constitution of the Universities, and as had already been pointed out, the Chief Secretary had not ventured on that account to withdraw the constitution of the two Universities from discussion in the House. They all held together, those five bodies, the two Universities, and the three constituent colleges. In comparing the different elements which went to form these governing bodies of the colleges it had been assumed that the nominees of the Crown should be regarded as an academic element. Looking at the history of appointments in Ireland he was not quite able to assume that the nominees of the Crown would be of that character. In Committee, he had moved to reduce the nominees of the Crown, but he did not wish to have instead a preponderating element of councillors. At the same time let it be understood that he was not against a mixed constitution, for he desired that there should be others than academic persons on those bodies. He had seen himself in the practical working of such governing bodies great advantage come from the introduction into academic bodies of men of business with civic experience, in close touch with the communities they represented. Therefore, he desired that this element should be represented only not in any undue proportion. The hon. Member for Cork had spoken of the advantage that came from bringing a whiff or breath of public air into those closer academic bodies and he quite agreed with him. If he were dealing only with the College of Cork he would be strongly tempted to leave the constitution as it was, because he had already seen partly in the munificent action of the hon. Member for Cork himself and in the keen interest which a great many persons in Cork had taken in this question a pledge and promise that popular representation in Cork would not be tempted to abuse its powers. But they were now laying down a constitution which was to last for years, and be applicable to all the Colleges. The Chief Secretary had said that he had perfect confidence that the county councils of Ireland would not interfere with patronage; but if that was so it would be the very first instance in which the county councils had refrained from exercising the privilege. If there was one thing above another that brought together county councillors from the remotest parts of the country it was the exercise of patronage. He did not suggest that they would have some malign influence over the college in their own neighbourhood; but whatever they knew about other things, they did not know much about the government and policy of Universities. They might or might not have a political bias. He did not rest it on that, but on the fact that though it was wise to excite their interest and elicit their generosity, it was not wise to put so much power in their hands. To sum it all up, his one object in this Amendment, as in the others that he had put down, was to start these Universities and colleges on lines that would ensure a successful future. In order to do that, his confident belief was that they should be kept free as far as possible from all religious and political outside influences, and that the University element, as distinct from the civic element, ought largely to preponderate in the government.

Mr. BIRRELL agreed that the problem was to combine the academic and civic elements. No University had been established of late years on any other principle than that of invoking the aid of the locality were it was situated, and anybody who knew anything of the work of primary or secondary education knew that it was hopeless to establish a University without the presence on the governing body of representatives of the locality. It was most desirable that they should reserve to themselves greater liberty to try the experiment of these governing bodies rather than to stereotype them in the Bill; but the House would never consent to the minimising of the civic element that was contained in the hon. Member's schedule. The whole question was what proportion they were to fix between the civic and academic elements. There was a very considerable difference between the hon. Gentleman and himself. The hon. Gentleman cut the civic representatives in Cork down to two; while preserving the academic majority he desired to enlist the sympathy of the county councils of that great province which the University would serve, and he could not, therefore, accept the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 249; Noes, 38. (Division List No. 216.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Chance, Fredreick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Halsam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.

Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Natheniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murnaghan, George
Murphey, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Show, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. McKinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clark, George Smith
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Fell, Arthur
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Holt, Richard Durning
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Joynson-Hicks, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Massie, J.
Moore, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Butcher and Mr. Hugh Barrie.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out the word 'the,' and to insert the words 'any such new.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, after the word 'Charter,' to insert the words 'or an alteration of an existing Charter.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*SIR **PHILIP MAGNUS** said that in the absence of the hon. Member for Cambridge University he wished to move an Amendment, of which he himself had also given notice. The main object of his Amendment was to give in the first instance powers of recognising institutions and teachers to the Statutory Commissioners rather than to the Senate. As soon as the functions of the Statutory Commissioners ceased it would be in the power of the Senate of the University to recognise any institution that they liked. Personally, he thought that it would be a very great advantage if, in the first instance, the Statutory Commissioners should be empowered, as they were not by the Bill, to recognise institutions which would receive the privileges referred to in the clause. There were many reasons why it was desirable that those powers should be given to the Statutory Commissioners. In the first place, the Statutory Commissioners might be said, without any disrespect to the new Senate, to be a more judicial body than the Senate. They would be altogether freer from external influences or pressure being brought to bear upon them. Further than that, they were a very much smaller body, ten in the case of the Dublin University, and seven in the case of the Belfast University. He thought that such a body would be able to consider the evidence that might be submitted, and adjudicate on the claims of institutions to be recognised as part of the University very much better than the Senate which consisted of thirty or forty members. He must say that there was a good precedent for the course he recommended. In the case of the London University, the Statutory Commissioners actually put into the Schedule of the Statutes certain schools which became schools of the University. Moreover, they scheduled at the same time the first list of teachers who were to be regarded as recognised teachers of the University. There were special reasons why the Statutory Commissioners should exercise that power in the case of the two new Universities in Ireland. He did not think there could be any doubt whatever that the Statutory Commissioners as well as the Senate of the University which was to have its seat in Dublin, would recognise Maynooth as one of the colleges to which this privilege was to be given. Personally, he had never seen any objection to the recognition of Maynooth, although similar objections applied to Maynooth which had been urged against Magee College. He did not think there was any likelihood of the Statutory Commissioners, with the strong evidence which would be brought before them as to the importance of recognising the College of Maynooth, refusing to do so. But there was another college much more closely connected with the educational life of Ireland, which it seemed to him it was still more important should be recognised in the new University to be established in Dublin. He was not so certain that the Royal College of Science would receive the same measure of recognition from the Senate to be appointed as he believed it would from the Statutory Commissioners, after hearing all the evidence as to its claims. He referred, as he had done in the Committee upstairs, to the importance of closely associating one of these new Universities with the Royal College of Science; and there were several reasons why that College should be associated with the new University at Dublin. He ventured to think that one of the first duties of the Commissioners would be so to arrange matters that there should be no overlapping nor cause of friction between the Royal College of Science and the University to be established in Dublin. The time had long since passed when humanistic studies were regarded as the main subject upon which a course of University education should be founded. Oxford and Cambridge had both created schools of applied science in which engineering and agriculture were taught, and every new University which had been established in this country had made its faculty of applied science one of the most important in the University. If they looked abroad they found the same thing. In France new Universities had been established in many towns, and attached to them all were what were called special schools, in which some branch of applied science or technology was made an essential part of the instruction. In Germany, for a long period, two sets of Universities had been in existence. That was to say, the teaching of applied science had been divorced from University education. The Germans themselves acknowledged that no greater mistake was ever made, and that if they were establishing their Universities afresh, they would attach the faculties of engineering and applied science to the Universities. In Ireland, of all countries, it was very important that great prominence should be given to the teaching of applied science and technology, and for that reason he strongly urged that the Commissioners to be appointed should have the power of recognising the Royal College of Science. There could be no doubt whatever that in the new University at Dublin applied science would be taught, and he had no hesitation in saying there was no room in Dublin for three efficient schools of applied science. There was already such a school in connection with Trinity College, and there was the Royal College of Science, and it would be a lamentable waste of effort and money if separate laboratories were to be established in connection with the new University, having regard to the excellent arrangements that now existed for the teaching of different branches of pure and applied science in the Royal College of Science. Complaint was made that the amount of money placed at the disposal of the new University for building and maintenance was insufficient, but if use were made of the facilities for the teaching of science which already existed in connection with the Royal College of Science, a large amount of money would be set free for the purpose of establishing those hostels which were such an important part of the organisation of a University. Only recently a Departmental Committee, of which the Minister for War was Chairman and of which he himself had been a member, recommended that the Royal College of Science and School of Mines at South Kensington, together with the City Guilds Technical College should be united in a new Institution to be known as the Imperial College of Science and Technology and should be affiliated to the University of London, and only yesterday it was admitted as a school of the University. But for that recommendation the Imperial College might have preferred to remain apart. It was for that reason that he wished the Statutory Commissioners to have power to recognise such colleges as they might think should be at once affiliated. Suppose that recognition did not take place, what would happen? How were the students of the Royal College of Science to obtain University degrees? The Royal University was already abolished, and the students of applied science would not be able to obtain a degree at all unless this college was recognised as part of the University. The students of this institution, which had done a most important work for the last forty years, would not otherwise be able to obtain degrees from the new University. What he had said with regard to Dublin applied equally to the University at Belfast. He had an Amendment on the Paper that the Technical Institute of Belfast should be represented on the governing body of the University of Belfast. It was essential that there should be the closest intimacy between the two. There were branches of engineering taught at the Queen's College and other branches taught at the Technical Institute, and it was essential that there should be no overlapping. The amount of money at the disposal of the new University was not too great, and it was most important that the teaching should be properly co-ordinated, and that these institutions, which were at present giving instruction in applied science, should be affiliated. He begged to move.

*MR. BUTCHER seconded the Amendment. As the Bill at present stood affiliation could be carried out only by the University governing body. But there would be an interval of two, perhaps of three years, during which the Commissioners were exercising their powers and no affiliation would be possible. During this interregnum the affiliation of a particular college or institute might become pressing, for one of the first duties of the Commissioners would be to draw out the general framework of study and to organise the faculties. Now the faculty of science could hardly be constituted unless the existing machinery for the teaching of science in Dublin was at once utilised. He reminded the House that the Royal College of Science was the only college in Ireland which the Robertson Commission recommended for immediate affiliation. As the Bill stood, however, the whole organisation of the science faculty would have to be postponed for two or three years until the powers of the Commissioners expired, and the Senate became the body responsible for the government of the University. This was a matter of urgent importance, and he could not conceive any reason why the Commissioners should not be entrusted with the power. The Chief Secretary said he desired to leave the governing body of the University free; but the Statutory Commissioners were a body quite as responsible as would be the new governing bodies, and were, moreover, invested with powers far greater than this which was denied them. Possibly there were one or two other affiliations which ought to be carried out at once. He thought it extremely likely that the Royal College of Surgeons ought to be affiliated without delay; but in proposing that the Commissioners should have this power, he was not suggesting that reluctant bodies should be affiliated by force.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 15, after the word 'which' to insert the words 'the Commissioners, and after the powers of the Commissioners determine."—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL said that whilst in accord with a great deal of what the hon. Members had said, he really did not see the necessity of the Amendment. He was the last person in the world to doubt the qualifications of the body of gentlemen who, at great self-sacrifice, had consented to take upon themselves onerous duties, and to become Commissioners. The proposal of the Amendment was that the actual power of affiliation of any institution under the Bill should be taken away, at all events for the time being, from the Senate and conferred upon the statutory body of Commissioners. He did not think that would be wise or desirable. The Commissioners would have full power to make such recommendations as they might think fit as to what bodies should be affiliated, and it would be in the power of the Senate to come to a decision upon any matter that might be of urgent importance. It would be impossible for the Commissioners to proceed with the determination of the faculty of science without knowing whether the College of Surgeons was willing to be affiliated, and whether the Senate intended to affiliate it. Supposing the Senate found that the college was willing to be affiliated, it would be quite possible for it to meet and decide the question, and the responsibility should be upon them rather than upon the Commissioners, whose powers were already sufficiently great to excite a certain amount of alarm amongst people interested in the subject. The Senate would be able to meet immediately after the passing of the Act for the purpose of electing Chancellors, and it would also meet from time to time for the purpose of relieving the work of the Commissioners and enabling them to know exactly what form their statutes were to take. The Senate would be able to meet at any time to consider any point that might be submitted to it, and he was quite sure they would give every consideration to any recommendation, aye or no, coming from a body so competent to perform their duties as the Commissioners, whether the College of Surgeons or the College of Science should be affiliated. He regarded the power of recognising courses of study in external colleges with a good deal of suspicion, and, if the Senate exercised any freedom which they must allow them, he hoped they would do so in a jealous and guarded spirit. He quite recognised that the case of the College of Science in Dublin presented difficulties, and that it would be a difficult thing to organise the faculty of science of the new University leaving that body altogether out of consideration. Many of the Commissioners were well acquainted with Dublin and the work of the College of Science, and, if these eminent men were to come to the conclusion that it was necessary for the working out of their scheme that the College of Science should be taken in, and they made a recommendation of that kind, he was quite sure the Senate would give that recommendation every consideration.

MR. WALTER LONG said he was sorry the Chief Secretary could not meet the difficulty raised by his hon. friends. It would, of course, be the aim and object of the new University to extend its area as widely as it could and offer as great facilities as possible for higher education in every branch. The College of Surgeons and the College of Science were two institutions which had attained a high position amongst educational establishments in the world, and they had gone through a very serious period of development in their history. The Chief Secretary, he thought, ignored the fact that they were endowing this new

University with a large amount of public money; and surely he knew that to argue that the Senate could give effect to this or that desire was really rather misleading. The powers of the Commissioners took precedence of any powers the Senate might have, and, assuming it to be the desire of the new University to offer facilities for education in science or surgery, it was quite conceivable that using the endowment Parliament was giving they might arrive at some scheme offering improved facilities on those of the College of Science and College of Surgeons at lower terms. He did not think it would have been outrageous to demand that those institutions should be affiliated, presuming they were willing. If they did not desire to be affiliated, well and good; but, assuming that they did, were they going to leave it open to the new University to destroy them by creating competing institutions? The Chief Secretary did not think it would happen. They did not ask that the colleges should have priority; all they asked was that it should be obligatory on the part of the Commissioners to hear and consider the case whether they should be affiliated; and, if the case was proved, to do what was necessary to affiliate them. Was it to be left to the Senate to decide, aye or no, according as cheaper and better facilities might be offered by the new Universities? Surely the Chief Secretary must see that that was not treating the colleges fairly. These institutions were absolutely undenominational, and there could be no arguments similar to those used in connection with Amendments previously moved. They occupied special positions not only in Ireland but throughout the world. Did the Chief Secretary really believe he was giving them a fair chance by refusing the Amendment? He could answer for it that there was a very widespread feeling in Ireland, not by any means confined to one side of politics or creed, in support of the view put forward, and he profoundly regretted that the Chief Secretary had been unable to meet it, because he believed that by rejecting Amendments of this kind he was not giving his Bill the fair start which it ought to be given if it was to prove the success which it ought to be.

Amendment negatived.

*MR. BUTCHER moved an Amendment to provide that affiliation should be "by statute." The question was whether this very important question of affiliation—because there was no other word which expressed the meaning—should be carried out by statute or by resolution. For the moment, he would ask the House to put out of their heads the question of Maynooth, on which he would not enter, although it was the one which was most prominent in their minds when the word affiliation was mentioned. Maynooth was not the only body in Ireland which might be affiliated. Probably many hon. Members were not aware that there were many other seminaries in Ireland besides Maynooth, and bodies which would undoubtedly desire to get University degrees. It was given in evidence before the Robertson Commission by Dr. O'Dea, then Vice-President of Maynooth, that among the religious orders in Ireland there would probably be a hundred at any given moment who might wish to attend University courses in Arts. There were in Ireland altogether fourteen orders which embraced something like 600 priests. In addition to the religious orders, there was another class of clerical students who were preparing in their own seminaries for work in England or the Colonies, and that work was carried out at All Hallows College, Dublin, and also at four diocesan colleges. There were over 300 of these students, and they had been told on the same authoritative evidence that there would probably be about 100 candidates who would desire to graduate in Arts. It was quite clear that very great pressure would be brought to bear by all the seminaries in Ireland to get the same privileges which were given to any one seminary. But it was not merely a seminary question. There were a great many other colleges in Ireland which had nothing to do with clerics, where laymen would seek to get degrees by living in them as affiliated institutions without the necessity of residence at the seat of one of the constituent colleges. He mentioned this merely to show that affiliation ought to be guarded by the most stringent provisions that the House could provide, not from a religious or denominational, but from a purely educational point of view. If the Universites they were now setting up were to be teaching Universities, residential Universities in the real sense, the facilities for affiliation must be limited to the very utmost of their power, otherwise it was frankly his belief that they might as well maintain the Royal University as an examining body and not disturb existing arrangements and waste an enormous amount of public money. If that was so the privilege ought to be granted in a very guarded and restricted manner, and a mere resolution of the governing body should not be sufficient to carry out affiliation. There were two other considerations in this federal University, which made it all the more important that the procedure should be careful and deliberate. The first was this. The new University of Dublin was a federal University, and one of the weaknesses of a federal University was that its component elements were rather loosely compacted. It had not that degree of unity which obtained in the single independent University. It was always tending to disintegration, and disintegrated the new University would surely be, if they attempted affiliation on any large scale. The other consideration arose from the fact that according to the Bill and the charter read together, affiliation might take place on the proposal of any one of these constituent colleges without the consent of the other colleges. To take a single instance; suppose the college in Dublin desired that certain institutions should be affiliated to itself that were not even in the Province of Leinster, but in Munster, and within the sphere of influence of the college of Cork. This would at once withdraw students who would naturally have gone to the college in Cork. Therefore, they needed a method of procedure more careful and stringent than they had in the Bill. In the United Kingdom there was in existence one other federal University only, namely, the University of Wales, and affiliation in the University of Wales could only be done by statute. It required, moreover, the approval of the visitor, that is, the King acting through the Lord President of the Council. There they went so far as to make a two-thirds majority of those present and voting necessary for the making of the statute for carrying out affiliation. In the Scottish Universities affiliation could only be carried out by ordinance, which corresponded to a statute, and lay on the Table of the two Houses, from which there was an appeal to the Privy Council. There was also an elaborate arrangement in the newer Universities of Manchester, Leeds, and Liverpool, to safeguard the procedure of affiliation. Knowing what the dangers of affiliation were—dangers to the very existence of the new Universities—he thought it would be hardly possible for the Chief Secretary to refuse the Amendment.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'may,' to insert the words 'by statute.'"—(*Mr. Butcher.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said that to impose the obligation referred to by statute would defeat the object of the hon. Member. The words of the clause were—

"Nothing in this section shall prevent provision being made by the charter of the new Universities under which the University may give to students who are pursuing a course of study of a University type approved by the governing body of the University in any recognised college in Ireland under teachers recognised by the governing body for the purpose, the benefit of any privileges of matriculated students of the University, or the right of obtaining a University degree, subject to any conditions or limitations contained in the charter or statutes of the University."

Having once gone the length of recognising courses of study and teachers by statute they would not watch them with the same care afterwards. He shared entirely the hon. Member's anxiety upon this subject, and he was all the more anxious that the University should keep in their own hands the constant power of altering and withdrawing the privileges conferred by the clause. Supposing Dublin solemnly recognised Maynooth or some other place by statute, they could only take it away by statute, and thus instead of strengthening the hands of the

University they would put obstacles in their way. Procedure by statute in a Ministerial Act of this sort, which had to be taken almost from term to term, was not the ordinary way in the case of other Universities. There was, however, a good deal of force in the point with regard to the fact that Dublin was a federated University, having colleges outside at Cork and Galway. It was very desirable that it should not be in the power of the senate of the University to recognise an affiliated institution within the area of influence of one of the outlying constituent colleges without the consent of the governing body of that college. He was not sure that the charter as drawn up was as precise as it ought to be, and he was prepared to make an alteration so as to prevent the governing body at headquarters from coming within the immediate sphere of influence of either Cork or Galway, and so affiliating institutions they would not otherwise have affiliated. In consultation with the hon. Member he would see that the charter was altered in that respect.

SIR E. CARSON said the point in dispute between the right hon. Gentleman and his hon. friend was really one of procedure. He thought the whole future of the University scheme which was being set up would practically depend upon how the procedure worked out. He believed that the Senate of the new University would do all they could to make it a success, and for his own part he hoped they would succeed. The question of the affiliation of schools was of extreme importance, and surely the Chief Secretary knew that in a country like Ireland it was not merely a question of what was said at Maynooth, but it was a matter of external pressure. It was that pressure which they ought to take care should be minimised as much as possible by the House of Commons as regarded the Senate. If he was right in his contention that it was merely a question of procedure, surely they ought to adopt that method which was the most deliberate, and which gave the greatest possible power to the Senate in resisting the pressure that might be put upon them from outside. Instead of having a mere resolution which might be carried to affiliate any of those colleges or seminaries, he thought it should be done by the statute of the University. That was a matter which ought to be fully considered, not merely with a view to the Senate passing a resolution, but also with a view to the statutes being laid upon the Table of the House. The Bill gave an enormous power to the Senate, and the Senate ought to have every opportunity of resisting outside pressure. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had given any real answer as to why the more deliberate form of affiliation should not be adopted. His hon. friend behind him had quoted two precedents—one, the precedent of Wales, which was a federated University wherein such a matter could only be done by the statute, Not only that, but there must be a considerable majority—a majority of two-thirds—in favour of the statute being passed. The other precedent quoted by his hon. friend was the Scottish precedent, which was in the same direction. Those precedents were founded upon commonsense and upon the idea that such a matter as this ought to be done with the greatest possible deliberation in regard to schools which it might not be advisable to admit to the position of affiliated colleges. In all goodwill he pressed this upon the Chief Secretary as a matter which might have far-reaching results upon the position which the University would attain not only in the United Kingdom, but throughout the Empire. If it came to be believed outside of Ireland that there were schools attached to the University which should not be attached to it, the University would never reach a position of eminence in the world of Universities, and in the world of science and art. This was a matter which ought not to be hastily dealt with. It ought to have very grave consideration. He thought the Chief Secretary should provide some safeguard to ensure that affiliations would be carried out in the best interests of the University.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL said that the Amendment was based on a suspicion that these bodies would not have at heart the interests of the Universities that they represented. Why should the Universities be tied down in swaddling clothes from the very outset? It was obvious that the persons who would have the greatest interest in the Universities would be the members of the Senate, and he did not think that they should be hampered in matters in regard to which they would be very much better informed than anybody else could be. On that side of the House they believed that the fifty-two bodies would be more or less representative, and that their work should not be made more difficult by unnecessary restrictions.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said this was a matter of the greatest importance to the future of the Universities, and he hoped that hon. Members below the gangway would understand that, whatever criticisms he had to offer in regard to the proposals of the Government, he heartily desired these Universities to be a success. He wished to call the attention of the Chief Secretary to this point. The conditions under which affiliation was to take place were indeterminate. There seemed to be a risk that the University might be flooded by extraneous students who had no opportunities for building up the traditions on which a University must afterwards live, and who might damage and disparage its character with the outside world. The affiliation of a college ought to be a matter of serious consideration to the body undertaking it. Although the Chief Secretary had said that it was so delicate a matter that it ought not to be stereotyped in any way by statute, he ventured to say that it was one of those things which could not be undone readily. Once done, it could not easily be undone, and if the University was to stand on its own foundation it ought not to be flooded at the outset with extraneous students who had no opportunity of associating themselves with the life of the University.

Mr. BIRRELL said the clause provided that the benefit of the privileges of the University or the right of obtaining a University degree, were only to be extended to students of affiliated colleges "subject to any conditions or limitations contained in the Charter or Statutes of the University."

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that might be done or undone by a body sitting in private, and there was nothing in the whole of the conditions of affiliation to prevent provisions being made for the affiliation of colleges contrary to the wish of the general body of the University.

Mr. BIRRELL said there was the statute of the University.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said a statute of the University was passed by the governing body of the University, and not by the general body of the University. The University public had no opportunity of considering whether it was or was not to the advantage of the University that an affiliation should take place. Affiliation should not be allowed to take place except after the fullest publicity and consideration. He had no desire to check the progress of affiliation in the case of institutions which it was desirable to affiliate, but it was most important when a new University was to be built up that its life and tradition should not suffer from the affiliation of institutions which ought not to be affiliated.

Amendment negatived.

*Sir PHILIP MAGNUS moved to amend subsection (4) of the clause so as to provide that the University might "recognise any college or institution in Ireland" by giving to students the privileges mentioned in the subsection. The purpose of this Amendment was, he said, to give a definition of what the recognition of a college really meant. He would point out that there was a little more in the Amendment than might appear at first sight. He would like the Chief Secretary to explain whether he intended that a set of teachers or a particular teacher, who might give education of a University character, should be recognised as such, notwithstanding any conditions under which that teaching was given. That was to say, was the right hon. gentleman prepared to give recognition to institutions in which the education provided was clearly of University type, or to teachers in Colleges whether or no they were properly equipped.

Mr. RAWLINSON seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, to leave out the word 'give,' and insert the words 'recognise any college or institution in Ireland by giving.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Mr. BIRRELL said he could not possibly accept the Amendment, which would completely upset the whole purport of the clause. The clause did not propose to recognise any college or institution whatever in Ireland, as such; it would simply ascertain whether in any particular college or institution there were teachers of a particular University type, giving teaching of a particular character. He would point out that they were making very slow progress, and that they had to get somewhere or other through a whole number of Amendments, and nobody wished to sit late that night or beyond a comparatively reasonable hour to-morrow.

Question proposed, "That the word 'give' stand part of the Bill."

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BIRRELL moved the insertion of the word "matriculated" before, "students." It was obviously a mistake to have omitted the word in drafting the subsection, because it was perfectly plain that the benefit was to be conferred only on matriculated students.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, after the words 'give to' insert 'matriculated.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'matriculated' be there inserted."

Captain CRAIG said that a considerable number of colleges considered that the provisions of the Bill would exclude a very large number of extern students from the benefits of the measure. As the merits or demerits of the Bill were bound up with the question whether extern students could get a degree under its proposals it seemed to him that the only opportunity which the House would have of discussing the question of extern students would be on the Amendment of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. BIRRELL said that even if an extern student were to be admitted he would have to be matriculated.

Captain CRAIG understood that it did not entail the student's being resident in the University.

Mr. BIRRELL: No.

Mr. MOORE asked whether the matriculation to be recognised was to be at Maynooth or at the University.

Mr. BIRRELL said that matriculation was a University performance.

Mr. MOORE said that that was quite inconsistent with the clause. If it was to be matriculation at the University these students could not be denied the same privileges as the students of the University.

Mr. BIRRELL pointed out that a student could not matriculate at Maynooth. Maynooth was not a University.

Mr. MOORE contended in that case that it went further than the Chief Secretary intended, and that the word was being put in the wrong place. If the right hon. Gentleman read the clause with the word "matriculate "put in after "pursuing" he would find that the student would matriculate in a recognised college.

Amendment agreed to.

Further Amendment agreed to.

Captain CRAIG moved to omit the provision that the course of study of a University type giving students the right of obtaining a University degree should be "approved by the governing body of the University, in any recognised college in Ireland under teachers recognised by the governing body for that purpose." He said that the point raised by the Amendment was very important. Under Clause 2 as it at present stood there was no power whatever to provide that an external student should be treated in a similar manner to that in which he would in the Royal University of Ireland. A great hardship would be done thereby to Irish national school teachers whose case could be dealt with by leaving out the words suggested in the Amendment. He submitted that as these teachers were worse paid than similar teachers anywhere else they should at least be given the privilege under the Bill of attending the University and paying half fees. Outside that there was the question of the various county councils of Ireland sending privleged men in their area to be taught in the University. There were people in

Ireland who could not go and ask for special treatment such as that, and to that class his Amendment specially applied. The rule would prove a great success to those who were able to pass the qualifying examination, if this clause passed. But if it was confined to those students who were students of an affiliated institution, those who did not belong to such an institution would be cut off from all privileges which all persons in the category had been anxious to obtain in the Royal University of Ireland. The institutions to be affiliated to the Universities proposed by this Bill were already known. It was also well known that none of the county councils of Ireland would send up to the Universities anyone but their own particular *proteges*. And nobody believed that in certain parts of the south and west of Ireland such toleration would exist as the extension of this privilege by the county councils to the small minority of Protestant parents who resided there, or that their children would ever be sent to the University at the expense of the rates. That being so, they would refuse to go to the county councils for assistance to obtain the privileges they had had in the past. One of the greatest blots on the Bill was that it excluded entirely the external students. Under it they had no opportunities. There need be no question of bigotry, because the Amendment covered both Universities. He submitted that they should not give all these privileges to the students of these affiliated colleges and keep them from a man who desired to take a degree at the University as a reward for his own hard work at the cost of his own small savings. The amendment was absolutely necessary in order to protect the Universities in Ireland. County councils were all very well, but they were not to be trusted to treat the Universities as they ought to be treated; and in their interest, and particularly in the interest of the established body of national school teachers, he hoped the Chief Secretary would allow the Amendment.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG commended the Amendment to the House as one of the utmost importance. There were at the present time in Ireland 4,000 students of the Royal University, and of these there were probably 2,500 who had worked in their own time, and had perfected themselves for examination for a degree at the Royal University. The Bill would absolutely exclude these students from the right which every Irishman had enjoyed for a great number of years, to present themselves for examination at the Royal University and to obtain a degree. This was a very serious step for the Government to take. The Chief Secretary, the hon. Member for Cambridge University, and other Members, contended that the most valuable part of University education was the association with one's fellows, and in this he was to a certain extent in agreement; but he would ask the House to remember that there were fundamental differences between England and Ireland in this respect. There were many more Universities in England, and it was much more easy for an individual to become a student of a University. Ireland was comparatively a much poorer country, and the proportion of persons who could afford the time and money to go to a University was much smaller; in fact, the number who would be able to avail themselves of the University to be set up would be comparatively small. Everybody agreed it was desirable that people should obtain sufficient knowledge to take a degree, and, whilst he admitted there were a great many arguments in favour of the association of persons in a University, he believed nothing but good could be said to have come from the system which at present existed in Ireland, and by which anybody could get a University degree if sufficiently clever. He had not heard any sufficient argument why the right which had been enjoyed in Ireland for a great many years should be suddenly cut off. The case of the national school teacher would be particularly hard. If anybody ought to be able to obtain a degree with the least amount of trouble, it was the person who had to impart instruction to others. He could not understand what argument could be put forward why this deserving class should be deprived of the right of taking a degree at the Royal University. There was also a large number of clergy who were too poor to go either to Trinity College or to one of the Queen's Colleges, and who, in their leisure hours had worked, and had finally presented themselves and obtained a degree at the Royal University. They, too, were going to be cut off from the right.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 17, to leave out from the word 'type' to the second 'the' in line 20."—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'for' in line 19, stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL said that were the Amendment carried, the Bill, in his opinion, would be worthless; certainly from that moment all his interest in it would cease. They had all along made it perfectly plain that their object was to try and establish a University of the same kind as the Universities of England and Scotland, not merely a University where degrees should be obtained, but a University which should in fact be a teaching institution. It was no use saying the University would have the power of recognising teaching in another place. That in no way disproved the value of the new University they were setting up, because the rights of affiliation where used would be used in respect of places where University teaching was given. The case of the national school teachers could easily be provided for by the rules and regulations of the Universities.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS ventured to hope that this Amendment would be withdrawn. He himself had an Amendment on the Paper which raised the question of the external students, quite independently of these matters, and he thought it would be better raised on that Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed:—

"In page 2, line 19, after the word 'body,' to insert the words 'of the University.'"—*Captain Craig.*

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill," put, and negatived.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS, in moving an Amendment in the interests of extern students, said that notwithstanding what had fallen from the Chief Secretary, he ventured to appeal on behalf of the external students, because the opportunity of residential instruction in colleges in Dublin was not necessarily incompatible with external graduation on the part of those who had neither time nor money to provide for residential courses. After all, residence was not everything. In these days, when examinations were so much disparaged, it was nevertheless something to prove a knowledge of any particular subject. The Chief Secretary would not run down examinations. He had quoted Melancthon to prove they were an antidote alike to sloth and to arrogance. The importance of the University of London in this regard was to the point. Some ten years ago the University was reconstructed by this House, and made a teaching University. But it was not thought wise to shut the door to external students, and that door had remained open ever since, and notwithstanding the fact that it had been made a teaching University the external side was as large now as it was in 1898, or larger. It was stated in the Committee upstairs that this difficulty could be got over by providing bursaries, scholarships, and so forth. There were two types of knowledge which came to the door of the modern democratic University, and asked for recognition. On the one hand there were those who proceeded along the approved course of residential teaching with examinations conducted largely by their own teachers; and on the other hand there was a high standard of pass degrees conducted by independent examiners for those who had been unable to avail themselves of the residential facilities. Many of the most worthy candidates would have the door shut in their faces if this clause as it stood was sanctioned by the House. Not only would the national school teachers be prevented from obtaining degrees, but many who were engaged in commercial pursuits and technical work and training, and who, after their day's work was over, sat down and studied the theoretical side of the practical work they had done during the day, and who desired to register the result of their studies in it by taking a degree. In his opinion the University of London ought to be a guide to the Government in this matter, and it was for that reason he proposed this Amendment. For the first twenty years of its existence the constitution of the London University was very much the same as that of the University of this Bill. Its candidates came only from affiliated institutions. But it was soon found that this was very little guarantee of any academic attainment whatsoever. It was in 1858 that it threw open its doors to the external student, and from then up to 1898 all the students were external students. When in 1898 it was made a teaching University it was thought unwise to shut the external door. He thought the same experience would repeat itself in Ireland. He thought in carrying out affiliation the tendency would be for the affiliated colleges to degenerate. The University of London maintained a system of high standard examination which kept the door open to all who applied. In that way they would be recognising a class of knowledge the recognition of which ought not to be denied to anybody in a democratic free University such as they were told the new Universities were going to be in Ireland.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said he would not repeat speeches which had been made upstairs. He understood that some of the opposition of the Chief Secretary was due to the fact that he was afraid this would lead to students cramming, and that University degrees might be obtained in that way. Personally, he had the same detestation in regard to cramming. So far as the degree was concerned it merely marked in these cases the standard of education attained, and was not worth much to those who received it. That might be the idea of the Chief Secretary, because they all knew his great scholastic attainments, but that was not the idea in the mind of the average Irish student. The average student trained in a college liked to feel that by energy and industry he would have a chance of getting one of those degrees. What would be the result if this Amendment was not carried? There were a great number of obscure people who through poverty could not obtain the highest form of education in the usual way, and they resorted to secondary and technical schools, burning the midnight oil, and in his opinion nobody ought to be more encouraged in this form of education than those who did all this by their own solitary efforts. It was easy for the Senates to exercise some control over the crammer, because they might inquire as to what method a candidate had adopted to gain the knowledge he possessed. He was convinced that the right hon. Gentleman would be consulting the needs of the poor if he would consider the advisability of accepting the Amendment. He could not see what danger there was in allowing these external students to come in. They had to show evidence that they had attained a high standard of education or they would not get their degree, and then they would have paid all their money without any result. External students were not any danger to college life, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised if he accepted this Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, after the word 'purpose,' to insert the words 'or to students who are pursuing studies otherwise than in a recognised college.'"—(*Sir William Collins.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL said that for over thirty years the Royal University had allowed external students to come in, and he had never heard any opposition from hon. Gentlemen representing Ireland, and there had been no condemnation of the system. Now the proposal was being made to exclude externs although everybody in Ireland approved of the system. He found that the association of Catholic graduates met in Dublin and condemned this proposal, and the Convocation of the Royal University, representing 7,000 graduates, demanded the inclusion of externs. The Rev. Dr. Delany, the Rector of the Catholic University College, also condemned the proposal to exclude externs. He was quite certain that the Chief Secretary would not be able to mention one single authority in the whole length and breadth of Ireland which approved of this great desire to have nothing but strictly residential college education in Ireland. There was nothing more honourable in the whole field of education than the giving of every assistance and opportunity to the poor student to win a high position in the academic world. Such opportunities were necessary for the great body of teachers. It was well known that when a teacher was in the lower ranks of his profession he could not rise unless he got a University degree. Another objection to the Government proposal was that it would practically exclude women. Other Universities gave degrees to women, and he noticed recently in an Irish newspaper the fact that some nuns had obtained degrees at the Royal Universities. If the right hon. Gentleman would not yield on this point he felt sure he would be doing a great injury to education in Ireland, for he would be closing the door which had been open for thirty years to external students and slamming it in the face of the poor of Ireland. Even the University of London found it necessary to open its doors to extern students. He felt strongly that the proposal to exclude external students was a retrograde and undemocratic idea which would prevent poor students from obtaining degrees in Ireland.

SIR E. CARSON said that those who were acquainted with the conditions of the people of Ireland knew that this was an exceedingly difficult question. If they were going to have this system of external students, why should the Royal University be abolished? The Royal University had existed as a degree conferring University, and he supposed it was because it had not sufficiently met the wants of the people that the new Universities were being set up. If they adopted this Amendment they might as well retain the old Royal University. He did not see the distinction. At the same time he thought they had gone a considerable way towards that in the provision which had been adopted with respect to affiliation of schools and colleges throughout Ireland. He doubted whether the students would be anything but external students, unless great care was taken in regard to affiliation. He would point out to the mover and seconder of the Amendment that the teaching obtained in affiliated schools would count as if the students had come up to live in the University. So far from approving of that, he thought it was a blot on the Bill. He felt perfectly certain that they ought not to go further in putting an end to the Bill by inserting provisions which would really be equivalent to the retention of the old Royal University.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said the hon. Member for Walworth was a member of the Committee upstairs, but not during the whole of its deliberations. He gathered from the hon. Member's remarks that he must have been absent when this matter was under discussion. If he was present, he could not understand his statement that no people representing Ireland were in favour of this provision in the Bill, because if he was present he would have known that the Nationalist Members spoke and voted against the Amendment.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: I said no public body in Ireland.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he regarded the elected representatives of the people as fulfilling that definition. The objection which he and his colleagues took to the Amendment had been stated by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dublin University. The grievance which they had against the system of University education which had existed up to the present time had been that the Royal University had simply been an examining board, and that there had been nothing in the nature of a teaching residential University. They desired that that University should be abolished, and that there should be established a teaching residential University. They were anxious to attract students to Dublin to take their course in that University. He regarded the obtaining of degrees by external students who were crammed for examinations down in the country, and who had no share in University life, as of little value whatever. The value which he attached to University life was to be found, he might almost say, more in the associations and life of the University than in examinations. He was not at all sure that it was a good thing for a boy living down in the country to be crammed, and then sent up to take a degree. They wanted to attract students to the great central institution which they hoped would be established. The only arguments against that was that there would be many poor but clever boys whose parents would not be able to pay for their coming up to take the teaching in the University. That argument was met by the provisions in the Bill which enabled county councils, and the Intermediate Board of Education, which had large funds at its disposal, to establish exhibitions and bursaries to enable clever boys to come up to Dublin. These exhibitions and bursaries would, of course, be properly distributed. He was sure no one would pay any attention to the unworthy insinuations thrown out by some hon. Gentlemen that these exhibitions and bursaries would not be given impartially. They would be offered to clever boys whatever the creed or the politics of their parents might be. He would regret extremely if the Amendment were carried. It would destroy the Bill and leave them still with the system of which they complained under the Royal University.

*MR. BUTCHER said he agreed with what had been said by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, and he hoped the Chief Secretary would be inexorable on this point. The Amendment went to the very heart of the Bill. It would establish in the new University two competing principles which would continue to compete until the one had finally vanquished and subjugated the other. He believed that when the system of examination was brought in under the Royal University, classes in the teaching institutions were depleted and men ceased to learn in the old way, and, what was more, the idea of University education almost ceased to exist in Ireland. He thought London University was a most dangerous precedent, and to him it was an example to be avoided in regard to Ireland. He did not mean to say that London was a failure in its own line, but he thought that if the London system were transferred to Ireland it would be an absolute failure in regard to the new University. He admitted that the poverty of Ireland was a matter which deserved consideration in this matter, and when he supported the principle of the Bill as against a system of external students, he did not do it on the high and lofty ground of academic principle, but on the ground of the experience of Ireland itself. The canker of examination had eaten into the whole educational system of Ireland. He opposed the Amendment not on any *a priori* or academic ground, but in order to remedy an evil which had been recognised by everybody in Ireland who had given serious consideration to the question. One hon. Gentleman had said that he did not know who had ever condemned the system of the Royal University of Ireland. He did not know anyone out of this House who had ever defended the Royal University system. In three volumes of evidence given before the Robertson Commission he did not remember the name of one single witness who had defended it. The one thing on which everyone was agreed was that the system must be brought to an end. He admitted that the poverty disability was undoubtedly a real one; but other countries had proved that their love of learning could prevail even over conditions of poverty. Everybody who knew Scotland was aware that though there was poverty in that country, thousands of young Scotsmen flocked to their Universities; and once the love of learning was kindled in the people, poverty would be no bar to its acquisition. As the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had said there were provisions in the Bill which would make it possible for the poorer young men in Ireland through the Intermediate Board and through the county councils to be aided in their University education, by way of scholarships, bursaries, and payment of fees. And it was to be remembered that a certain period of grace was given. The system was not to be brought to an end at once; at least five or possibly seven years interval would elapse during which candidates would be able to adjust themselves to the new conditions. He would only say that if he had to choose between an academic degree without academic training and academic life on the one hand; and an academic training and academic life without a degree, he should choose the latter.

MR. BIRRELL said that for reasons he had already expressed on other occasions, and for the reasons stated by previous speakers, it was perfectly impossible for him to accept the Amendment. The effect of it would be to continue the existence of the Royal University as a mere examining body with students coming up to it and taking their degree, and the new University would not be able to compete with it. An hon. Member below the gangway had spoken of getting rid of the crammer; but he did not believe it posssible that any University body could dodge the crammer. If they kept the Royal University alive, by which men could get a degree by simply passing its examinations, they would never get rid of the canker which was eating the heart out of true learning in Ireland. It was therefore absolutely essential to get the Royal University out of the way after a period of at least five years.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he should vote for the Government on this occasion on account of the Chief Secretary. He was in favour of the Amendment. He should vote against it, but he had not time to state the reasons.

Mr. MOORE hoped the mover of the Amendment would go to a division, because to pass the clause as it stood meant a great hardship to many students. It was not necessary to go to London to see how the Amendment would work. In Trinity College, Dublin, there was a system whereby extern and residential students obtained degrees together, and it had worked exceedingly well so long as the standard was kept up. The experience of London University showed that the two systems could grow up together, and he saw no reason why the two systems should not prevail in the new University.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 38; Noes, 263. (Division List No. 217.)

AYES.

Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Bennett, E. N.
Brace, William
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gretton, John
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hill, Sir Clement
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Rowlands, J.
Sears, J. E.
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir William Collins and Mr. Seddon.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Armitage, R.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo)
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHn.RichardKnight
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,HC(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)

Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Harcourt, Rt Hn. L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harrington, Timothy
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N)
Meehan,Patrick A. (Queen'sCo.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, T. W.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smyth,Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Motion made, and Question, "That further consideration of the Bill, as amended in the Standing Committee, be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Birrell*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS [REMISSION].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the remission of the debts due to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland from certain Railway Companies, in pursuance of any Act of the present session, to grant money for the purpose of certain Local Loans out of the Local Loans Fund, and for other purposes relating to Local Loans."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Mr. T. M. HEALY: May I ask the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to give the explanation I asked him for last night?

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.) said the explanation which the hon. and learned Gentleman desired was in respect of Clauses 4 and 5. The history of this transaction, which went back to no inconsiderable date was practically this. The railway was constructed out of a loan which originally came to about £20,000. It was raised partly by subscription, in which he thought the Spinners Company was largely concerned, and partly by subscriptions by local residents, and partly by grants from the Treasury to £100,000. The estimated revenue of something like £4,000 was found to be very much over-estimated, and it eventually proved to be about £2,000, having a net deficiency of £49,450. The position came to this, that the local railway which was at that time working the line on behalf of the original constructors, found they were working it at a loss of £4,000 or £5,000 a year, and they made an offer of £2,000 to buy the line. The question arose whether it was wise to scrap the railway or to leave it, to be worked at a loss, to the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company, or, as it subsequently became, the Midland Company. By scrapping it a sum of something like £6,000 might have been obtained to cover the small sum advanced for construction, but looking at it from the point of view of those who held the mortgage it was thought better to let it go on being worked, and a sum of £2,000 was eventually accepted for the line. It then became necessary, in order to restore to the Public Works Loan Fund this sum of £17,000, to come to Parliament with this Act. The whole thing was an unfortunate speculation. Railway experts were sent down from time to time to inquire into the working of the line. The first two greatly over-estimated the traffic returns and under-estimated the cost of the line. That led to the unfortunate financial state of things which existed when the bargain was struck. It had not injured in any way the persons who subscribed originally to construct the railway, and on the whole he thought the best thing that could have been done was to have continued the line by letting it be taken over by the Midland.

Mr. T. M. HEALY admitted that the present Government had no responsibility for the transaction, but he wished to denounce the British Treasury. This was one of the grossest instances of the stupidity, neglect, and absolute incompetence of the British Treasury. He attacked the job at the time, and said it was a humbug. He told them they should dandle this little railway on their knee, and instead they threw it to the wolves. The Treasury concealed from Parliament that there was this loan in the background. They did not dare disclose it, as money was being actually thrown away. This was a little railway made locally. The local people put their money in it, and got a little loan from the Treasury. The loan was not being paid, but he supposed the railway was far more valuable than the loan. The gentlemen connected with the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway had a secret deal with the Midland Railway Company to whom they intended selling the line, and they kept it from the Government, and persuaded some gentleman in the Treasury to foreclose the mortgage. Irishmen did not know how these suggestions were driven into the minds of the Treasury. They did not know the Treasury clerks; but gentlemen in England who had the ear of the Treasury and the advantage of their society and could make suggestions to them, did get them at times to do what turned out to be gross and scandalous jobs. They foreclosed their mortgage, and, through the Member for East Worcestershire, said—"Oh, what are we to do? These little Irish shareholders are poor people, and have just sold and destroyed their little railway." That was very good, but the following year the great Midland Railway of England came and bought up the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway and this little railway. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman and the Government of the day come forward then and insist on recovering from the Midland Railway Company, who had a most valuable bargain, this £17,000 for the taxpayers? Where were the watch dogs of the Treasury? They talked about the way in which the Irish peasants did not pay their debts and the insolvency of the Irish ratepayers; but why did not the Treasury of that date say that, in addition to giving them this ten miles of railway for £2,000, there was £17,000 which they were not charging them and which they would bring forward when the new Government came into office? Whoever was the Treasury clerk responsible for keeping from Parliament a transaction by which they made a present to the great Midland Railway Company of £17,000 ought to be bastinadoed. He considered the matter one of such grave importance that in his view a Select Committee ought to be appointed to inquire into it. It was inaccurate, he believed, to say that the shareholders lost no money by the transaction. He thought they lost the whole of their money, and they, at any rate, got no satisfaction out of the business. Parliament had had to wait until the year 1908 for the sequel to this transaction. Why did the Public Loans Bill of 1908 contain this sum of £17,000? Why was it not proposed in 1907, 1906, or 1905? Why had there been all this delay? It was because the Treasury hoped that Parliament would have forgotten, and that the Irish Members would have been away from the House. They hoped to put the matter through in the small hours of the morning, and that the history of the miserable transaction would not be exposed. It was, however, a matter that was far too serious to be allowed to slip by without protest, because it showed how Irish affairs were dealt with at Downing Street. Hon. Members were entitled to know who were the clerks and others who had kept from Parliament all knowledge of this unhappy transaction. Whether it was John Smith or John Brown, they ought to have the name of the man. These were the gentlemen who were lording it over Ireland. There must be some man with a name who was responsible for the transaction. Let the Treasury representative say who he was. He supposed it was somebody who had a C.B. or a knighthood. He repeated with all the emphasis he could use that they were entitled to know from the Secretary to the Treasury who was the individual responsible for having kept such an unfortunate transaction from the knowledge of Parliament for at least five years.

Mr. HOBHOUSE said that the picturesqueness of the description of the hon. and learned Gentleman of this transaction was a little spoiled by the fact that the final part of the transaction was not concluded until the passing of the Midland Railway Act of 1907. Therefore, this was the first opportunity there had been of bringing the matter before the notice of the House, and there had in fact been no delay whatever in acquainting Parliament with the transaction. He wished to make it quite clear that as the representative of the Treasury in the House of Commons he and he alone, under the authority, of course, of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was responsible to the House, and not the Treasury clerks, who had no opportunity of defending themselves in that Chamber. He repeated that this was the first opportunity the Treasury could have had of putting the facts of the case before the House. It was true that there had been a loss to the shareholders. There had also been a loss to the Treasury; but there had been no present at all to the Midland Railway Company. What were the facts? The line was worked at a loss and it was very liable, therefore, to collapse from want of funds. He could assure the hon. and learned Member that, as far as he could trace the history of the case, if the line had been left to its own unaided resources it must have been closed down. That would have been a very regrettable thing from the public point of view, as well as, he should think, from the point of view of the hon. and learned Member. They must sympathise, of course, with those who regretted that what was once an independent Irish local line should have been transferred to a large British railway company. Still it was better, it seemed to him, from the point of view of the district itself that the railway should continue to be worked by a real live company than that it should have been allowed to collapse altogether. He hoped that the explanation he had given would satisfy the hon. and learned Member.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: May I point out that the Secretary to the Treasury is entirely mistaken. The true fact is that the Midland Company did not acquire the line in 1907, but in 1903.

Mr. HOBHOUSE said that the Midland Railway Act was not passed until last year. If the hon. and learned Member looked at Clause 4 he would see that it read—

> "And whereas by the Midland Railway Act, 1907, an agreement for sale of the said railway to the Midland Railway Company, freed and discharged from all encumbrances, liabilities, contracts, debts and engagements of the Limavady and Dungiven Railway Company, for the sum of £2,000 was confirmed, and the said purchase money has since been paid."

The agreement was not, therefore, confirmed until 1907, and the Act of that year obtained by the Midland Railway Company was really the one under which the transaction took place.

Mr. T. M. HEALY did not blame the Secretary to the Treasury in the least for the inaccuracy, but he was entirely mistaken. He (Mr. Healy) debated the matter in the House when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the right hon. Gentleman to the best of his recollection became Chancellor of the Exchequer in or about the year 1904. At any rate the right hon. Gentleman was Chancellor of the Exchequer when he (Mr. Healy) debated the matter with him. The Act under which the Midland Railway Company acquired the line was passed as far back as 1903. There was no doubt about it. He would not oppose the Bill at that hour of the morning, and he had no hesitation in saying that the Secretary to the Treasury was free from responsibility in the matter. He was not attacking the hon. Gentleman, but the system, which was altogether at fault. Why on earth did these great Treasury experts, whose names were never mentioned, delay five years before bringing this matter before the notice of Parliament? Of course, the hon. Gentleman had a complete answer to him. He said that the officials were not responsible to Parliament, but to the heads of the Department. He (Mr. Healy) knew the hon. Gentleman's statements were inaccurate having regard to the true facts, but he did not care to enter into a controversy with him on that score. The hon. Gentleman was wrong, but did not know it. He was quite *bona fide*. There must, however, be some person in the Treasury who was individually responsible for the matter, and they should know who he was, even though, as the hon. Gentleman said, he was not directly responsible to Parliament. Somebody must have made the suggestion of foreclosing on this little line and selling it to the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway for a mere song. He would like to know who made that suggestion to the Treasury. Then the idea of the bargain with the Midland Railway Company must have existed in somebody's mind. What he wanted to know was this: why five years had been allowed to elapse before the matter was brought to the attention of Parliament? Why was it not brought before them last year? This Government were in office last year. They were as ignorant of the matter last year as they were to-day, and, therefore, quite as competent to deal with it. He respectfully protested against the system, and said that every Public Works Loans Bill covered a job. This had been the case ever since he had been in Parliament. These Bills were brought forward year after year by the Treasury clerks, who pretended to be great experts and who lorded it over Ireland, as well as over England and Scotland. In future he would try to peel the mask off the face of these gentlemen, and when this sort of thing occurred again he would demand to know who was the individual responsible for it.

MR. FORSTER said he was not conversant with the details of the question under discussion, but he rose to make an emphatic protest against the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Louth, whose appearances in the House were all too rare. The hon. and learned Member had seen fit to make a gross and unfounded charge against the Treasury officials. It has been his (Mr. Forster's) happy lot only a few years ago to serve at the Treasury and he said emphatically that no permanent official of that Department was open to the grave charge which the hon. and learned Member had formulated. Anybody who knew these gentlemen would ridicule the suggestion that they could in any way be associated with a grave and scandalous job. The hon. and learned Gentleman had been a Member of the House long enough to know that if he had any charge to bring against any official of the Treasury, that charge must be directed against the representative of that Department in the House of Commons. The Secretary to the Treasury had told them that the operative date in connection with this transaction was in the year 1907.

MR. T. M. HEALY: It was not.

MR. FORSTER: I said the operative date. The Secretary to the Treasury has read the clause in the Bill.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I adhere to my statement. The Bill was passed in 1903.

MR. FORSTER said that the Bill might have been passed in 1903, but clearly the operative date was not until 1907. All he had risen to do, however, was to protest against the action which the hon. and learned Member had seen fit to take that night, an action which he thought was not usual with gentlemen who represented Nationalist constituencies in Ireland. He was sure that on calmer reflection, the hon. and learned Member would see that his protest should have been directed against the representative of the Treasury on the Government bench, and not against the permanent officials who were not there to defend themselves.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said that he and several other hon. Members who were interested in railways thought it was highly desirable that, if possible, they should have exact information of what had happened. The Treasury appeared to have lost £17,601 which they had advanced to this railway. They all agreed with the hon. Member who had just spoken, that whatever was done, the Government in power at the time and not the permanent officials of a particular department, were responsible. Having advanced £17,000 to the railway in question, the Treasury eventually foreclosed, and there was no doubt that they were perfectly justified in doing this.

MR. HOBHOUSE: They lost £17,601.

MR. AINSWORTH said the point to be borne in mind was that the Treasury foreclosed and became the owners of the little railway which they had been told was ten miles long. Then it appeared that the railway was sold to the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company for £2,000. Everybody, either in that House or out of it, who was acquainted with the working of railways knew that the rails alone in this case were worth a great deal more than £2,000. They could only suppose that if the railway was sold for that ridiculously small sum there was some arrangement whereby it should be worked for the convenience of the public. They ought to be told what that arrangement was. The small railway was eventually sold to the Midland Railway Co., and nobody would deny that each railway company was bound to make the best bargain it could for itself. What they wanted to know was this: The railway, having been parted with for a scrap-iron price, what *quid pro quo* was given for it? Was it to secure advantages for the public that this sacrifice of public money had been made? He hoped that if the Bill passed through Committee that night the Secretary to the Treasury would undertake to give them exact particulars of the transaction on the Report stage.

MR. T. M. HEALY said it was not to be supposed, if the Treasury had been frank about the matter when the Midland Railway Company were negotiating for this railway, that Parliament would have allowed the transaction to go through in the way it had done. The Midland Company got this line costing £50,000 for £2,000, so that at the very smallest computation they were making £48,000 on the deal. The British Government allowed the Midland Company of England to get hold of that valuable bit of property for £2,000, concealing from the House of Commons the fact that there was due to the nation this money. England as well as Ireland, the English taxpayer as well as the Irish, was being swindled. He only raised the question because he knew the facts and he wanted to know why in 1903 when this vigilant watch-dog of the Treasury was standing sniffing over the cash and when the Member for Sevenoaks was—he did not know what he was, he never paid any attention to what any man in the Government was, they were all the same to him, "a row of jealous individuals," as the late Mr. Biggar said—when the Member for Sevenoaks was at the Treasury which he so eloquently defended, he concealed, if he was responsible, the facts. The Member for Sevenoaks said that he (Mr. Healy) ought to attack him. He did not know what the Member for Sevenoaks sins were, but he would like to be told why that transaction was not revealed to the House of Commons in 1903. They had on the Treasury Bench great zealots of economy, and the matter did not affect the Liberal Party; they were entirely free from it, because the Tory Government was in office. Was *esprit de corps* so strong with regard to a transaction like that that the present Government would shield the Treasury Clerk responsible from exposure and in the meantime, for all they knew, were distributing C.B.-ships and baronetcies and knighthoods and all that kind of thing, old-age pensions perhaps? A Gentleman in the House of Lords was so strongly opposed to old-age pensions that he took £2,000 a year for himself. Let that be as it might, he asked why this Government, in regard to a past transaction where not one of them was concerned and not one of them was affected, stood over this transaction, covering up the conduct of Gentlemen who were their predecessors in office? It was really a serious matter. The First Lord of the Admiralty used to be Secretary to the Treasury. He understood the transaction. He was now a member of the Cabinet. Was it not a pretty example to Irishmen to know that an Irish line worth £50,000 could be sold for £2,000 to an English railway Company, and a debt of £17,000 left to the British Government; and if a humble Irish Member with a memory of the transaction had not raised it, the Bill would have passed smack-smooth and without the Treasury making a single comment. The Treasury put the Public Works Loans Bill into the hands of the right hon. Gentleman who was now Secretary. He did not know a bit about it. There ought to be a phonograph on that Bench. He (Mr. Healy), asked the Financial Secretary last night, and he knew absolutely nothing. And yet such was the system of legislation in the House of Commons that he was put forward to pass this transaction, and they were supposed to give their great respect to him. He was doing the Treasury's job. It was really extraordinary that not one single member of the bench responsible for that transaction raised his voice in condemnation of what was done eight years ago.

MR. HOBHOUSE said he really thought the language which had been used and the insinuations which had been made by the hon. and learned Member were absolutely and entirely unjustifiable. What took place? The line was attempted to be made by private subscription, but it could not be so completed, and the promoters came to the Treasury for a loan. That loan was eventually made, nominally £20,000, actually rather less. When the line was completed it was never worked by the company as many small lines were never worked by the company which constructed them. It was worked by the Belfast Northern Counties Company by arrangement. The company had never from the first moment paid a single penny of interest upon the money advanced by the Treasury. That very clause which wiped off the principal had to wipe off the whole of the interest which ought to have been paid in return for the loan.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Why were we not told this six or seven years ago?

MR. HOBHOUSE said he was not on that bench seven years ago. He was now explaining the actual, not the imaginary facts to the House. If it was the desire of the hon. and learned Member that no money should ever again go to an Irish loan, nobody would be better pleased than the Treasury. Whether that would prove to the satisfaction of hon. Gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House below the gangway he was not quite certain, but as Secretary to the Treasury he would second his endeavour. Returning to the actual facts of the case this company, as he said, failed to pay a single penny of interest, and therefore not only the principal, but a large sum of interest had accumulated in arrears. The hon. Member who sat for Argyllshire said: "What a bad bargain the Treasury made!" Again look at the facts. The Treasury tried to get £5,000 for the railway. Nobody would pay it. The best they could get for it was £2,000. They were informed at the time the sale took place that at least a sum of £8,000 would have to be spent on sleepers alone. On the report on which the Treasury acted, he asked would any Member of the House have advanced any large sum such as that which the Member for Argyllshire suggested ought to have been advanced upon a railway which was worked at a loss, whose permanent way was in so bad a condition that a sum of £8,000 for sleepers alone would have to be spent on a line ten and a quarter miles long which had not paid a single penny of interest from the day it was constructed? The only alternative to taking the sum which the Treasury eventually accepted would have been to break up the whole line with great detriment to the district concerned. Though a larger sum would have been realised to the Treasury he thought that course would have been harsh and ungracious.

Mr. AINSWORTH said his hon. friend did not see his point. Whatever the line was worth, it was worth the value of the rails. Everybody must see that the rails of a line ten and a quarter miles long must be worth more than £2,000. The hon. Gentleman's predecessors were perfectly right in helping the line if they could, but the point was, how much public money were they to sacrifice to do that? What were the terms of the bargain? He did not say they were not justified in handing over the line to the Befast and Northern Counties Railway for £2,000, but what guarantee did they get that the line would be worked in the interests of the public and at reasonable rates? Would the right hon. Gentleman bring that up on Report?

Mr. HOBHOUSE said there was nothing to bring up on Report further than the explanation which he thought he had offered at great length. The Treasury, as he had told the House, could have got a sum of £6,000 if they had broken up the line. That was what they were told they could have got if they had broken up everything and carted it away. They preferred to take a smaller sum and keep the railway for the inhabitants. The bargain was that they got £2,000, and the railway instead of being dead was now alive, and being worked for the benefit of the inhabitants.

Mr. MARKHAM (Notts, Mansfield) said he objected to the Secretary to the Treasury giving information to the House unless he had verified that information. He had stated to the House that the sleepers alone for the line would cost £8,000. A railway did not take more than 2,000 sleepers to the mile. The cost would not at the most exceed 3s. 6d. per sleeper, and the total cost of the sleepers could not in any case come to more than £3,500. How did they get the balance of £4,500?

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he did not blame the present Secretary to the Treasury, personally. What he did was simply to expose the Treasury tricks and methods. It was nothing to him; no doubt the line was a good line, and he wished its possessors joy of it, but why were the facts concealed from the House of Commons for seven years? Why was this in the Bill of 1908 only?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Caldwell): Order, order. The hon.

and learned Member has repeated that several times.

MR. T. M. HEALY: But I never got an answer.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. and learned Member cannot go on repeating it.

MR. T. M. HEALY: All I want is an answer. I do not want to keep the House of Commons up, but I do respectfully submit that we are entitled to know who is the person responsible for having kept from the House of Commons the facts for over five years. Why not have put it over for another five years?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Secretary to the Treasury has stated that he is responsible for whatever fault is in the Treasury. The hon. and learned Member has got his answer that the Treasury Bench accept full responsibility. Obviously, there can be no further answer.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle) asked how long the rails on that line had been laid down, and how many locomotives the line possessed. Surely locomotives would be required on the line.

MR. HOBHOUSE said he had already explained that a very small line had been worked by the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company, and therefore, they required no locomotives but their own.

*MR. HUDSON said there was the line at least, and there were stations and buildings and some railway stock of some description. There were the land, stations and buildings, and even if two-thirds of the estimated cost as mentioned by the Secretary to the Treasury was necessary to re-sleeper the line, that line would at least be worth three times as much as the amount in question, and therefore, the transaction on the face of it had been a very bad one indeed. He was really astonished at the explanation which had been given. To put it at its lowest value the railway was worth ten times as much as it had been given away for.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported this day.

NAVAL LANDS (VOLUNTEERS) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; Bill read the third time, and passed.

NAVAL MARRIAGES BILL.

Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for this day.—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

REGISTRATION BILL [LORDS].

As amended, considered.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, S. Shields) moved that the Bill be read a third time.

MR. FORSTER said an Amendment was accepted by the Attorney-General on a previous stage, but it did not appear in the Bill. He took it that the reason for that was that the Bill had not been reprinted.

SIR W. ROBSON said that that was the case.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Statement showing for each Secondary School, in respect of which Waiver Resolutions were passed by the Local Authority under Article 43 of the Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1907, the Articles which the Board were asked to waive and their decision as regards each Article [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MINES AND QUARRIES (FIRE AT HAMSTEAD COLLIERY).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by R. A. S. Redmayne, Esq., on the causes of, and circumstances attending, an underground fire which occurred at Hamstead Colliery on 4th March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BASUTOLAND.

Copy presented, of Report of Proceedings of the Basutoland National Council, 1908, and Correspondence as to affairs of Basutoland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATAL.

Copy presented, of further Correspondence relating to Native Affairs in Natal [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BANKRUPTCY.

Copy presented, of Twenty-fifth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under The Bankruptcy Act, 1883 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 254.]

BANKRUPTCY (GENERAL RULES).

Copy presented, of the Bankruptcy Rules, dated 6th July, 1908, made pursuant to the Bankruptcy Acts, 1883 and 1890 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CUSTOMS.

Copy presented, of Fifty-second Report of the Commissioners of Customs for the year ended 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1908–9).

Copy presented, of a Revised Estimate of the Further Amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1909, for Public Education (Ireland) [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 255.]

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF APPEAL, ETC.

Copy presented, of Account showing the Receipts and Expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended 31st March, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 256.]

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Resolved, "That this House do meet To-morrow, at Ten of the Clock."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

GUARANTEED 2¾ PER CENT. STOCK.

Return ordered, "of Guaranteed 2¾ Per Cent. Stock Issues under the Irish Land Act, 1903, in the following form :—

Date of Issue.	Amount.	Price.	Cash Product.	Deficit.	Annual Charge on Ireland Development Grant for Excess Stock.

—(*Mr. John Roche.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Appointments in Armagh Post Office.

MR. P. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that in the month of January last candidates were invited for the position of male learner in the Armagh Post Office; that a competitive examination was held; that, when it was found that the successful candidates were Catholic boys from the Christian Brothers' schools, no appointment was made, and whether the vacancy was filled by a female who had previously failed to pass the necessary examination; whether he is aware that the female staff at Armagh was formerly fixed at three, and will he say on what grounds the female staff has been increased; and whether there is a Catholic officer at Armagh, having twenty years service and an excellent record, whose promotion has been prevented by the anti-Catholic influences at this office.

(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I strongly deprecate the implication conveyed in this Question that a candidate's chance of obtaining an appointment to the Post Office service is affected by his religious beliefs. The arrangements for such competitions as that at Armagh have to be made some considerable time in advance, and in this particular case the situation for a male learner which was offered for competition was abolished in connection with a revision of the indoor staff at Armagh three weeks before the competition was held. As, however, the competition had been advertised it was considered better that it should be held, notwithstanding that it would not be possible to appoint the successful candidate to Armagh. The successful candidate has accepted an appointment at Lurgan. The addition of one appointment for a female sorting clerk and telegraphist at Armagh was authorised in January last to provide for an increase of work. I have no knowledge of the religious beliefs of any of the officers at Armagh, and the suggestion in the last part of the hon. Member's Question is absolutely without foundation.

Classification of Bournemouth Post Office.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the Bournemouth office has been raised by his recent classification to be a Class 2 office; whether, in view of the recommendation of the Hobhouse Committee that in such offices a division of the postal and telegraph staffs should take place, it is the intention of the Department to carry out such reorganisation; and whether his attention has been called to the fact that, in consequence of dual qualifications being insisted on at Bournemouth, men fully qualified in postal duties have had their increments arrested for inefficiency as telegraphists.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Bournemouth office under the new classification is in Class 2, and the question whether the staff should be divided or not is at present under consideration. The new classification is determined partly by the amount of work and partly by the cost of living; and the staff at offices placed in Class 2 on the latter grounds will not be divided unless the nature of the work renders division necessary. So long as the staff at Bournemouth remains amalgamated dual qualification is required, but if the staff is divided I will consider specially the case of any officer whose increment has been arrested because he is not dually qualified.

Irish Savings Bank Work.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that he is unable to furnish the main details of the approximate total cost of having the Irish Savings Bank work done in London and the main details of the approximate total cost if such work were done in Dublin, he will say on what basis it is officially stated that it is more economical to do such Irish work in London than in Dublin.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) If the work connected with Post Office Savings Bank accounts opened in Ireland were transferred from London to Dublin it would be necessary to re-advise every transaction which took place in one country in respect of an account opened in the other. There would also be duplication of other work, and the cost of supervision would be higher if the force were divided.

Transfer of Postal Clerks from London to Dublin.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that many Irish female clerks in the General Post Office in London have for a number of years had their names registered as desiring to transfer to Dublin, that such transfer is frequently desired for health reasons, and that Miss Bradley, one of these clerks, was some months ago compelled to retire on pension although she had made repeated applications for a transfer to Dublin on account of health, he will explain why a junior female clerk with less than two years service is about to be transferred from London to Dublin on account of ill-health.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I explained in writing to my hon. friend, as long ago as 7th April last, the circumstances which unfortunately disqualify Miss Bradley for further service in the Post Office. The disqualification applies obviously no less to service in Dublin than to service in London.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that several Savings Bank women clerks of Irish nationality, who had, or who had not, registered their names as desiring transfer to Dublin, were asked by the savings bank authorities, either privately or officially, some time before the present Government came into office, if they would be willing to serve in Dublin; that the average vacancies for women clerks in Dublin number only one or two a year; that several Savings Bank women clerks of Irish nationality had already registered their names as desiring transfer to Dublin; and that, as it is now officially denied that the late Government contemplated the transfer of the Irish Savings Bank work to Dublin, he will now say why such a number of Savings Bank women clerks were, at the time referred to, asked whether they would be willing to serve in Dublin.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) This Question is identical with one put by my hon. friend on 14th May. I fear I have nothing to add to the reply which I gave on that occasion.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that a number of Savings Bank women clerks were asked by the Savings Bank authorities, either privately or officially, some time before the present Government came into office, if they would serve in Dublin; that about fifty-eight women clerks serving in London had already applied for transfer to Dublin; that the number of vacancies for women clerks in Dublin averages only one or two per annum; that the late Government contemplated the transfer of the Irish Savings Bank work from London to Dublin; that the percentages of Irish deposits and withdrawals made through British deposit books and *vice versa*, as worked out by the Savings Bank, either privately or officially, show only 1 per cent. approximately on the totals; that, apart from the inconvenience to Irish depositors, Ireland loses £30,000 per annum by having the Irish Savings Bank accounts kept in London; that 99 per cent. of the manufactured stuff used in the Post Office in Ireland is not manufactured in Ireland; that clerical work can be as efficiently and, having regard to the cost of housing accommodation, more economically performed in Dublin than in London; and that it would be more in conformity with Irish ideas if the Irish Savings Bank accounts were kept in Dublin, he will further consider the advisability of transferring the work of keeping these accounts from London to Dublin.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have nothing to add to the various replies which I have given to my hon. friend's previous Questions on this subject, except that I must not be taken as admitting the accuracy of the numerous statements which his Question contains.

British Post Office at Tientsin.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster-General what countries have Post Offices in Tientsin; whether steps are being taken to abolish the British Post Office at that place; has Germany offered to take over the British postal business there; whether the British or Imperial Treasury has definitely refused to contribute anything towards the British Post Office at Tientsin; whether it has been definitely decided to close the British Post Office at Teintsin in October next unless the inhabitants of that place pay a large sum of money for the expenses; and whether any demand whatever has been made by Germany from the German subjects there for postal expenses of the Tientsin German Post Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Besides the Chinese Imperial Post Office, there are British, French, German, Japanese, and Russian Post Offices at Tientsin. The question of the continued maintenance of the British agency is now engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government. I have no information as to the incidence of the cost of maintaining the German agency.

Wages, Work, and Cost of Living of Agricultural Labourers.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state, in the form of a comparative table, what are the average hours of work, the average rates of wages, and the average cost of living of agricultural labourers in the United Kingdom, the United States, France, Germany, Russia, and Italy, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I regret that there is not sufficient statistical information available to enable me to give my hon. friend the comparative figures he requires.

Postal Employee and Portadown Disturbances.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a letter-carrier in the employment of the local post office was a member of a band who paraded the streets of Portadown on the morning of the 13th instant, cursing the Pope and smashing the windows and doors of Catholic houses; and whether any reprimand will be conveyed to this individual.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will make inquiry on the subject.

English Ancient Monuments—Terms of Reference.

MR. SILCOCK (Somersetshire, Wells): To ask the Prime Minister whether the Government will include in the terms of reference to the Royal Commission for reporting upon the preservation of ancient monuments an inquiry into the desirability of taking steps for the protection from injury or desecration of scenes of great natural beauty or historic interest, such as the Cheddar Cliffs, in Somerset, which are being seriously injured by quarrying operations.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The terms of reference will be similar to those of the Scottish Commission.

Vacant Post of Director of the Natural History Museum.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the post of Director of the Natural History Museum, South Kensington, has been vacant since January last; will he say if there is any intention to abolish this post; and whether it is the intention to leave this museum, which costs about £54,000 annually to maintain, without a scientifically-trained director.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I shall shortly be receiving a deputation on this subject, and perhaps my hon. friend will defer his Question until I have heard what representations may be made to me.

Repair of Ballintoy Pier.

MR. GLENDINNING (Antrim, N.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he is aware that the County Council of Antrim have bought the pier at Ballintoy, thereby obtaining full control; and if under these circumstances the promise of the Board to repair the pier may be carried out at once, as risk is run of total destruction if this work is not completed before the late autumn and winter gales come, which are so frequent on this coast.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) Port Ballintoy is in process of being transferred to the county. When the necessary legal steps are completed the work will be undertaken with the least possible delay.

Rathlin Fishing Pier.

MR. GLENDINNING: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he is aware of the condition of the fishermen's pier, Rathlin Island, and of the necessity that something should be done to help them; and if he proposes to contribute to the repair of their pier to enable them to get out and in with convenience and safety, thus helping these poor people to earn a living, which is practically impossible under present conditions.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my Answer to the Question on this subject which was put by the hon. Member for West Belfast on the 16th instant.

Cairo Drainage Schemes.

MR. RIDSDALE (Brighton): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office have any detailed information with regard to the scheme prepared by the Egyptian Government for the drainage of Cairo; whether certain portions of the scheme necessitate the adoption of one particular patent; and, if so, whether he will advise the Egyptian Government to throw the whole scheme open to competition and give full consideration to alternative methods.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I beg to refer you to the reply which I returned to the Question asked by the hon. Member for the Tyneside Division of Northumberland on the 7th instant. I have not yet received any further information.

Board of Education Lifts.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether a rule has been put in force lately to the effect that only the higher staff are to use the lifts in the new building of the Board of Education; and, if so, whether he will explain why this difference of treatment has been made between the higher staff and junior assistants.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The two passenger lifts provided in the portion of the new building assigned to the Board of Education would be quite insufficient to supply, without some restriction, the requirements both of visitors, and of the Board's staff which will number over 1,000. It has therefore been found necessary to restrict their use to officers of or above the rank of minor staff clerk.

Education Grants—Deduction for Teachers' Superannuation.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE: To ask the Secretary for Scotland with reference to the deductions from the grants payable to school boards and other educational bodies for teachers' superannuation under Clause 13 of the Education (Scotland) Bill, as amended by the Standing Committee, whether that deduction is to be made in respect of the teachers of each school board or other governing body from the amount of the grants otherwise allocated to that school board or governing body, or whether it is to be made in respect of the teachers as a whole from the grants as a whole before that allocation takes place.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) It is proposed that the deductions in question should be made from the grant to each school, whether under a school board or other governing body, in respect of the teachers employed in that school, and not from the grants as a whole before allocation in respect of all the teachers in employment in Scotland.

Expenditure of Government Departments.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state for each of the financial years 1905–1906, 1906–1907, 1907–1908, and 1908–1909 (as estimated) the total annual expenditure of each of the following Departments, namely: War Office (including ordnance factories), Admiralty, Civil Services, Revenue Departments, under each of the following headings for each Department, namely: expenditure from net Votes voted in Supply; expenditure from receipts appropriated in aid; expenditure out of issues to meet capital expenditure under various Acts; expenditure incurred on account of this Department by other Departments; together with the totals of these four headings for each of the four Departments, and a deduction from the total of each Department of the expenditure incurred by that Department on account of other Departments.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I do not think such a Return would possess such value as would justify the cost of preparing and publishing it. At present the Treasury is engaged in compiling the similar, but more elaborate, Return moved for on 25th June by the hon. Member for Preston. To furnish also the Return suggested in the Question would involve needless duplication of work and expense.

Expenditure on Extra Police in Ireland.

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what were the total amounts charged to local rates on account of the expenditure for extra police employed in each of the years ended the 31st March, 1905, 1906, 1907, and 1908, in the counties of Clare, Galway, Leitrim, Roscommon, Longford, King's, Sligo, Meath, and Westmeath, respectively; and if he will also state what is the approximate monthly cost for which these counties are at present severally liable, based on the strength of the extra police forces now assigned to each county.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*)

County.	Amounts charged to local rates in respect of extra police in the year ending 31st March.				Approximate monthly charge for extra police at present.
	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.	
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Clare	—	—	39 13 2	1,888 5 1	205 0 0
Galway	—	749 15 1	659 11 7	4,179 14 1	910 0 0
King's	—	—	—	645 0 3	65 0 0
Leitrim	—	—	339 18 0	636 14 8	50 0 0
Longford	—	—	—	448 6 0	55 0 0
Meath	—	—	—	762 0 1	90 0 0
Roscommon	—	—	9 19 11	3,347 8 4	300 0 0
Sligo	—	—	—	—	85 0 0
Westmeath	—	—	—	444 19 3	125 0 0

Purchase of the Kingston Estate, Mr. T. Sullivan's Holding.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners will explain why the holding of Mr. Thomas Sullivan, Pollardstown, on the Kingston estate, Mitchelstown, has not yet been included in the general sale and purchase of this estate; whether the price demanded by the landlord for the holding, upon which a second-term rent had been fixed, was twenty-six and a quarter years purchase, this price being refused by the tenant, who so informed the Commissioners, and they, on 24th March, 1907, sent Mr. Sydney Smyth to inspect the holding, and as a result reduced the price to twenty-three years purchase which the tenant expressed his willingness to accept; and if this matter will receive the consideration of the Commissioners so that Mr. Sullivan may be enabled to purchase his holding upon the agreed terms.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners understand that in the case of Thomas Sullivan, a judicial tenant, the vendor offered to sell the holding for £625, being a price within the zones, but the tenant declined to purchase at that price. The Commissioners have had the holding inspected and consider that £550 would be a reasonable price, but the vendor is unwilling to accept it. The Commissioners will endeavour to arrange this case and some others of the same kind in connection with the sale of the residue of the estate.

Roscommon Board of Guardians Clerk.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Mr. Michael Moran is a practising solicitor in the town of Roscommon, and if it is with the approbation of the Lord Chancellor that this gentleman acts as clerk of the Roscommon Board of Guardians; and, if the Answer is in the affirmative, for what reasons have the Local Government Board waived the regulation requiring this gentleman to give his whole time to the duties of the clerkship.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Mr. Moran, who is a solicitor, was in November last appointed as clerk of the Roscommon Union. There is no regulation requiring a clerk of a union to give his whole time to the duties of the office. The Lord Chancellor informs me that his approbation is in no way required for the employment of a practising solicitor as clerk of a union. He understands that there are other cases in which solicitors are similarly employed with much advantage to the public interest.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Napier; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. John Robertson and Mr. Russell Rea.

Report to lie upon the Table.

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.

Special Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 257.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 257.]

ASSIZES AND QUARTER SESSIONS BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday 19th October, and to be printed. [Bill 342.]

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), further considered.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) moved to amend subsection 4 of Clause 2 (Colleges) by omitting the words providing that students of recognised colleges might be given the benefit of any privileges of matriculated students of the University. His object, he said, was to secure that if recognition by affiliation was to be allowed, the advantages thereby conferred on students of the colleges affiliated should be strictly confined to the privilege of presenting themselves for examination with the view of taking a degree. If the words he proposed to leave out were retained in the Bill, the students of merely affiliated, or recognised, institutions would have every advantage enjoyed by the students of the constituent colleges.

Mr. BIRRELL: They must have matriculated.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said they would be put in possession of all the advantages that every student in the University was in possession of. Those advantages were very considerable. All that the student of a recognised college required was the means for obtaining a degree, and these extended rights and privileges would have a tendency to interfere with the entry of students to the University itself. A student finding he could enjoy all these privileges would, if it suited his personal convenience, refrain from entering the University. The retention of the words would tend to discourage membership. It could not be said that any hardship would be created so far as the students of these recognised institutions were concerned if the advantages given to them were confined to their being able to take a degree. Without troubling the House further he begged to move.

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.) seconded the Amendment. He was, he said, glad that this Amendment had been moved, because in his opinion the Amendment moved by the Chief Secretary on the previous day made this section meaningless, or at the least, very much confused. It was absurd to suggest that a mere matriculated student of these recognised institutions should have all the advantages and privileges of a matriculated student of the University.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out the words 'the benefit of any privileges of matriculated students of the University or.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'or' in page 2, line 20, stand part of the Bill."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said the second Amendment on the Paper made quite clear the point that troubled the hon. Member for North Armagh. With regard to the Amendment generally, he quite agreed that nobody who was not an affiliated student should have these benefits. Therefore it was desirable to make it plain that the student pursuing a course of University education in some extraneous institution would have to take the first step and become an undergraduate of the University. That could only be done by matriculation. Having become an undergraduate it was extremely desirable that he should have access to the library and other advantages of the position.

MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) sympathised with the object of the Amendment, but was not sure that the omission of the words would be satisfactory. The enjoyment of University privileges should be confined to students, resident in the University, attending lectures in the University town. He did not think that students of affiliated colleges scattered all over the country should have all the rights and privileges of genuine undergraduates. He did not know of any affiliated colleges in the United Kingdom where such rights were granted to students of affiliated colleges. On the other hand, if an institution like the Royal College of Science were affiliated to the University in Dublin the students of that college, whether they attended University lectures or not, would be matriculated students of the University town, and he did not know how they were to be differentiated from the internal students of the University. There was one phrase in the clause which met to some extent his difficulty and the difficulty of the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment. These privileges were granted subject to any limitation contained in the charter or statutes of the University. There were no limitations in the charter, but there might be in the statutes, and he thought they should trust to the governing bodies of the University to put into the schedules such restrictions as would ensure that these students of outside districts should not have the advantages which were extended to the affiliated colleges in the University towns. As he considered the proposal of his hon. friend was somewhat dangerous he was not prepared to support the Amendment striking out these words.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) felt some difficulty in giving a vote on this question, as he was in some doubt as to the meaning of "affiliated." He called attention to the statement made by the Chief Secretary on the previous day "that the clause did not propose to recognise any college or institution in Ireland as such whatever," and asked how that could be reconciled with the statement in the charter, which provided that the University might recognise certain colleges for certain purposes.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, after the word 'University' to insert the words 'who are pursuing a course of study at the University.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, to leave out the word 'or' and to insert the word 'excluding.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*DR. HAZEL (West Bromwich) moved to add at the end of line 26: "and provided that a student in a recognised or affiliated college or institution shall not be entitled to obtain a University degree unless he shall have completed a period of study of not less than two academical years in a constituent college of the University in Dublin or in the University of Belfast." It would be agreed by all, whether in favour of the Amendment or not, that no more important Amendment was before the House. It was moved in Committee by the hon. Member for Cambridge University, and he could have wished that its conduct had remained in his hon. friend's abler hands. Though it had found a foster father, he hoped his hon. friend, like a right-minded parent, would support his child. The Amendment was moved from principle and not from prejudice. He hoped it would be admitted that in the discussions on this Bill he had always endeavoured to say nothing which could be regarded as in the least offensive to those of a faith other than his own. Those of them who objected to the Bill might as well make up their minds that it was going to pass, and that being so they wished it God speed, and they were anxious that it should, if passed into law, achieve all those great results for Ireland which its best friends hoped and wished for, but it was highly desirable that the principles on which the Bill was based should be adequately safeguarded. What were those principles? The first was the establishment of a teaching University, and the second was the establishment of what, so far as law could make it, should be an undenominational University. In order to establish a teaching University the Chief Secretary had found it necessary to exclude the external students. They had had from him again and again eloquent speeches on the evils of a purely examining University, and of the desirability of social and academic intercourse in the lecture rooms and playing fields, and he agreed to all the right hon. Gentleman said. The hon. Member for East Mayo had several times asked for a definition of a denominational University. He would not offer that, but he would offer a suggestion as to what was an undenominational University. It was a University which by its constitution provided as far as possible that no special privileges should be granted to particular religious denominations, and he thought he would be able to show that unless the Amendment were accepted the Universities of the right hon. Gentleman would not answer that definition, because there were in the Bill wide powers of what was originally called affiliation, but what was now called recognition. They had had a change of terms, but affiliation, as allowed in the Bill, smelt no sweeter to him under its change of name. Everybody admitted that the Senates of these Universities, unless they were in some way restricted, would recognise certain sectarian seminaries, and would recognise attendance at lectures in these seminaries as equivalent to attendance at the lectures of the constituent colleges. That would be done in Dublin in the case of Maynooth certainly, and probably in Belfast in the case of Magee College. If they got recognition of the courses at theological seminaries of any faith whatever as equivalent to courses at the University itself, they would knock the bottom out of the Bill, and violate both of the principles that it must be a teaching and an undenominational University, and the right hon. Gentleman would be an accessory before the fact. There was no academic defence, and no precedent, for recognition of purely theological seminaries as equivalent to University colleges for the purposes of a degree, and if hon. Gentlemen opposite could produce such instances he would be glad to hear of them. The right hon. Gentleman yesterday was eloquent on the safeguards for the undenominationalism of this University—no tests for students or professors, offices open to everybody, without any religious tests, etc., and that was so in the case of the constituent colleges, but the whole position might be turned by the process of affiliation. The right hon. Gentleman, by rejecting a previous Amendment had affirmed the principle that the students in these affiliated colleges were to have all the privileges of the students of the constituent colleges. The constituent college student was not tested, but who was going to say that the affiliated college student, the student from Maynooth or Magee, would not be tested? They had got there an inroad on the principle of undenominationalism. What was the past attitude of the right hon. Gentleman in relation to these affiliated students? Speaking on the 11th May on the Second Reading of the Bill the right hon. Gentleman said he—

> "hoped the senates would be strenuous in their determination to secure that anybody who was a graduate of Dublin or Belfast was really a Dublin or Belfast man, and that that would be the spirit in which they would approach the question in Committee."

He (Dr. Hazel) had to state with regret that that was not the spirit in which the right hon. Gentleman approached the question in Committee, otherwise he would have accepted the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cambridge University, which was the one now before the House. He took it that a Dublin man, from the University point of view, was a man who had studied at Dublin. Just as an Oxford man was a man who had studied, or rather resided for the ostensible purpose of studying, at Oxford. Within twelve miles of Cambridge University there was Ely Theological College, which was devoted, he understood, to the manufacture of High Church curates. Suppose that the University of Cambridge were by some resolution to grant that a student of the Ely College who had never quitted the precincts of that college for educational purposes should come in for the examination at Cambridge and take a degree, would the right hon. Gentleman, a distinguished Cambridge man himself, describe that student as a Cambridge man? He thought he would utterly repudiate the idea. Why then should a Maynooth student who was going to pursue his Arts course about the same distance from Dublin as Ely was from Cambridge be a Dublin man? Why should he be called a Dublin man because he had passed three years in the cloistered seclusion of Maynooth, or a Belfast man because he had spent three years in the sectarian shades of Magee? These affiliated students need never, under the Bill, reside at the University nor hear a single University lecture, nor set their foot inside the University premises, and yet they would be graduates of the Dublin University and precisely on the same footing, when they had taken their degree, as those who were *bona fide* members of the constituent college at Dublin. There would be two degrees of entirely different value going forth to the world as of precisely the same value. This Amendment sought to save the right hon. Gentleman from that. It would secure that these students would be not entirely Dublin or Belfast men in the academic sense, but at any rate two-thirds Dublin or Belfast men. He had selected the period of residence adopted in other Universities, but he was not wedded to it; one year would meet his principle just as well, although in practice he thought two years would be far better. He would like to call attention to the history of the Amendment in Committee. On the first occasion when it was discussed the hon. Member for East Mayo spoke on behalf of the Nationalist Party, and opposed the Amendment, not on the ground of principle, but on the ground of expense. He said it was academically desirable, and that it was for the best that Maynooth students should pass at any rate a portion of their Arts course in the University of Dublin, but that it could not be done because of the expense. The line then taken by the Chief Secretary was this: "You are presenting a pistol at the head of Maynooth if you pass the Amendment, and you are telling them that they must at once find accommodation for 200 or 250 Arts students in Dublin." He thought the right hon. Gentleman receded a little from that position when it was pointed out that under his own Bill there would be a period of seven years for Maynooth to accommodate itself to the situation, and that during those seven years these students would be able to obtain their degrees under precisely the same conditions as at present. He ventured to assert that if there had been a division taken at that sitting the Amendment would have received considerable support, if it had not actually been carried. Everybody expected when they left the Committee that day that some concession would be made. He made no charge of any broken pledge, because no pledge was given, but there was an impression abroad to that effect. Then they separated for the Whitsuntide recess, during which time a distinguished ecclesiastic returned home from America, and a meeting of the Irish bishops was held at Maynooth, and then the Committee met again, some three weeks after they separated, for the resumption of the debate on the Amendment, and for the division. What happened? In the meantime the right hon. Gentleman had hardened his right honourable heart. More than that, he no longer relied for defence, as before, on the light battery of "pom poms" from the Irish Office, but he brought up the heavy artillery, in the person of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. And the hon. and learned Member for Waterford came armed not only with the charters of the new English Universities but with something far more potent, the ultimatum of the Irish bishops. He would quote the portion of it which was of most interest on this point—

> It ran, "We beg to state that we cannot undertake to send the students in the Arts Faculty in Maynooth to reside in Dublin. The result of the Amendment would be to deprive hundreds of students resident in the College of the opportunity they at present enjoy of gaining a University degree."

That was read by the hon. and learned Member during his speech, and it made a profound impression particularly in the neighbourhood of the Treasury Bench. In a moment the ground of objection was entirely changed. It was no longer a question of expediency; it was no longer a question of expense; but it was a question of vital principle. And the hon. and learned Member went so far as to wind up his speech by saying that the adoption of the Amendment would be "not only a slur but an actual insult to Ireland," an attitude of which there was no suspicion on the preceding occasion when they discussed this matter. Yesterday the hon. and learned Member had asked the hon. and learned Member for Oxford University for some evidence of the control of the hierarchy in connection with this Bill. Here was some. Here they had, as he suggested, the hierarchy moulding, or, at any rate, endeavouring to mould this measure in Committee. If this was done in the green tree what would be done in the dry? If this was done while the Bill was before the House of Commons, what was likely to be done when the Bishops had to influence not the House of Commons, and not a Standing Committee of the House of Commons, but merely a friendly Senate? Was this Amendment, this suggestion that there should be some restriction on affiliation, an insult and a slur on Ireland? He did not know whether the hon. and learned Gentleman adhered to that view to-day.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Yes.

*DR. HAZEL asked why was this styled an insult and a slur? He presumed that it was because the autonomy of the Senate was restricted, because there was restriction on the power of the Senate to do what it liked in the University. But he found that the Bill bristled with restrictions of various kinds on the autonomy of the Senate. Were they also a slur and an insult? When did restriction become a slur and an insult? Was it when there was restriction on affiliation or on recognition? Was it fair for the hon. and learned Member for Waterford to denounce this Amendment as a slur and an insult to Ireland, when without a word of protest from him another and, as he suggested, a wider and more serious restriction was placed on the power of affiliation? A wide restriction was contained in the latter part of subsection 4 of Clause 2, by which it was provided that the Universities—

> "Shall not give privileges under this provision to students in any college or institution in Ireland which prepares students for intermediate or other school examinations or gives education of an intermediate or secondary character."

This was a far more serious restriction of the power of affiliation than anything proposed in this Amendment. So one was reluctantly forced to entertain the uneasy suspicion that a restriction became a slur and an insult to Ireland only when it was one to which the majority of the Irish bishops declined to agree. But who had proposed restrictions on the power of affiliation? He had the Report of the Robertson Commission, and he found, on pages 39 and 40 of that Report, that the Royal Commission expressly declared against any power of affiliation being given to the new Roman Catholic University, except only in the case of the Royal College of Science in Dublin. It did not stop there, for the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary himself had declared for restriction. Speaking on the First Reading of the Bill, on 31st March, he said that—

> "There must be a severely restricted right of affiliation."

So the right hon. Gentleman had cast a slur and an insult on Ireland! Surely the restriction on the power of affiliation, so far from being an insult and a slur on the Senate, which had the management of a University, would really be a very considerable assistance to it in resisting pressure from outside. In conclusion let him deal with the second point of the bishops' ultimatum, which said that the Amendment would deprive the students of Maynooth of the opportunity they now enjoyed of gaining University degrees, that was to say of obtaining degrees at the Royal University of Ireland. It was perfectly true that they would not be able to obtain degrees under the same system that they obtained them now, namely, by preparation entirely at Maynooth, or examination by an examining body. That was not a disability confined to Maynooth. There were scores of institutions in Ireland which had been able up to now to prepare students for degrees, but which would no longer be able to do so under the present Bill, and hundreds also of deserving private students would lose the same chance, all in the name of academic efficiency. They were told to come to Dublin and attend the lectures, and they could graduate. Why should that be in the case of Maynooth a wrong of the deepest dye, while, in the case of these students, and these other institutions, it was merely necessary in the interests of academic efficiency? There would always be an opportunity for Maynooth students to take their degrees like other people. London University was offered to the external students excluded by the abolition of the Royal University of Ireland and it would be equally open to the clerical students. Moreover, seven years were given under the Bill in which degrees could be obtained under precisely the same conditions as now. During that period it would be perfectly possible, if only the authorities were willing, for the proper accommodation to be acquired or erected in Dublin, in order that the clerical students might take their courses with the rest. The position appeared to be this. The right hon. Gentleman kicked the lay external students, male and female, down the front steps of the new University, and put up the notice, "This is a teaching University," at the same time that he took measures to admit the clerical external students by a side door, marked "Recognition." That being so, the University as it stood was neither a teaching University nor an undenominational University. The position of the Maynooth student after affiliation would be this: he would have precisely the same teachers as now, he would be in the same college as now, he would come up and be examined as now, but instead of being examined by the Royal University of Ireland, he would be examined by the new University of Dublin. He would be so far as that University went as completely an external student as he was now an external student of the Royal University of Ireland. He objected to the policy of preference, economic or academic, colonial or clerical. The case for the Amendment had strong Roman Catholic support. Anybody who would take the trouble to look at the evidence given before the Robertson Commission would see that every educated Roman Catholic layman who had given testimony on this point was emphatic as to the necessity of residence in Dublin for clerical students, and if that House were a "Palace of Truth," and they could get at the real opinion of the Irish Party opposite, he was perfectly convinced that the vast majority of them would be found to be of precisely the same opinion. But it did not rest on lay opinion. Catholic ecclesiastics in their educational moments had declared for it with emphasis. He had in his hand the references to the evidence given before the Robertson Commission on this very point by distinguished Roman Catholic ecclesiastics — educationists like Dr. O'Dwyer, Dr. Delany, Mons. Molloy and Dr. Archdall, all of whom declared that the Maynooth students ought to go to Dublin; and still more emphatic was the testimony of the Maynooth professors themselves. Take the evidence of Dr. Hogan, who at that time was Professor of Literature at Maynooth—

> "Speaking for myself," Dr. Hogan said, "and my colleagues in the Arts Department, we are strongly of opinion that at least from the scholastic point of view these studies could be carried on far more satisfactorily and successfully in Dublin than in Maynooth."

Take too the evidence which was given before the Commission by Dr. O'Dea, who was then Vice-President of Maynooth. He said—

> "From the intellectual and social as well as from the spiritual point of view, I readily grant that it is the best scheme."

He was speaking of the scheme for Maynooth students spending their whole course there. Then he went on to say something which he would ask the House to mark, because it was an absolute anticipation of the Amendment which he was commending to the House—

> "Difficulties against it would be considerably diminished if pass students were to spend only two years at the University, and take their third at Maynooth in preparation for their degree."

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork) asked whether the hon. Gentleman would state in respect of what kind of Dublin University these gentlemen gave their evidence.

*DR. HAZEL: As he understood, the evidence given by these gentlemen had never been departed from. They desired that their Arts students should spend their Arts course, or part of it, in Dublin, in order that they might rub shoulders with laymen. The hon. Member knew, of course, that the evidence was voluminous on those particular points, and that it was impossible to lay it before the House, but he thought that the hon. Gentleman would agree, if he had refreshed his memory lately, that the words were spoken by these rev. gentlemen without qualification as to the particular kind of Roman Catholic University they were to have. He commended the Amendment to the House because it would help the Senate to resist pressure, at the same time that it would help the liberalising party in the Roman Catholic Church, which he was glad to know was an increasing party, and which was anxious that its clergy should have an education which fitted them to deal with laymen in their future career. Furthermore, it would help the University to be mistress in its own house, as it would not be if there was affiliated to one of its colleges a college infinitely more powerful than the college to which it was affiliated. It had been insisted again and again by hon. Gentlemen opposite, and by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, that they could find no restriction such as this in the statutes or the charters creating the newer English Universities. These hon. Gentlemen clamoured for a free University. If any restriction was proposed in a direction which would tend to make the University more undenominational they raised protesting hands to heaven and cried out that the great principle of freedom was outraged. They wanted as he understood, precisely the same charters as were granted to the newer English Universities. It was rather surprising to find hon. Gentlemen opposite clamouring for the application to Ireland of English rules and English precedents. He always thought they were advised by them to consider the special circumstances of Ireland. That was what he did when he said there had never been any English University founded with a full knowledge that immediately the powers granted by the Act could be put in force, the Senate of the University would proceed to affiliate to itself a theological seminary, more powerful than any constituent college of the University. That was why in order to prevent the shifting of the academic centre of gravity from Dublin to Maynooth, it was necessary in respect of Dublin University, and, incidentally also for other reasons, in respect of Belfast University, to secure that those who took the degrees, who would be entitled to vote in its convocation, and would have all the other rights belonging to graduates, should at least have passed some time in the lecture rooms of the University of which they were graduates. The analogy from the newer Universities of England must not be pressed too far, because the new English Universities, practically without exception, had been founded by privately subscribed funds. Here Parliament was paying the piper, and Parliament should have the right to call the tune, at any rate, to the extent of saying that Church music should not be played. The Amendment would not prevent the affiliation of Maynooth. If the University was founded it was desirable that Maynooth should be affiliated, and he hoped it would be, but it should be affiliated on such conditions as would secure that it did not become a sort of Aaron's rod, and swallow up the college to which it was affiliated. The right hon. Gentleman desired a teaching University, and an undenominational University. Here was a simple precaution, which, without injuring the framework of the Bill in the least, would assist to secure that this object should be carried out. He respectfully invited the right hon. Gentleman to accept this safeguard, or failing that, at any rate to leave it to hon. Members of the House, unpressed by the attentions of the Government Whips, to express their opinion freely.

*MR. HAY MORGAN (Cornwall, Truro) in seconding the Amendment said he thought the Chief Secretary, and perhaps Nationalist Members opposite, ought to be very grateful to him for intervening in the discussion and being a kind of buffer between them and the speech of his hon. friend, and giving them a little breathing space. He had never heard a stronger speech dealing with the point at issue than that to which they had just listened. He wanted to deal with the point that by practically excluding students in these affiliated colleges from Dublin and Belfast they were doing the students a grievous injustice. They pretended to offer them the advantages of a University life, but somebody, he did not know who, was preventing them from obtaining those advantages. The hon. Member for Cambridge University had said that if he were put to the choice between the advantages of University life and University teaching, he would unhesitatingly accept University life, and let the teaching go. He was disposed to agree with the hon. Member, and he could not understand why there should be any difficulty in accepting the Amendment. The hon. Member for Waterford had said that nothing was more important for the future of Ireland than that its priests should receive the advantage of University training. It was rather a dangerous thing to offer a commentary upon a speaker when he was present to contradict. He did not know whether the hon. Member was using the word "training" in contradistinction to the word "teaching," but he would emphasise the advantage of the word "training." He could not close his eyes to the fact that they would have a large number of students from Maynooth and, he hoped, from Magee. In both those colleges they would have the priests and ministers of Ireland training. He agreed that it was absolutely essential that if these gentlemen were to be thoroughly equipped for the work of their life they should have the advantage of a University training, should be able to mix with other than theological students, and should know the world in which they were going to live, and the people they were going to try to benefit. He believed that all these Churches, Roman Catholic and Protestant alike, had a salve for their sorrows, but it was not only necessary that they should know the medicine they were going to administer, but that they should also know the patients to whom they were going to administer it. They would have in these theological colleges abundant experience of the communion of saints, and it was a good thing for them that they should have a communion of such sinners as medical students and prospective Members of Parliament. They were also dealing with an important part in the training of the character of these young men themselves. On the previous day he had voted against an Amendment, and so severed himself from some of his Nonconformist friends, to confine the number of clerics that could be appointed to the governing body to one quarter of the whole, because he objected to distinctions being made between clerics and laymen. They had in the past put clerics on a pedestal sometimes, and at other times put them in prison. They were always trying to put them on one side as being different from ordinary people. The world would be far better to-day if they would only leave these men to be human beings. If the friendship and the fellowship of University life was a desirable thing for ordinary men, it was more so for priests and ministers. There was no life that a man could live so lonely as the ministerial life. He was cut off in all sorts of ways from the fellowship of other people, and the very fact that the circumstances of his ministerial life kept him away from the ordinary affairs of life had a very narrowing effect on his character, and a blighting effect upon some of the best part of his nature. He was thinking not of the lectures he would attend, but of the fellowship he would have in the playing field and the lecture room. Considering all the weighty circumstances which had been brought before them by his hon. friend, and the personal side which he had touched upon, which appealed very strongly to him, he was amazed that some arrangement had not been made to get rid of this part of the clause. The Bill claimed to create a free University. It would do nothing of the kind if the clause remained as it was. It was this very clause that made the Bill suspect from the Nonconformist point of view. If this could be cleared away there would be no difficulty in voting for the Bill as an absolutely undenominational Bill. The Chief Secretary was charged in this case with being in league with the Catholic hierarchy. He could not believe it. The right hon. Gentleman had always been a champion of equality in matters of religion, and many of his friends in the country looked with suspicion upon this section, as they did upon his introduction of Clause 4 of the Education Bill. The Catholic hierarchy could remove all this suspicion by the expenditure of a few hundred pounds to erect a hostel at Dublin for the Maynooth students, and he did not think the Catholic hierarchy (if the Chief Secretary were in league with them) would be so mean as to leave their colleague (the Chief Secretary) to bear all the opprobriums of these classes. Hon. Gentlemen from Ireland knew the circumstances of political life in this country. Surely they might have made some effort to assist this change. If a hostel could not be built, why should the students not travel from Maynooth to Dublin each day? The right hon. Gentleman said they could not send them from Maynooth to Dublin because the train journey took about an hour. He thought things moved a good deal quicker than that in Ireland. If they wanted to go faster why should not they charter a special train day after day, or hire a couple of motor 'buses? The arrangement of these small details, which sounded so ludicrous in themselves, might have obviated the violation of a great principle. He thought even now something ought to be done either to bring students to the constituent college daily or to give them residence in proximity to the college and so remove a serious blot from the Bill, and render it more acceptable to all sections of the House.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, at the end, to insert the words 'and provided that a student in a recognised or affiliated college or institution shall not be entitled to obtain a University degree unless he shall have completed a period of study of not less than two academical years in a constituent college of the University of Dublin or in the University of Belfast.'"—(*Dr. Hazel.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. JOHN REDMOND said it was unnecessary for the hon. Gentleman to commence his speech by putting in a plea that he did not intend to be offensive. None of them had ever experienced anything in the nature of offence from the hon. Gentleman. He recognised, considering the strong views which the hon. Member held on this subject, that his speech was free from anything of the kind. They had, however, to recognise the fact so much that the hon. Member was not concerned about the amendment of this Bill, as that he was an enemy of the Bill as a whole. The hon. Member seconded the rejection of the Second Reading and voted against the Bill, and so it was impossible for them to regard his action simply as isolated action asking for an Amendment in a particular direction, but they had to regard him as one who desired to kill the Bill and in fact had done his best to kill it. The hon. member had alluded to his action in Committee upstairs and to the action of the hon. Member for East Mayo. He thought that quite unintentionally the hon. Member had misrepresented the attitude of the hon. Member for East Mayo. It was true that his hon. friend in that speech stated that his ideal would be to have every student in the University a residential student, and further, that he looked forward to the future when it would be possible for students from Maynooth to come and mix freely with the students of the University of Dublin. He also took objection on principle to fettering the freedom of the Senate of the University, and to the attitude he himself took up after the adjournment of the Committee for Whitsuntide. That was not in the smallest degree inconsistent with the speech of his hon. friend a couple of weeks before. He did not speak before the adjournment, and if he had done he would have made precisely the same speech as he did after the adjournment. He took up a question of principle and what was it? It was the broad principle that this University should not be deprived in this matter of affiliation of the freedom which had been conferred upon other Universities created in recent times in this country. But the hon. Member rather unfairly sought to twit those Members on the Irish Benches because they were asking for the privileges contained in the statutes and charters of English Universities, and he said "you are always demanding the right to govern yourselves in Ireland, and now you are asking to apply purely English statutes and charters to Irish Universities." They were asking for nothing of the kind, and they had never asked for that at all. He had never denied that there might be circumstances in connection with Ireland which would necessitate some variation in the statutes. What he claimed was that where perfect freedom had been given to English Universities in this matter of affiliation similar freedom should be given to Ireland. The hon. Member said that he desired that they should have a free University, but to bring that about he was going to tie the hands of the governing body of that University. He said that he desired that the Irish University should be mistress in its own house. It was for that very reason that he (Mr. Redmond) protested against this Parliament in advance tying its hands in a matter where perfect freedom was given to the English Universities. The hon. Gentleman had tried to put aside as of little consequence in his argument the statutes of the Universities in England. But they could not put them aside. They could not say that the freedom given to English Universities should not be given to the Irish University, because by doing that they took up the position that the Irish people were not to be trusted. The Senate of this new University would be an elected body, although the first Senate during the first five years was to be a nominated body and, therefore, they could not take up the position that they were not to be trusted, or that they would be so unmindful of the future prosperity and welfare of their country, and so treacherous to the interests of higher education in Ireland, that the Senate would at once, at the bidding of ecclesiastics or any other body, proceed to make an improper affiliation with some college or institution which ought not to be affiliated at all. To take up that attitude would be taking up a position which was perfectly ridiculous. Was that the attitude which hon. Members took up? He was sure they would be slow to admit it. Both hon. Members who had spoken in support of this Amendment were in favour of Home Rule for Ireland, and he could not understand anyone in favour of Home Rule refusing to trust the Irish people in a matter of this kind. If they believed that the Irish people were fit to govern themselves it followed as a natural course that they must be willing to concede to the governing body of this University as much freedom as they gave to the governing body of English Universities. He would take Leeds for example, the Charter of which in Article 2, Section 8, provided:

> "To accept the examinations and periods of study passed by students of the University at other Universities or places of learning as equivalent to such examinations and periods of study in the University as the University may determine, and to withdraw such acceptance at any time."
>
> Section 9.—"To affiliate other colleges or institutions or branches or departments thereof, or to admit the members thereof to any of the privileges of the University, and to accept attendance at courses of study in such colleges or institutions in place of such part of the attendance at courses of study in the University, and upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as may from time to time be determined by the University."

The Liverpool Charter in Section 27 (Affiliation and Recognition) provided that—

> "1. The University shall have power by ordinance to adopt as an affiliated college or institution any college or institution which may have attained a standard that shall be deemed satisfactory by the University, and to confer on its teachers and students or any of them such privileges and on such terms as may be from time to time determined to require contributions for University purposes from such college or institution as a condition of affiliation or otherwise to regulate its relations to the University and to determine the number (if any) of the representatives of such college or institution on the Court of the University. But the University shall not have power either by ordinance or otherwise to incorporate with itself any college or institution.
>
> "4. The University may recognise examinations and attendance upon courses of study whether in an affiliated college or institution or not as wholly or in part qualifying students for graduation."

The Birmingham Charter contained the following:—

> "Section 20. Affiliation: 1. The University shall have power to affiliate colleges which may have attained a standard which shall be deemed satisfactory by the University to require contributions for University purposes from such colleges as a condition of affiliation or otherwise, and to make ordinances for regulating their relations to the University, and in particular for regulating the number of the representatives of such colleges on the University Court.

Sheffield:—

> "Article 18. The University may upon such terms and conditions, and subject to such regulations as may from time to time be prescribed by ordinances of the University—(a) Admit to affiliation with it or to any of its privileges or recognise for any purpose and either in whole or in part any college or institution, or the members or students thereof, but may not incorporate with itself any college or institution outside the City of Sheffield.

Manchester:—

> "Article 2, Section 8. To accept the examinations and periods of study passed by students of the University at other Universities or places of learning as equivalent to such examinations and periods of study in the University as the University may determine, and to withdraw such acceptance at any time."

> "Section 9. To affiliate other institutions or to admit the members thereof to any of its privileges, and to accept attendance at courses of study in such institutions in place of such part of the attendance at courses of study in the University, and upon such terms and conditions, and subject to such Regulations as may from time to time be determined by the University."

In every single case where they had conferred Universities they had given the power to the governing body which it was now proposed should be refused to the governing body of the new University in Ireland. The hon. Member had reproached him with having said that this Amendment was in the nature of an insult to the Irish people. Did the House understand what he meant when he used that phrase? He said that because he could not conceive of any Radical Member moving such an Amendment except on the ground that they were unfit to be trusted, and if any man took up that stand then it was an insult. That was the broad principle upon which they had been going in resisting this Amendment, and on that broad principle he asked the House to reject it. The discussion had been entirely directed to the question of Maynooth, and he noticed that the hon. Member who moved the Amendment spoke of Maynooth as a purely theological seminary. He did not know whether the hon. Member was aware that there was an Arts faculty there entirely separated from the other faculties, and the students did not commence their Divinity studies until they had been through the Arts course. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member for East Mayo in the words he had used which had been quoted. He would be glad to see all those students mixing up with the lay students in the University, and he believed that probably in the future that would come about. He based that opinion upon the views of certain well known Catholic ecclesiastics in Ireland. But they had for the present to face the fact that it was impossible. If they had a Government grant of £50,000 to build a series of hostels in Dublin that might make a great impression, but under existing circumstances the students could not come up for residence in Dublin. Mark what happened. The hon. Member who seconded the Amendment had quoted him as having said that he considered it of the utmost importance that the priests of Ireland should not be deprived of University training. He spoke with the utmost sincerity in saying that. The students in the Arts faculty at Maynooth, although they were not in residence there in a University, were keeping University courses, and were getting University degrees at the Royal University. But the Royal University was about to be abolished. Under existing circumstances they could not go into residence in Dublin, and therefore they were going to deprive the ecclesiastical students of Maynooth of the limited facilities which they had at present for obtaining University education. He could not conceive that anybody with any sense of responsibility would take the view that that was even a possible course for the House to adopt. The Chief Secretary had been twitted with something he said on the Second Reading of this Bill when he spoke about his desire that the students of Dublin University should be Dublin men, and the students of Belfast University Belfast men in the sense that they should be residential students. That might have left the impression that in his Second Reading speech the right hon. Gentleman did not foreshadow any possibility of the affiliation of Maynooth, and that his attitude now was the result of some intrigue and pressure brought to bear upon him. That was a misapprehension, because the right hon. Gentleman said in his Second Reading speech that he contemplated the affiliation of Maynooth; therefore the suggestion that he had given way to pressure on this point was entirely unfounded. He asked the House not to accept the Amendment. It was discussed at great length in Committee in the freest and fullest manner. It was supported by the same arguments as had been put forward that day, and when it went to a division it was defeated by two to one. In Committee the Amendment was proposed by a gentleman who was a friend of the Bill. To-day the Amendment came from an enemy of the Bill who had done his best to defeat the measure, and who would be glad, no doubt, if by the carrying of the

Amendment, he was able to defeat the object they all had in view. He asked the House to take a serious view of the situation, and not to be led into a vote which might have a serious effect on the whole of this great project. Not on the question of Maynooth, nor of any other seminary, but on the broad principle that the senate of the University would exercise their rights properly, and that they were entitled to the same freedom which had been freely given to English Universities, he asked the House to reject the Amendment.

*MR. BUTCHER said he moved the Amendment in Committee, and it would be uncandid of him if he did not express his views on the question now before the House. The main argument used against the Amendment was that the Senate of the new University ought to be free to act as it pleased in regard to the conditions of affiliation. The Chief Secretary frequently said upstairs: "We do not know what the Senate may do, we cannot anticipate their action; we merely wish that their freedom should be unfettered." He would ask the House to get rid of make-believe and unreality. The truth was that they did not know what the Senate were likely to do, and they were also pretty sure what they would do. The Senate practically was not free to impose any conditions of affiliation in regard to Maynooth if it wished the University to run at all. They must recognise that they had been told beforehand by the authoritative voice of the Bishops that they could not allow their students from Maynooth to go up to Dublin to take an Arts course at the University. There was no use disguising that fact. Therefore, to say that the Senate would be perfectly free and unfettered to affiliate on any conditions it pleased was to his mind simply a refusal to face the facts of the situation. If the affiliation was to be allowed at all on terms such as those it would be allowed only because the hierarchy said they would not have it otherwise. He was in a difficult position. He was in favour of the Bill, and he would deeply regret if it were wrecked; at the same time he owned he did not like this method of commending the proposals to the House of Commons. On the other hand, he could not, looking to the whole previous history of University education in Ireland, shut his eyes to the fact that, the Bishops had it in their power to wreck any measure regarding University education. They could wreck it in two ways. They could wreck a Bill before it passed Parliament, and that had been done thirty years ago. They could also ruin a measure after it had been passed; and anyone who looked back upon the dismal failures of University education in Ireland could not help feeling that it was idle to set up a University on conditions which might lead to the new University being starved or banned, or, at the best, treated with cold neglect, as were the Queen's Colleges in Ireland. And so he paused when he put these considerations together. He never felt in a more difficult position than he did now in regard to the right course to take. It offended all his academic instincts of freedom and all the ideas he held of a University that those two great inroads should be made into the University idea, and into the principles which underlay this Bill—first of all, that residence away from a University was to be equivalent, not in part but in whole, to residence in the University; and secondly, and this was even a greater difficulty to him, the principle that seminary life was equivalent to academic life. Those two principles together did, as it seemed to him, strike a fatal blow at the real academic principles which were otherwise embodied in the Bill. He owned he had brought himself with great difficulty to admit the idea that a seminary ought to be affiliated at all. He believed in principle that a seminary ought not to be affiliated, but looking at the difficulties of the situation and the needs of the case in Ireland, personally he had got over this, and had said to himself, "We will give power to affiliate your theological seminary, but agree to it on condition that the theological students shall pass at least part of their University time in the University in attendance upon lectures." He owned it was difficult for him even to bring himself to that. But when it came to exemption not from part but from the whole period of University residence, and to making seminary life absolutely equivalent to University life, nothing but an intense desire to get some University Bill passed could make him assent to such a principle. Everybody in the House in his heart felt that a seminary and a University belonged to two different orders of things. It was not disparaging to a seminary to say that it was not a University; in its very essence it was different; its fundamental principle was different. It would be very disparaging to a University to say that it was a seminary. They were dealing with two things which were on a totally different plane, and when it was urged as it had been by very high authorities in Ireland that at the seminary of Maynooth they had the principle for which they were contending—the principle of residence and of teaching, and not of mere examination, he replied, Yes, that was all very true; they had residence, but residence of exactly the wrong kind from the University point of view, because it was residence within closed doors, hardly with open windows, in an air sheltered from all public discussion, and shut out from all the influences which a University was designed to develop—all that was implied in comradeship between men of all kinds, no matter what their profession in life; for, after all, freedom of discussion was the very life and soul and breath of a University. So that to make the one thing equivalent to the other seemed to him to go to the very root of the principle which they were attempting to embody in the new University. He rejected in principle the notion of such a residence being in any true sense a University residence. They had made the suggestion, therefore, to the bishops of Ireland, whether they could not accept residence in the University town—residence not in a lay college but in a hostel that was controlled by the bishops themselves, under their own discipline and their own supervision, allowing their theological students to go to the University lectures, and both as regarded study and pastimes, to take a part in that liberal education which ought to be common both to priests and to laymen. The suggestion seemed very reasonable, because it violated no Catholic principle, for the principle of University residence in a hostel was already accepted at Oxford and Cambridge. At Cambridge they had the Benet House for the Benedictines, and St. Edmund's House for the regular clergy. At Oxford both Jesuits and Benedictines joined in the common intellectual life of the University under similar conditions of residence. Dr. Hogan stated in his evidence in 1902 that every professor in the Faculty of Arts at Maynooth was in favour of the Arts students at Maynooth going up to Dublin to study for their University degree. Maynooth students now went through a course of seven years, three years being given to Arts and four years to theological studies; what they proposed was that of those preliminary years devoted to Arts two out of the three should be spent in the University. In 1901 the Bishop of Limerick, Dr. O'Dwyer, speaking of the immense importance of educating the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland, said—

> "Are they never to have a hope of participating in the widening and elevating influences of a University career? Are they to be cut off, as far as it is in the power of English legislation to effect it, from all association during their earlier years with the students of secular knowledge and kept strictly to their ecclesiastical colleges and their own professional studies?"

So far as it was in the power of English legislation to effect this, English legislation was attempting to undo this wrong and give them the opportunity of participating in those widening influences. And the moment the attempt was made in England, there came from Ireland this absolute refusal to accept the offer given. That was surely very embarrassing for all who wished to help to carry out the higher hopes of thinking Catholics themselves, not merely laymen who thought strongly about this in Ireland, but also some of the most enlightened and ablest bishops in their own Church. From one point of view the proposal that the students of Maynooth should not be obliged to attend the University classes at all might be regarded as a privilege given to clerical externs. No doubt from that point of view it was impossible to defend such a discrimination in favour of the cleric. From another point of view—and he regarded it from this point of view—it seemed to him an educational disability that was put upon the clergy, not by them, but by the authorities of their own Church. From the larger point of view, what could be more unfortunate than the segregation of the clergy and the laity? If there was any country in Europe in which it was important that the clergy should be educated in the best thought of their time and that the clergy and the laity should come together, not only in the cause of religion, but for the sake of the many political and social movements that were in progress, that country was Ireland. So that, from whatever side he regarded it, it came back to him as a matter of profound regret that the authorities in whose hands lay the question of the education of the clergy had been unable to accept this Amendment which was offered, not in any spirit of hostility to their Church—quite the reverse—but in a spirit of good-will to the Church and also of loyalty to the very idea of a University. It had been said that at Maynooth they were getting a University education. But by the necessities of the case the University could not go to Maynooth, though Maynooth might come to the University. If then in obedience to higher decrees they were obliged to accept the unfortunate arrangement permitted under the Bill, then their only hope was a hope in the future. It was a hope which had been referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, and he believed it was a real hope; but it was no assurance, no guarantee. It was merely a hope and nothing more—the hope that rested on a growing feeling within the Church itself, not only on the part of the laity, but of the bishops, that in the interests of the Church it would be impossible much longer to keep the clergy out of the best education of the time. They must console themselves with that hope; but he did not feel any confidence that the change would come immediately. They were told that by degrees, little by little, first a few and then a larger number of students would be brought up to Dublin from Maynooth and take part in the University studies. He trusted that that might be so; and he thought that the opinion of educated men in this country, and above all the opinion of Catholic laymen, both in England and in Ireland, ought to have some influence on those who determined the destinies of Catholic education in Ireland.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork) said it might be imagined that it would not be easy to say anything that was new in this debate. Quite the contrary. He was deeply sensible of the deference shown by the Nonconformist Party in the House during these debates to Irish Catholic feeling, and also, he must say, of the restraint that they had, in general, put upon the no less natural feeling of their own. But it was for that very reason that he thought it a pity that the Member for West Bromwich should have proposed the Amendment which did something to mar and spoil the grace of the Nonconformist attitude towards the Bill, and which if persevered in would wound Irish feeling to the quick. The matter was one which concerned only and solely Catholic religious liberties, and could not possibly involve any religious disability upon others. He imagined that enlightened men of all creeds should have a common interest in giving Maynooth students every possible facility within their own precincts and in their own special atmosphere for liberal and enlightened education, for every man, every statesman with a head on his shoulders, must know and recognise what a great and powerful influence the clergy of all denominations had over the fortunes of the country in every conceivable circumstance. Were they going to offer these facilities only on condition that the students should to a certain extent throw off their character as ecclesiastics and sever themselves from their own religious associations? If in the Bill provision were made for a residential college in Dublin, unquestionably a much stronger case would have been afforded for insisting that every one of the Maynooth students should come up to Dublin and reside in an establishment which would be under grave and orderly management and discipline. It was solely in view of such an establishment that Dr. O'Dwyer, the President of Maynooth, Dr. Delany, and others, gave evidence before the Royal Commission. But they were doing nothing of the kind; they were simply asking Maynooth students for the two most critical and important years of their lives, to separate themselves from influences of a peculiarly sacred character, and throw themselves into the distractions of a city life. Could hon. Members be astonished, therefore, that the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland should in the most moderate, most reasonable, and most conciliatory language intimate that they could not accept University teaching at such a cost to their ecclesiastical students? The hon. Member who proposed the Amendment had taunted the Nationalist Members that their opposition to the Amendment was based solely on the ground of expense. He thought that was a very unfair representation indeed of the speech which the hon. Member for East Mayo made in Committee. That hon. Member took quite other grounds, and he for one had never based his opposition to the Amendment solely on the ground of expense, important as that was; nor, he must add, merely on the principle of protecting the freedom of the University. There were other grounds. He spoke to men of all Christian persuasions alike, when he said that if there was one feeling of objection more than another to anti-clerical laws, it was the proviso which compelled young ecclesiastical students to quit their seminaries at the very crisis of their lives, and to subject them to the degradations and temptations of barrack life. He did not for a moment suggest that in a city like Dublin, Roman Catholic ecclesiastical students would be exposed to any influences of that kind, through their intercourse with medical and law students in a free University. Quite the contrary. He was sure they would welcome the association with their lay fellow-countrymen. That association was already most free in Ireland in every possible way; but he understood very well indeed the shrinking that the ecclesiastical authorities quite naturally would have from any disturbance of the life of devotion which was essential to the development of the religious avocation in some of its highest and most delicate phases. He was satisfied that on that matter all hon. Members, no matter what their creeds might be, would be on common ground. The hon. Member who proposed the Amendment blurted out the real apprehension which underlay the Amendment—the apprehension that Maynooth would overrun and overshadow and hypnotise the lay elements in the new University—when he described Maynooth as being an Aaron's rod which would swallow up all the colleges. He did not believe that Irish laymen were plants of such tender growth that they required any artificial exotic aid to enable them to take precious good care of themselves. The notion of Maynooth swallowing up the other colleges was a bugbear. Let him remind the House that Maynooth at the utmost could undertake to contribute 100 to 120 students a year, but this number would be utterly swamped and swallowed up by the 3,000 or 4,000 students which there was every reason to anticipate the constituent colleges would send. Suppose a certain number of Irish bishops and priests did obtain a certain reasonable influence in the government of these colleges, as, of course, they would obtain by the votes of the Irish laymen alone, in the name of all that was liberal and enlightened what could be the harm either to learning or morality that the representatives of the highest forces in national life should have a voice, and a powerful voice, in the government of these great institutions, just the same as laymen or lawyers? He did not really know whether hon. Members had read the very interesting report published by the last Government from the British ambassadors abroad as to the treatment Catholic ecclesiastics received in other countries. He thought they would be rather ashamed of the way in which the Catholic party was cold-watered and shoved into the background under this Bill compared with the generous treatment they received from almost all other Protestant countries in the world, including England. In Germany, Hungary, Switzerland, the United States, and in this country, although the Catholics were in a minority the faculty of Catholic theology was freely recognised, and the Universities were governed autonomously by Catholic ecclesiastics. The whole thing was found to work with the best results for liberality and toleration all round. They had been reminded by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford that they were pursuing the same system in England almost everywhere. If he was not mistaken there was, at the present moment, passing through the House a Bill for Durham University having its own faculty of theology. That Bill was passing without demur. The Bill now under discussion did not propose to subsidise Catholic teaching by a single shilling, but what they did ask was that a man should not be denied a University teaching merely because he was at the same time receiving religious teaching, with the provision of which the State had nothing to do. They asked in one word that the students of Maynooth should not be excluded from learning and scientific training merely because they were Catholics. They asked the House to remember that this great institution of Maynooth was founded by a Parliament of Protestant Irishmen for the express purpose of enabling the Catholics of Ireland, without quitting their own walls, to obtain means of higher culture. Let it not be said that in this twentieth century they were less liberal in their interpretation of religious liberty than was the Irish Protestant Parliament. In doing a good work he urged them not to stoop to make these petty reservations in a Bill which undoubtedly, if they had fair play, would be the means of striking off the last shackles of sectarian disability. He hoped the House would not reject this clause. If they did it would be a very serious matter indeed, and he was not sure whether in that event, they might not, in the words of the Chief Secretary "go home."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) expressed the hope that he would say nothing to excite religious hostility on either side. He supported the Amendment because he felt that unless something like it was carried the Bill would not effect the object which those who like himself desired to see a Roman Catholic University established, had in their minds. He had always desired that there should be open to the Roman Catholics of Ireland a University in which should be the free and common life, the common studies, and the free interchange of ideas which those who had had the benefit of an English University education had so fully enjoyed. He hoped that this Irish University would gradually build up for itself that character and would create by the associations it left in the minds of its students that sense of corporate life and loyalty which were the features of the Universities of England. If it was possible, as it was under the Bill, that students in large numbers belonging to a separate institution, wholly dissociated from the new University, should be able to take their degrees in the new University without any association with the students who lived in the constituent colleges in Dublin, then it seemed to him that they might as well have admitted the external students. They would be more loyal members of the University than the student contemplated by this Amendment; for this reason, the external student would have a sense of loyalty and obligation to the body from which he had derived his degree and the educational advantages which came from the study for the degree. In this way he was not sure that the external student would not be a more genuine and loyal member of the new University than the student at Maynooth. What would happen in the case of this affiliated institution? The student would live there; would enjoy the common student life of the institution; he would see nothing of the University, would take no part in its studies, its amusements, its life; his only association with it would be the painful one of preparing himself for examination under its rules to obtain his degree. The position of the affiliated student was less desirable for the purpose of creating the strong corporate life which they wished to see in the new University than was that of the external student whom they had dismissed so summarily on the previous night. It was argued that the Amendment would hamper the freedom of the senate and that the English Universities were left free to affiliate other institutions as they pleased, but those who brought forward and contrasted the charters of the old and new Universities with the proposal contained in this Amendment would have done well to have looked at the practice of the old Universities and seen whether it was the practice of those Universities to admit students to their degrees who had taken no part in their studies of life. In his own University they were opening their doors to students who were unable to go through the full course, but who wished to come up for a particular course of study lasting a short period and take away some record of success in that course. They provided for that by conferring diplomas on students who had obtained a certain proficiency in a particular branch of study, but they drew a marked distinction between the diploma and the degree, and they had always maintained that a man who took the Oxford degree should be an Oxford man and that he could not be an Oxford man unless he had resided for eight terms in the University itself. It might be desirable to alter or reduce the terms, but that a student should have shared the life of the University which conferred on him the degree and gave him the *imprimatur* of a University man seemed to him essential to the character of the University. They were asked why they were suspicious of Maynooth. He thought it was common knowledge that what was contemplated was that Maynooth should be at once affiliated. The very reason that the bishops urged against the Amendment was that it would deprive the Maynooth men of the advantage of taking a degree as they had done at the Royal University. But the Royal University had been condemned on the ground that it did not convey to any of the students any of the advantages of University life. They were founding here a new institution that had to make its way in life, and by its side to claim its degrees they were putting an institution organised and manned with nearly 600 students and eighteen professors, whose government was a strong one and entirely clerical, and whose course of study lasted for seven years. Was it asking too much that, of those seven years, two should be spent in contact with the student life of the new University, so as to ensure that a Maynooth man should be also a Dublin University man, having grateful recollections of the pleasure and benefit he derived from his University career? For anyone to say that to expose these young men to the risk of free life not in a hostel nor under special supervision was to expose them to temptation was to put the character of these young men at a very low point.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN pointed out that what he said was that the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland and all men would welcome free intercourse in an establishment in Dublin under proper management, but that it was wholly improper to allow clerical students to take part in the life of a great city without some supervision over them.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON asked whether it was contended that a student who came from Maynooth and who was going back to Maynooth and was under all the serious obligations which he was to that institution and to the holy profession which he was about to enter was too tender a plant to expose to two years free life among the other students of the college. If so, it was putting humanity at a somewhat low level. It was not a very substantial objection, he thought, to the Amendment before the House. Was it reasonable to expect that, with these two institutions side by side, one of many years standing, established, organised numerically strong, the other a nascent society with its future to make, that one would not overshadow and eclipse the other? He had the greatest desire to see this new institution prosper, and it was with that desire and the hope that Roman Catholic clergy and laity might meet in the new University life and be mutually better for the association, and might, as had happened in English Universities, influence each other for good, that he would vote for the Amendment. He recognised the responsibility of so doing, because they were told that the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church might put a ban upon the new institution if it were not framed altogether as they desired. But was there no responsibility on the hierarchy if, after members on both sides of the House had made great sacrifices in regard to their religious convictions in an earnest attempt to give education which everybody admitted to be desirable for the higher culture of Irish life, they should make it impossible for the institution to work, because they would not admit that a man intended for the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church could be trusted to live in Dublin for two years in association with other students and under all the influences that could be brought to bear upon them without falling into the evil ways of an evil world?

Mr. BIRRELL said he had listened with interest to the two admirable speeches of his hon. friends who had taken up the Amendment which had been pressed upon the Committee by the hon. Member for Cambridge University. They put before the House many academic considerations of considerable value and some importance, but as he listened to their speeches and to that of the hon. Baronet, there were ringing in his ears two famous lines of a famous poem by a famous man who took upon himself to give advice, as he was qualified to do, to scholars. The lines were these—

> "Deign on the passing world to turn thine eyes
> And pause awhile from letters to be wise."

What he wanted for himself and for the House, if possible, was to be wise. What was the situation? People had spoken as if this new University were already in existence. It was still a dream, a hope of the future. Its prosperity and its future were still risky things. People had talked of the money which the Treasury had placed at its disposal. He said nothing of those sums; they were large, but would be nothing but a bagatelle. If this University of Dublin were to be anything more than a tin-plate University, it would have to receive, from the generosity of Irishmen and lovers of education, large, and he might almost say gigantic sums before it could affect to compete with such new Universities as those of Leeds, Manchester, and Liverpool. In these days, when modern learning had developed in many directions, the number of chairs in a modern University was large, and the endowment of those chairs, if meagre as far as the occupant of each chair was concerned, would have to be very large indeed It was, therefore, of the utmost importance that this University and that of Belfast should receive large donations, which would be received by the people for whom they were intended with some degree of enthusiasm, pride, and even joy. Everybody, therefore, must look with a considerable amount of anxiety to the future of these Universities. Everybody must agree that if there were one body of men in Ireland more than another upon whom it was desirable to bestow the benefits of a learned education and the advantage of a degree with the dignity pertaining to it, it was the Roman Catholic clergy. To leave those clergy out of the new University of Dublin would be a fatal error. His academic friends said they wished them to come in, but opposed the conditions. They said: "It is for us, breathing the atmosphere of England, to impose the conditions. We cannot trust the Senate of the University to have proper regard to the honour and dignity of the University of which they are trustees. We will impose the conditions and limitations upon which alone the clergy of the Church of Rome are to receive University honours." Was that wise? Did they suppose that, if they passed the Amendment, they would effect their pur: pose? Did they imagine that the young ecclesiastics of Maynooth would flock into Dublin to the University? If they wanted, by this Amendment, to begin with a quarrel, that would be very far indeed from being wise. Maynooth was a comparatively ancient institution. It was for many years endowed with £26,000 from the pockets of British Nonconformists. The late Mr. Gladstone made a very good bargain, and paid the whole capital sum out of purely Irish money, relieving the Nonconformists of what had been for many years a considerable burden to their consciences. Maynooth had a very considerable reputation. He listened with some surprise to the description given of it by the Member for Cambridge University. The hon. Member spoke of it as a seminary. He did not exactly know what the word meant, but it had a very disagreeable sound, he admitted, in his Nonconformist ears. But suppose they called it a training college for clergy, then his Nonconformist friends might have less difficulty in recognising it. To say that there was no free discussion at Maynooth, to say that nobody ever talked about anything except what was first breathed into his ear by his confessor—well, he was only once at Maynooth, and he discussed almost very subject under heaven, including the character and learning of his hon. friend the Member for the University of Cambridge. He did not deny that, when they were training young men for such a position as that of priests in such a Church as the Church of Rome, and when they remembered that they would be dedicated, the moment they took Orders, to a celibate life, care and delicacy were required in their education. He was not going to enter into a discussion, because it was altogether outside the Bill, as to the benefit which the clergy, let them say of the Church of England, derived from spending a period of their existence before they took Orders at the University of Oxford or Cambridge. There was a good deal to be said in favour of that course, but it was no business of theirs. The question for them was whether, at the outset of the establishment of these two Universities, they were to fix restrictions, in a manner they were unaccustomed to when they were dealing with other Universities, upon the power generally enjoyed by the Senate because they anticipated that they would exercise that power in such a way as to give facilities to the clergy of the Church of Rome to obtain degrees on terms which they could not, as academic persons, wholly approve. Supposing the bishops of the Church of Rome had been very strongly in favour of entering into negotiation for the building of a hostel—and, after all, when they talked about the free life of the University, all they meant was that young gentlemen were to be taken from Maynooth for two years, and, instead of living there, to live in a hostel in the neighbourhood of the University, and there to enjoy all the charm of the friendships they would make in the lecture rooms of the University. He made some enemies in the lecture rooms. He was in favour of having a hostel in Dublin, but it was a mistake to run away with the notion that because they got a hostel in Dublin, they would thereby train up the future clergy of the Church of Rome to the free life and intercourse at present enjoyed by the medical and other students of the colleges in Dublin and other places. Although there was, happily, and in Maynooth in particular, a very strong movement in the direction of some such proposal as was contained in this Amendment, they must leave that spirit to work out itself. At the present moment the bishops, to whom Maynooth belonged, were not prepared to throw open the whole of their doors to their Arts students and say they were at liberty to go up to a University hostel in Dublin. His own feeling was a strong hope that some day they would do so; but this Amendment would not have the effect of making them do so, but precisely the opposite. Shut up their mind against this proposal, and they would begin this new University in Dublin—which he hoped would, in the long years before it, have a glorious, prosperous and useful career—in its early and most troubled days, when it most stood in need of support, moral and financial, with, as he had said, a quarrel, a dispute, with a sense of wrong, because they had deprived the Maynooth people of the opportunities of taking their degree at the Royal University. They had a chance of obtaining degrees at the Royal University after five years. That would be entirely cut off, and, therefore, they would feel that in this great University movement, which they had watched with such eagerness, they, and they alone of all the people of Ireland, were to be left out of its benefits. He therefore objected to the Amendment, not so much because of the academic reasons on which it was founded, but because, so far from favouring the object in view, it would destroy it, and because so far from supporting these new Universities, it would, at the earliest and weakest moment of their existence, deal them an almost deadly blow.

Mr. HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said the Amendment seemed to him a most moderate one, but the right hon. Gentleman had spoken in such a manner as to lead the House to believe that there could be no two sides to the question. He said that to accept the Amendment would be to commence with a quarrel, but with whom would the quarrel be? His right hon. friend was prepared to quarrel with anybody but the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland. When this was suggested in Committee the hon. Member for Waterford read a communication from the Irish bishops as to the effect the Amendment would have, but he thought too much importance had been attached to that communication. It contained a threat, but there was no definite statement in which they said that if the Amendment was accepted the Bill would become useless, and he thought those who wished to give full consideration to the views of the Irish bishops went too far when they assumed that if this moderate Amendment found its way into the Bill the future of the Bill would be jeopardised. It was very extraordinary how those who opposed the Amendment seemed to assume that it would strike a blow at the whole of the studies pursued by the clergy students. It would do nothing of the kind. It only proposed that two years of their Arts course should be spent in a teaching University. What was the use of all those eloquent phrases from his right hon. friend in favour of a teaching University if for the largest portion of the community who were going to receive its degrees they were not to have the advantages of the University as a teaching University? He was told there were 200 Arts students at Maynooth, and was it contended that for a question of the accommodation of 200 students all this objection was raised? Surely it would not tax the consideration of the Roman Catholic Church to make the necessary provision for them. Why could not Maynooth be made a constituent college of the University? He failed to see, if it was all his right hon. friend said it was, why it should not enjoy the advantage of being a constituent college. This Amendment would not deprive clergy students of University training, and if they were to lose their degrees it would be the fault of those who abolished the Royal University. It was not only the clergy students who would lose this right, for there were students now getting degrees from the Royal University from a number of other institutions. Would they not have the same claim for consideration at the hands of the Senate of the University as the Maynooth students had? Why did they impose on other students the necessity of going to Dublin, Cork, or Galway, and only allow this special privilege to a particular college because it happened to be associated with clerical training and under the influence of the bishops? He was struck by the fact that in the whole of the discussion that afternoon everybody had said that the one college to be affiliated was Maynooth, and yet they were constantly told that this would not be a denominational University. If this privilege was such a tremendous necessity for the students at Maynooth, what was going to happen if the Senate of the new Dublin University declined to affiliate or recognise Maynooth College? They did not propose by the Amendment to lay down the principles upon which Irish Roman Catholic clergy students were to be educated, but they did say that if they were to have the stamp of University students and all the honours of a University degree, they should have the same duties and responsibilities of an undergraduate in a residential University that they imposed on other students.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said he regretted that the external students were excluded on the previous night, but they were told that because the external student was excluded they were to act upon the same policy as the horse doctor who had got a horse lame in one foreleg and who knocked him lame on the other so that he would run without a limp. The mover of the Amendment stated that the Chief Secretary had kicked out of the front door the student who was not affiliated with Maynooth, but that the Maynooth student was to go in at the side door. He thought they would all agree that this was a very vital Amendment to the Bill, for it meant either the inclusion or the exclusion of the Catholic student according to how they voted on it. Did the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment wish to exclude the Roman Catholic students? If not, he would point out that it was stated emphatically by those who had the power to speak for them that it would have that effect. What did the hon. Gentleman mean by an undenominational college: that it should be without tests? Surely the Bill laid that down clearly. He would also like to ask his Nonconformist friends if they would accept an Education Bill for England without any tests for teachers or students. Surely that was the claim they were making for the English Education Bill, and if it applied in England they need have no great fear that, with no tests for professors or students, any great danger would come so far as Maynooth College was concerned. He had discovered, so far as he had been able to follow the speech of the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment, a latent fear of Roman Catholicism. He himself had got no such fear. The Bill was framed on democratic lines, and while he was strongly opposed to clericalism, if his creed in a democratic atmosphere could not stand by itself, then so much the worse for his creed. He had every confidence that if this Bill was carried the association of cleric and laymen would be for the benefit of higher education in Ireland, and he therefore hoped and trusted that Nonconformists who were anxious for higher education in that country would not do anything to jeopardise the Bill by supporting the Amendment, but that they would support the Chief Secretary.

*Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside) said he wished to urge one or two political considerations in a debate which had run too much to academic considerations on one side, and theological considerations on the other. The Chief Secretary had pointed out that the House was not entitled to settle such a question on the basis of such purely academic considerations; and he would like to urge on the hon. Member who had moved the Amendment, and on those who supported it, that they were in fact seeking to apply to Ireland a counsel of perfection which had never been applied to England. The hon. Member for Cambridge University, who drew such an attractive picture of an ideal University, was not describing any University which existed. He did not know whether there was anything special in the atmosphere of Maynooth, but he would suggest that there was no ecclesiastical chair in this country which gave the ideal teaching which the hon. Member held out as that which ought to be given in every University. He did not think that the supporters of the Amendment realised that their principle if carried to its logical conclusion would exclude—and it was this which he called a counsel of perfection—all theological chairs from Universities, for this reason, that all theological teaching was preordained teaching, and was incompatible with the ideal modern University. Those who supported this Amendment were all willing to begin to apply to Ireland an extremely high principle in these matters, when no such principle had been applied to England. Stress had been laid by one hon. Member upon the suggested danger of the students of Maynooth becoming graduates and swamping the new Dublin University. Every English and Scottish University was swamped by clerical graduates. In face of that state of things—he did not in the least approve of it—he did not wish to see imposed on the Irish people a counsel of perfection which had never been applied to England and Scotland. The proper way, of course, to settle the Irish University question would have been to give Ireland Home Rule, and let the Irish people settle it themselves. But in this matter the Irish people and the Government were in agreement in proposing a measure which was at least a marked improvement on the state of things that had gone before, and he should strongly deprecate his hon. friends supporting a principle which had never been applied in their own land.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 75; Noes, 216. (Division List No. 218.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beck, A. Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bryce, J. Annan
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Collings,Rt.Hn. J.(Birmingh'm
Cooper, G. J.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Fell, Arthur
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gordon, J.
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hedges, A. Paget
Hill, Sir Clement
Holt, Richard Durning
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Kennaway,Rt. Hon.SirJohnH.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lynch, H. B.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
McArthur, Charles
Massie, J.
Moore, William
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Ridsdale, A. E.
Robinson, S.
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.

Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Dr. Hazel and Mr. Hay Morgan.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allan, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J. T. (Chesh.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jordon, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Symth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Torrance, Sir A. M.

Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

MR. SPEAKER: The next Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for South Antrim seems to me to have been disposed of in the decision the House has come to; and the two Amendments standing in the names of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North-East Down go beyond the scope of the Bill.

*MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) moved to omit the words "requiring the Commissioners to frame a declaration for professors," and insert the following declaration: "I, A. B., do hereby promise that I will faithfully, and to the best of my ability, discharge the duties of professor, and I further promise and engage that in lecturing and examining, and in the performance of all other duties connected with my chair, I will carefully abstain from teaching or advancing any doctrine, or making any statement, derogatory to the truths of revealed religion, or injurious or disrespectful to the religious opinion of any portion of my class." It was proposed by the Bill that the form of declaration should be decided by the Commissioners. He did not wish to detain the House by repeating the arguments which had been used in Committee, but he desired that this declaration should be in the Bill. It had been enforced at the Queen's Colleges for forty years, and in regard to it he had never heard any complaint. Those who supported the Amendment were anxious that it should be retained, and they saw no reason why it should not be. They preferred that it should be inserted in the Bill rather than that it should be left to the Commissioners to decide.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.), in seconding the Amendment, said that as the debate proceeded the statement which they had made from the beginning was more and more confirmed in its accuracy, namely, that this was an absolutely denominational University which was proposed to be set up in Dublin. Indeed he thought it would be quite safe to say that every Member of that House now admitted, if not openly, in his innermost heart, that this was an absolutely denominational institution. In regard to the southern University, if there was to be the slightest hope of those who were in a minority using the free constituent colleges of the University at all, it would be necessary to put in something which would guard those persons' religious opinions very much more effectually than would the ridiculous proposal contained in subsection 2 of Clause 3. He would read that subsection, and ask hon. Members what it meant—

> "Every professor upon entering into office shall sign a declaration in a form approved by the Commissioners under this Act, securing the respectful treatment of the religious opinions of any of his class."

There was no meaning in that whatever. The right hon. Gentleman, he understood, objected to the proposal of his hon. friend, and he had informed them in Committee that he did not know what revealed religion was. He did not say that he knew a very great deal about it himself, but he did know that the persons who, forty or fifty years ago, set the Queen's Colleges on their course, had adopted the formal declaration contained in the Amendment, and ever since it had done good work and had done exactly what was intended. He had never heard any exception taken to it at all until they got into Committee on this Bill. The words contained in the Amendment would have a much more intimidatory effect than the milk-and-water-phrase, "respectful treatment of religious opinions" contained in the Bill. In any case, supposing it was admitted that the form proposed to be inserted in the Bill was not approved, and was not sufficiently clear, what was to happen in regard to the person making a statement derogatory to true revealed religion? At any rate, the form which his hon. friend proposed was a stronger prohibition than that contained in the Bill, and if the right hon. Gentleman desired to protect the religious feelings of all persons attending the University he could not think that he would have the slightest objection to allowing this to be substituted for Subsection 2, which would not be of the slightest use.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 36, to leave out from the word 'sign,' to end of subsection (2) of Clause 3, and insert the words 'I, A. B., do hereby promise that I will faithfully, and to the best of my ability, discharge the duties of professor, and I further promise and engage that in lecturing and examining, and in the performance of all other duties connected with my Chair, I will carefully abstain from teaching or advancing any doctrine, or making any statement, derogatory to the truths of revealed religion, or injurious or disrespectful to the religious opinion of any portion of my class.' "—(*Mr. Barrie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'under' in page 2, line 37, stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL said he was afraid he would be out of order if he embarked on a discussion as to the precise meaning of the words just read out. So far as he was personally concerned, he had never disguised his opinion that it would be much better to have no such declaration at all, for the reasons which had been so admirably stated by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University. Such declarations only acted as a handicap on professors in the free discharge of their duties, and gave opportunity to litigiously disposed persons, or ignorant persons, who might be minded to give some trouble. Therefore, he himself was desirous to have no declaration at all. However, these declarations had extended for so long in Ireland that they were bound to retain something of the kind. There was a feeling that some test should be applied to the good manners of the professors. Everybody agreed that no professor would ever speak disrespectfully of any religious opinions which might be held by a member of his class. Therefore, he had handed over to the very highly educated body of commissioners, who were much better versed in passing such declarations, the duty of proposing a form which would discharge this test of good manners and secure respectful treatment of the religious opinions of members of the class. Certainly that was the only object, and he declined altogether to accept the proposal to reinstate the declaration upon which he would say no more than that it imposed no real test in any shape or form, and seemed to him, at all events, to be almost useless.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said he would draw the attention of hon. Members opposite to the fact that it was sought to make subsection 2 of Clause 3 more stringent and to put a further restriction on liberty; and, further, that all these proposals came from hon. Members above the gangway, who were claiming to have a thoroughly undenominational University, and yet asked for further restriction on the liberty of the teachers.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) said that this Amendment involved a good deal more than a mere question of good manners, as the right hon. Gentleman described it. The words of the Government were to "secure respectful treatment of religious opinions of members of the class." He did not call that a matter of good manners at all; he thought that it was much more a matter of principle.

MR. BIRRELL: It is good manners as well.

MR. MOORE: said that perhaps even more important than good manners was the question of principle. The question was whether the House would settle the terms of the declaration. Hon. Members ought to remember that it was no new limitation which was proposed; it was passed by Parliament in the year 1846 or 1847, and it had continued to be acted upon ever since. Parliament was simply asked now to carry out the existing protection for the religious opinions of the minority. He asked the House to take the matter into its own hands and give protection to the minority in the class, so that their religious opinions might be recognised as a matter of principle, and not merely as one of good manners.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 257 ; Noes, 29. (Division List No. 219.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd.

Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs., N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras,S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J.(Birmingh'm)
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craig, Captain James(Down,E.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Gordon, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham)
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Moore, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert(Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Hugh Barrie and Mr. Lonsdale.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 37, after the word 'Commissioners,' to insert the word 'jointly.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*Sir W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) moved the omission of subsection 3 of Clause 3. The clause was entitled "Prohibition of tests" and subclause (1) laid it down that there was to be no test whatever of religious belief imposed on any person as a condition of becoming or continuing to be a professor, lecturer, fellow, scholar, exhibitioner, graduate, or student. Subsection 3 removed the teachers and professors of theology from the operation of the clause in regard to tests. The object of his Amendment was to restore the Bill to the condition in which it was when it passed Second Reading and to make the prohibition of tests run continuously throughout all faculties alike. He did not know that the precaution against tests was less necessary in the theological than in any other faculty. The Chief Secretary, speaking of these Universities on the First Reading said—

"They are not denominational institutions. They are not marred or disfigured by tests of any sort or kind."

He did not give a definition of denominational or undenominational, but apparently he considered the absence of any disfigurement or marring by tests of any kind or sort essential to undenominational institutions. That should apply in the theological faculty as in any other. They had been told that these were to be as undenominational as other Universities which had recently been created in the United Kingdom. He had looked at the charters of these recently created bodies and did not find in any of them, where the prohibition of tests was laid down, that there was any subclause removing the theological faculty from the general operation of the prohibition against tests. It ought not to be so in this particular case, and they should be in the same position as these recently created Universities. One was not quarrelling with the existence of theological faculties or with the recognition of teachers in theological colleges, or with students graduating in theology, but when it became a question of a University appointment giving the style and *status* and authority of a professor, no test ought to be applied to any candidate for the post. He apprehended that the object of the appointment of a professor, even of theology, was the implanting of knowledge rather than the inculcation of any particular formulary, creed, or belief, and, as they separated tests of faith from tests of knowledge there ought not to be in the case of a professor of theology any inquisition into the particular views he held. He was there to impart knowledge and not to inculcate any particular belief. He hoped and trusted the right hon. Gentleman would allow the Bill to be restored to its original condition and thereby would be able to claim once again that these institutions were not marred or disfigured by any test of any sort or kind.

*MR. HAY MORGAN, in seconding, pointed out that the promoters of the Bill could accept the Amendment without in the slightest degree interfering with the essence of their demand. The professorship of theology was not in the appointment of these Universities. The chair was to be founded by private benefaction, and one might be well assured that the private benefactor would do all that was necessary by way of discovering that the religious opinions of the person whom they offered to the University were of the shade or colour that was most desired. The tested professor was presented to the University. This subsection would enable, if it was so desired, the governing body of the University to test the poor man again. What was the object of putting it in if it was not to enable the governing body of the University to impose another test upon the theological professor? Why not leave the governing body perfectly free of the matter, as they would be with regard to the other Professorships in the University so far as the imposition of a religious test was concerned. He could not understand any Nonconformist Member voting in favour of the retention of the subsection.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 40, to leave out subsection (3) of Clause 3."—(*Sir W. Collins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. DILLON thought the Amendment was moved in an entire misconception of the effect of the subsection. The hon. Gentleman who had seconded the Amendment had said that these appointments, if they were ever made, would not be University appointments at all. The provisions of the Bill made it absolutely clear that the University could appoint no professors of theology of any religious creed. When the Bill was being read a second time the Chief Secretary for Ireland said distinctly that he looked forward to seeing the departments of theology in the colleges in the course of the future founded altogether by private endowment. The way in which that would work out as they understood it was, as in the case of Universities in this country, that the Chair would be endowed, presumably by adherents of one form of religion, under a deed of trust which would set forth all the conditions of the appointment to the Chair. They would then offer the Chair to the University, which would inspect the deed of trust and examine all the circumstances connected with the appointment to the Chair, and, if they found nothing objectionable in it, would accept the professor. But it did not follow from that, nor would it ever follow in the natural course, that the University would have the appointment, then or in the future, of the Professor of Theology. He would be appointed under a deed of trust by the founders of the Chair and their successors. That was the only way he believed in which faculties of theology could arise in connection with the Universities under this Bill. There was the most absolute liberty to any body or religious creed to endow professorships of theology or any subject connected with theological study. But it was doubtful whether it might not be held that in a deed of trust certain religious formularies, which were not uncommon in these matters, he believed, making certain provisions part of the deed of trust, might not put coercion on the University to say: "We refuse to accept this professorship because there are certain conditions in the deed of trust." That was the whole effect of the clause. —to set free the hands of the University —to leave it absolutely free to accept a professorship, founded by private endowment, under such conditions, or not. That was the whole effect and he could not imagine that any objection could be taken to it. Not one farthing of public money under any circumstances was involved.

MR. BUTCHER thought the account which the hon. Member for East Mayo had given was perfectly correct. The subsection should be read in connection with Clause 7, subsection 4 (*c*) which provided that Chairs of theology might be instituted by private benefaction. The University did not itself appoint these Chairs, but the University might recognise any professor in theology appointed by a private trust. Unless there was some such provision as this, no professor of theology could be recognised. In the Catholic church a professor of theology could not be a person appointed without a test, and the only question was, could there be a faculty of theology in these Universities or not. In his opinion they ought to have the power, that all Universities that he knew of had, of having a faculty of theology. In foreign Universities there were sometimes three faculties of theology in the same University.

MR. BIRRELL quite agreed with the two hon. Gentlemen who had spoken. It was never intended that the section should enable a University to apply any test to any privately endowed chairs, and if any words were required to make it plain, he would consider them, but he thought it was all right as it stood. The clause said that no test should be imposed on any person. Then some kind person endowed a Chair of Catholic theology or Protestant theology, or what was better still, of true theology. They appointed a certain number of electors who were the proper persons to fill the Chair when it became vacant. The University had no concern with it. He did not know whether they would impose a test or not. He held that every professor of Catholic theology had to make a declaration at some time of his fitness for the post, but the University would not concern itself in any way with it, or impose any test on him. Some such words as these were necessary, because obviously in the case of a professor of theology, it would be rather difficult to impose on him a declaration that he was never to say anything that in any way interfered with the religious opinions of other persons. It was his duty to expound theology, and some theological opinion might possibly be treated as disagreeable or untrue by some person listening to him. Although he was quite prepared to consider whether there was any dubiety, let them all be agreed that it was the intention of the Act not to impose any test upon anyone who occupied the *status* of a professor. A privately-endowed Chair was filled by a person who, perhaps, had submitted at some time to the test of fitness to be a candidate for the Chair. He then became a professor of the University. Thereupon, someone rose up and said: "Here is a professor of the University, and yet a test has been submitted to him." It was in order to avoid a controversy of that kind that these words were inserted, and he thought they were necessary.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS said that so long as the words to which he had taken exception remained in the clause he must press his Amendment.

MR. MASSIE said the words of the clause appeared to bring the University within the range of applying a test to professors. Surely they could have some words put in to make it clear that no test was intended.

MR. BIRRELL said he was quite prepared to consider that point, and meet it in another place if it was found to be necessary. He would undertake that there should be no test whatever.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS said that on the understanding that no religious test would be applied to any candidate for a

University appointment, he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, lines 31 and 32, to leave out the words 'withhold his assent from,' and to insert the words 'disallow.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BUTCHER said the Amendment he had to propose had for its object to secure that in the case of University statutes there should be an appeal to the Privy Council. The procedure was contained in Clause 5, and it was provided that the statutes were to be laid upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament. His purpose was to secure that in the case of an alteration of the statutes or the adding of any new statutes there should be an effective appeal to the Privy Council, and in doing that the House would only be following University precedents. There was such an appeal in the case of the statutes of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London, the Scottish Universities and also in the more modern Universities of Manchester, Liverpool and Leeds, where he found that no Amendment could have any effect until it was allowed by a Committee of the Privy Council. He wanted to secure that the Irish statutes for the new Universities should receive the same consideration and have the same safeguard. It would be observed that he proposed an appeal to a committee of the Irish Privy Council. There was in England a Universities' Committee of the Privy Council and also a Scottish Committee of the Privy Council, but there was no such thing existing in Ireland, although he did not think there would be any difficulty in forming a Committee of the Irish Privy Council for the purpose of considering any statute. He begged to move.

Mr. MOORE said he wished to second this Amendment for the reasons which had been put forward by his hon. friend. This proposal might avoid a hardship being placed upon some outside body. Take for example the Royal College of Surgeons. If a statute was made which might affect the right they enjoyed as a corporation in respect to their students there was under the Bill as it stood at present no provision by which they could obtain redress except the cumbrous one of coming to this House and moving to alter a regulation which had been laid on the Table. It was desirable that they should have a local Court of Appeal on the spot, and, following the example of the London University, if such an appeal were allowed it would be useful to redress any grievance, and it was the only remedy which an outside corporation had against the statute.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 35, at the end, to insert the words '(3) The governing body of a university or constituent college to which this Act applies, or any other person, corporation, or body directly affected by such statute, may, within three months from the notification thereof in the *Dublin Gazette*, petition His Majesty in Council to disallow the whole or any part thereof. (4) His Majesty in Council may refer any such petition to a Committee of the Privy Council in Ireland with a direction that the Committee hear the petitioner personally or by counsel, and report specially to His Majesty in Council on the matter of the petition. (5) If the Committee report in favour of the disallowance of the statute or any part thereof, His Majesty may, by Order in Council, disallow the whole or part thereof accordingly, but any such disallowance shall be without prejudice to the making of a new statute. (6) The costs of any petition hereunder may be regulated by the Committee to which the petition is referred.'"—(*Mr. Butcher.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. BIRRELL said that there was agreement as to the form of appeal recognised in most of the other Universities. His only difficulty, however, in accepting the Amendment was that there was not in the Privy Council a body corresponding to the Universities Committee. He did not know whether there would be any difficulty in setting up a Universities Committee of the Privy Council here, but if those who knew Ireland better than he knew it were of opinion that this step could be taken, then the Amendment, of course, would be only following precedent. At the present time he was not quite in a position to accept it, but, subject to communications from Ireland on the subject, he would be willing to consider the introduction of the Amendment elsewhere.

MR. BUTCHER thought the Chief Secretary might have accepted this Amendment off-hand. Up to the present the right hon. Gentleman had not accepted a single Amendment on the Paper.

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, I have.

MR. BUTCHER said that in another part of the Bill an arrangement had been made for an appeal to the Irish Privy Council, and looking at the large number of distinguished men who formed that Council there ought to be no difficulty in getting some of the Judges and others to serve on a committee. As the Chief Secretary had promised to look into the matter he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG moved an Amendment in Clause 6 (Establishment of Commissions) providing for the representation of "a person nominated by the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, and a person nominated by the Royal College of Science, Dublin." He had put this Amendment down in order to see whether the right hon. Gentleman could give him any more information about the Royal College of Surgeons. He thought they ought to have representatives from the two bodies named in his Amendment upon the governing body in connection with these Universities. He begged to move.

MR. LONSDALE seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 2, after the first word 'of, to insert the words 'a person nominated by the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, and a person nominated by the Royal College of Science, Dublin, and.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said that he had already declared why he had found it impossible to make all the appointments those of representative persons. The Royal College of Surgeons had waited on him and the Prime Minister in order to lay their case before them as to the effect of competition with the new University. The colleges had no need to be alarmed, and the Prime Minister, who was an emotional man, said that he would look into the subject. The other day, in answer to a Question, he stated that the charters would provide for a full recognition of their schools and classes, and in that sense they would not be damnified by the establishment of the new University. It was also stated that if it were proved after a time they had suffered materially by the competition it would be a subject for the favourable consideration of the Exchequer.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said there was considerable sympathy with the College of Surgeons, but he thought the statement of the Prime Minister had gone a long way to allay any anxiety. He regarded the concession as a valuable one.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the Chief Secretary had not given them a definite undertaking or a pledge on this point. He had simply told them that if, in years to come, the Royal College of Surgeons found that it had been detrimentally affected by the operation of the new University their case would be considered. Personally he was inclined to go to a division in order to emphasise this point. When they placed a new University alongside the Royal College of Surgeons it stood to reason that they would inflict a very serious injury upon that College. Under the circumstances he would be satisfied with his protest, and he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BIRRELL moved in Clause 6, after the word "period" to insert the words "not exceeding one year." It was thought desirable that there should be a limitation upon the period during which the Commissioners should exercise their power.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 4, after the word 'period,' to insert the words 'not exceeding one year.'" —(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

CAPTAIN CRAIG moved to leave out Clause 7, which, he said, carried out the money Resolution passed in Committee of the House. He took exception to the unfair way in which the moneys were allocated. Neither the schedule nor the clause put any limit on the sum which might be paid towards the southern University. The Bill was wrong all through. In regard to finance the country was asked to spend a sum of money for which it was to get no adequate value. In spite of the large sum which was to be spent not a single man would get a better education than he could get at present, and not a single man would get a degree who could not get it now. What they were asked to spend on this project made it far too dear. If the Chief Secretary had never interfered in Irish education the country would have been £2,700,000 richer than it was to-day. Clause 7 was the worst clause in the worst possible Bill that had ever been presented to the House in regard to University education in Ireland. There was no question in the world about that. He felt so strongly opposed to this clause that, if he were the only person in the lobby, he would go to a division. He begged to move.

Mr. MOORE, in seconding the Amendment, said that Clause 7 contained some matter which it would be more difficult for the followers of the Government to swallow than some of the other matters in the Bill, because with the full concurrence of the Chief Secretary power was given to applying public money to the purchasing of sites in the proposed University and to the building of denominational places of worship. It also authorised that the class rooms and lecture rooms might be applied to the teaching of a particular religion. They were told at the same time that the scheme was entirely undenominational, and he had no doubt that they would be told so again by the Chief Secretary. He concurred with what his hon. and gallant friend had said upon the financial side of the question. It always happened when this Government had to treat the conflicting claims of north and south in the distribution of money the excessive claims of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway representing southern constituencies received chief consideration.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Clause 7."—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word "sums" in page 5, line 15, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he wondered if the hon. and learned Gentleman when he walked up Whitehall veer contemplated the beautiful buildings which had been put up at the cost of the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. The hon. and learned Gentleman had voted for the erection of the Government offices in London for which the money was found out of the general taxation, though they were of absolutely no benefit to Ireland. The sum of £10,000,000 had been spent in that way. There was one of the buildings alone which he never looked a without feeling a land hunger, for it cost £3,000,000. He entirely deprecated the suggestion that the south of Ireland would deprive the north of anything it was entitled to, or that hon. Gentlemen who represented the Presbyterian cause in the north were to be deprived of a single sixpence which they could get out of the Treasury. On the contrary, the more they got the merrier he and his friends would be. It was entirely unfair to say that in the south they were getting any superior sum. But if it were true, they could not forget the fact that the Catholics of Ireland were three-fourths of the people. What he complained of was that the financial proposals of the Bill, instead of being too large as the hon. and gallant Gentleman stated, were a little too tight. Subsection (2) of the clause said—

> "There shall be annually paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for the general purposes of the new university having its seat at Belfast, and the constituent colleges of the new university having its seat at Dublin, the sums specified in Part I. of the Third Schedule to this Act."

The hon. and learned Gentleman argued from that that the schedule gave unlimited power. The truth was that the schedule was too tight. Supposing they needed more money, they would be prevented by the Bill as it stood from getting it. What was really wanted was a rather looser framework than this clause. He had not the smallest doubt that the University in Belfast would be a great success. It would be one of the greatest glories of the north, and it would come back to Parliament for more money. He would advise the hon. and gallant Gentleman, instead of putting further fetters on the Government, to endeavour to get the clause made a little looser. In three or four years time all this religious fighting and wrangling would have entirely evaporated on both sides and they would be knocking at the door of this House and asking for more money.

Amendment negatived.

*MR. MASSIE moved to amend the proviso of Clause 7 by inserting after the word "benefactions," the words "and so long as the professorship or lectureship is titular only, and does not admit to the electoral, representative, or administrative powers of the ordinary professors or lecturers of the university, whether as to the senate or the academic council or the general board of studies or any faculty except the faculty of theology, if and when such is constituted" He observed that the Chief Secretary had to some extent met the Amendment by the revised charter for the University to have its seat in Dublin, Section xiv (4) of which now reads as follows:—"A professor of or lecturer in theology shall not be eligible for membership of the general board of studies or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology." If the right hon. Gentleman would put what he had read from the charter into the Bill as well he would be perfectly prepared to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 37, after the word 'benefaction,' to insert the words 'and so long as the professorship or lectureship is titular only, and does not admit to the electoral, representative, or administrative powers of the ordinary professors or lecturers of the university, whether as to the Senate or the academic council or the general board of studies or any faculty except the faculty of theology, if and when such is constituted.'"—(*Mr. Massie.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he deprecated very much any war on the question of theology. He did not see any reason why a professor of theology should be treated with more suspicion than any other kind of professor. He had no objection to the words of the charter to which his hon. friend referred being inserted in the Bill, but he did not quite know which would be the best place to insert the Amendment. Perhaps his hon. friend would allow it to be inserted in another place.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) asked whether there was anything to prevent a professor of an ordinary subject, say, mathematics, or mental and moral philosophy, from holding at the same time a professorship of theology provided that he did not take any money for the discharge of the duties in connection with the professorship of theology.

MR. BIRRELL said he should like to have notice of that Question.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS said it was quite a possible thing that such professorships might be combined.

MR. BIRRELL said he was quite willing to consider the question.

MR. MASSIE asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. HOLT (Northumberland, Hexham) moved an Amendment to provide that in the event of any professor or lecturer being recognised under subsection (4) of Clause 7 the governing body of the University should not refuse recognition on equal terms to other professors or lecturers in theology or divinity on the ground of their theological opinions. It had always been understood that this was an unsectarian and undenominational University, and that under this Bill there would be absolute liberty for any person to endow chairs of theology. He wished to put that down in black and white. He understood the hon. Member for East Mayo to say that he and his hon. friends who represented the Catholics of Ireland were in favour of that equality of treatment. There were other people in Ireland besides Catholics and Presbyterians, and he wished to keep the door open to them so that they might have the same advantages.

MR. WILLS (Dorsetshire, N.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 41, after the word 'funds,' to insert the words 'and in the event of any professor or lecturer being recognised under this subsection the governing body of the University shall not refuse recognition on equal terms to other professors or lecturers in theology or divinity on the ground of their theological opinions.—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL did not think it would be wise to compel any University to receive a chair in theology or divinity simply because it was offered. It was obvious they must exercise some control over their chairs and faculties, and it might possibly be that someone interested in the propagation of some theological opinion of his own might grant money for the purpose of a professorship which would obviously make any learned body ridiculous were they to accept it. He, therefore, could not accept the Amendment.

Mr. MOORE expressed the hope that the mover of the Amendment would go to a division. He moved this Amendment in the Committee upstairs and they got an equally halting and unsatisfactory reply then. If a Roman Catholic professorship was recognised in the new Dublin University, and if the money was forthcoming, it was right, at any rate, that provision should be made for giving similar recognition to professorships in connection with the Protestant denominations of the country. [An Hon. Member: "Christian Science, for example."] The conditions being equal, he thought it would be right for the governing body to consider and decide whether "Christain Science" came within the definition of "theology or divinity." It would be a thoroughly unfair thing to allow the governors to recognise a chair of theology or divinity for one church and not for another. In Belfast there would probably be Presbyterian and Episcopalian professorships of theology endowed out of private sources, but if the governing body did not give equal treatment to Roman Catholics, the bishops and the priests would come out again with the cry that it was a Godless University. He wished to have equal treatment for all churches.

Mr. HOLT asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Leave refused.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 41; Noes, 260. (Division List No. 220.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn Sir Alex.F
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bryce, J. Annan
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clark, George Smith
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grnst'd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur

Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gordon, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Holt, Richard Durning
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Dublin,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Moore, William

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seaverns, J. H.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Valentia, Viscount
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Hugh Barrie and Captain Craig.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William

Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHn SirJ.T(Cheshire
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley

Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.

Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, Jodn
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Percy, Earl
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Snowden, P.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

*MR. MASSIE moved to omit from subsection (4) of the clause paragraph (b), which gave permission to the University authorities to allow the erection of a chapel within the precincts of the University. This paragraph was not originally in the Bill, and it owed its insertion to an Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Cambridge University and accepted by the Chief Secretary. He was sure that it was moved in all good nature; and with characteristic good nature it was accepted, but, he was inclined to think, with some inadvertence. He would not be surprised to know that the Chief Secretary was nodding with most excusable fatigue. It was a well meaning insertion, but he feared that it was rather precipitate, that it was gratuitous, and that it was mistaken altogether. It had not been asked for either by ecclesiastics or by politicians, and he thought it was an unfortunate concession because it had created an artificial difficulty. At the time it was accepted it was a breach, an unconscious breach, of a pledge which had been given that no public money should be spent for any religious purpose. Of course the site on which the church or chapel would be built would be land purchased with public money. It had been suggested, and indeed practically offered, that the site should be repurchased with private money, and in that way of course the pecuniary objection would be overcome, and the original pledge of the Chief Secretary would remain inviolate. But while the price of the site, which was a minor difficulty, would be taken out of the way, a much greater difficulty would be left untouched. It was not so much the value of the site as the site itself that was the difficulty. The presence of a denominational chapel within the precincts of the University would be flatly opposed to the idea of the Bill. On paper at any rate the Bill was undenominational, but paragraph (*b*) for the erection of a chapel was on paper denominational, and would allow a foothold for denominationalism within the precincts of the University. It was more than merely on paper, because it was a solid and an ostentatious foothold. It gave room for the flag of a particular denomination to be planted proclaiming that the precincts of the University were the peculiar ground of one denomination. That at once affected the conception of the University and produced a conception contrary to the idea of the Bill. Many of them had already expressed the hope that Catholics would come to the University of Belfast and Protestants to the University which was to have its seat in Dublin, without feeling that they were aliens in a strange land. But if a chapel met them in the precincts of the University they would instantly recognise the symbol of an opposing ascendancy just as they did in the presence of a chapel within the precincts of Trinity College, Dublin, and they would be jarred by a note of discord and inequality. It was quite irrelevant to plead that in Oxford and Cambridge each college had its chapel within its precincts, or that in the precincts of Trinity College, Dublin, there was an Episcopalian Chapel. These were old institutions and the tokens of ancient exclusiveness could not easily be removed, and could only be slowly modified, and Trinity College, Dublin, should not be imitated on the side of its exclusiveness. No University recently founded within this kingdom had a church or chapel within its precincts. The idea was opposed to the idea of the Bill: it tended to thwart the hopes they entertained of a true catholicity in a free University: it was not asked for, and, as he thought, it was unfortunately given in inadvertence and in haste; and he pleaded that with consideration and at leisure the permission should now be withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 1, to leave out paragraph (*b*) of subsection (4) of Clause 7."—(*Mr. Massie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL said it was perfectly true that this particular subsection was not in the original Bill, and if it were the fact that, from the point of view of hon. Members behind him, the Bill had been made worse during its progress through Committee, the hon. Member for Cambridge University must be regarded as its evil genius. But, speaking quite frankly, he personally could see no reason why a University of this description should not have a church or chapel, particularly as the technical objection could be got over not only as regarded the site itself, but that the very bricks and mortar of the new chapel could be provided by private benefaction. The pledge that no public money should be devoted to sectarian purposes could be strictly maintained. His hon. friend who now moved the omission of this subsection had said that no analogy could be drawn from Oxford and Cambridge, because they were old institutions. The Church of Rome was, after all, an old institution, too. He saw no particular reason why, in a college which he had hoped, and still hoped, would be a residential college, there should not be planted, even within the precincts of the University, a church or chapel dedicated to the worship of Almighty God. He drew no strong distinction between the worship of Almighty God on one side of a wall and the other. He agreed that the erection of a chapel was not contemplated by him when he drew the Bill, nor was any demand or request ever made for it except at the instance of the hon. Member for Cambridge University, but, having been inserted in the Bill, he could not disguise from himself the fact that its withdrawal would not unnaturally excite a certain amount of feeling. Some of his hon. friends had addressed him almost as men about to die at the hands of outraged constituents on account of the pressure the Bill was putting on the consciences of Nonconformists. Hon. Gentlemen opposite who anticipated disaster to the Liberal Party in consequence of this measure would find their cheerful hopes entirely dissipated. At the same time the provision was not in the Bill when he introduced it, or during the Second Reading stage, and as undoubtedly it did introduce a new principle in modern Universities—[AN HON. MEMBER: Mansfield.] Mansfield College was not a University. It was a college, not a University, and was not, so far as he knew, built with public funds. He was, therefore, prepared, not without some personal regret that this should be forced on him, but fully recognising the great loyalty and generosity which his hon. friends behind him had exhibited throughout, to assent to the excision of the subsection, and he was sure he might rely on the warm support of hon. Gentlemen opposite whose souls, he knew, were very much disturbed by the idea of a chapel being built within the precincts of the University.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he had heard with great regret the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. It was true that the subsection was not put into the Bill at the invitation of the Irish Party. They did not ask for it, but having been inserted he extremely regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had agreed to strike it out. On the merits of the question he could not, for the life of him, see what objection any hon. Member could have to the provision. There was, of course, the technical objection as to site; that the land would be purchased by public money under a scheme under which it had been said that no public money would be devoted to denominational purposes. That objection could be removed, however, by inserting the condition that the site would only be given if it were purchased from private sources under conditions imposed by the Senate. He saw no objection in principle to that. Every college in Oxford and Cambridge had its chapel, and there was also a chapel in Trinity College, Dublin. An hon. Gentleman for one of the constituencies in Yorkshire had said that a way to settle the matter from a Catholic point of view was for Catholics to go to Trinity College and that another denominational chapel should be provided for them in that college. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment had stated that in none of the new Universities recently created was there a chapel. That was not exactly the point. The point was, was there anything in the constitution of these Universities to prevent a chapel being built within the precincts? He did not think there was; and he did not think that they had any right to impose upon this new University whose seat was to be in Dublin a disability which was not to be found in the constitution of the other new Universities in England. Their hope was that this should be a residential college, and in a residential college they had a right to have a chapel for the denomination to which the students belonged. He wished to express his regret and the regret of his friends at the decision arrived at by the Chief Secretary, but he thought that under the circumstances the least they could do was to record their vote against the Amendment.

*MR. BUTCHER said that as the evil genius of this amended Bill he would like to say one word about this subsection, the omission of which had been moved. He must say he knew at the time he proposed its insertion that it was going a little bit on the border line to suggest that a site bought by public money should be given for the erection of a chapel to be paid for privately, but that seemed a very narrow and technical objection to take. Yet if there were, on the other side of the House, some disturbed consciences which would be relieved by the easy method of the excision of these few words, he did not wish to prevent the placating of their consciences. He would only say that his idea in making the proposal and certain other Amendments which he had suggested was really to allow the Roman Catholics as Roman Catholics to make provisions for the furnishing of their University with those varied elements which had been historically associated with the life of a University and with a residential college.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he did not desire to prolong the discussion, as the Chief Secretary wished to bring the proceedings to a close in a reasonable time. He suggested, however, that if that was the right hon. Gentleman's wish he should not offer to the House such interesting subjects of debate as the probable effect of the passage of the Bill on the Liberal Party. If the Chief Secretary threw down challenges of that kind he must not assume that they on that side of the House were not prepared to take them up, or that they did not hold strong views upon them. Nor must he assume that they did not believe that when the proper time came to test those views it would be found that those of his friends were more correct than the right hon. Gentleman's. He merely said that by way of *caveat*. He was in this peculiar position—he spoke for himself alone—that he regretted the action taken by the Chief Secretary in omitting this section. He hoped that this University would be to a very large extent a denominational University, and if it had been started upon those lines its future prosperity would depend to a very large extent upon the enthusiasm which the Catholic Church in Ireland brought to bear upon it. It seemed to him that if a University was to be established in Ireland which was to satisfy the Catholic population of that country, it must be an educational centre in an atmosphere distinct from that of Trinity College, and it was amazing that in the new University they were not to be allowed the privilege which was already enjoyed in other similar institutions of having a chapel of their own. He could not appreciate the sense of the view which led to the support of this particular Amendment, but the Chief Secretary had adopted it and he congratulated the House on the admirable way in which this part of the proceedings had been carried through. All he could say was that it showed that it was not argument but some totally different motive which prevailed in accepting or rejecting Amendments. The course taken by the Chief Secretary threw a flood of light upon the character of the proceedings. The acceptance of this Amendment was a sort of peace-offering to those of the right hon. Gentleman's supporters who had behaved well. It was not arguments which always carried Amendments; the time occasionally came when it was thought desirable "to give a little bit of sugar to the bird." The Amendment was not an improvement upon the Bill, it was not another step to meet the just requirements of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, but was simply in order that the proceedings on the Government side of the House might be harmonious and peaceful towards the close. He could say of his friends that they were not by any means duped or deceived by what was going on, but they felt at the same time that they were not likely to receive any of the sugar. He believed that they would be wisely guided if they abbreviated any recommendations they had to make, having regard to the fact that in all their Amendments they had striven to make the Bill undenominational in its character.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth) said that he regretted he was obliged to separate himself from his Nonconformist friends on this occasion. He was a Liberal and had no great affection for clerical interference, but he had an affection for religion, and he regretted the excision of this subsection from the Bill, because he regarded it as the only undenominational part of the Bill. It was, he thought, monstrous, if they had Presbyterian students attending these Universities, that they should not have the fullest means of worshipping God according to their consciences.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 111; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 221.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Boland, John
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clancy, John Joseph
Clive, Percy Archer
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dillon, John
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gardner, Ernest
Gilhooly, James
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrington, Timothy

Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
McHugh, Patrick A.
McKean, John
McKillop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N.)
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Mooney, J. J.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Valentia, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Brooke, Stopford

Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clark, George Smith
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)

Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gordon, J.
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)

Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J, R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
McArthur, Charles
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mond, A.
Moore, William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nuttall, Harry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C.E(Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Rees, J. D.
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, RtHn.SirThomas P
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 6, line 25, to leave out the word 'senate,' and to insert the words 'governing body.'"

"In page 6, line 26, to leave out the word 'their,' and to insert the word 'the.'"

"In page 6, line 26, after the word 'colleges,' to insert the words 'of the new University having its seat at Dublin.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. T. M. HEALY moved the addition to the clause of a declaration that nothing in this section should preclude any money being provided by Parliament, in addition to the sums provided under the section, for the purposes of the Universities and colleges.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, at the end of the clause, to add the words 'Nothing in this section shall preclude any money being provided by Parliament in addition to the sums provided under this section, either in augmentation of any sums contributed for the purpose of the Universities or colleges from other sources, or otherwise.'"—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

*MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) moved to omit Clause 8 (Application of surplus of fee fund for the purposes of Universities and colleges). It was within the knowledge of all the friends of the technical instruction movement in Ireland that while the Treasury grant for that purpose was only £55,000, they had been getting a little help from this source also. It was with the utmost surprise and disappointment that they now found it was proposed, without explanation, to take away a sum, amounting roughly to about £7,000, which it had been hoped to utilise in aid of the work of technical education in Ireland. As one interested in that work, he protested strongly against the fund being diverted from the purpose for which it was earmarked to the new Universities. Such action was unfair and entirely without warrant, and should be reconsidered even at that late stage of the proceedings. In answer to a Question put down the other day the House was informed that almost all the modern Universities in England had been started on their career with grants of only £2,000 per annum. They found the new University in Dublin starting out with an income of £42,000 per annum, supplemented by a very large building grant, and as if that were not sufficient they had this comparatively poor and struggling technical department robbed of some £7,000. Technical instruction urgently required the additional grant which had been earmarked for it. He begged to move.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) seconded. He said that although he fully recognised that the Universities needed the money, he seconded the Amendment, not because he loved the Universities less, but because he loved technical instruction more.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 40, to leave out Clause 8."—(*Mr. Barrie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'for,' in page 7, line 2, stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL said that this matter was fully explained in Committee. It was not quite accurate to say that this fund was earmarked for technical education. It was set apart in order to meet certain demands which had to be met year by year. The last person who had any claim on the fund died some time ago, and the fund was entirely released. It then became a question as to what was to be done with it. On consideration of the question, and in view of the fact that these Universities wanted all the money they could possibly get, they thought this was the most admirable and proper use which could be made of the money.

MR. MOORE said a definite appropriation of this fund was made by Act of Parliament, and because it was held in suspense to meet certain charges was not sufficient ground for saying that the money could be appropriated by that House for other matters.

MR. GORDON (Londonderry, S.) said that technical instruction in Ireland would suffer by the withdrawal of this money, and he did not think anyone wanted to see technical instruction in Ireland in any way weakened or hampered by want of funds. It would not confer any benefit on Ireland to take away money devoted to a very useful form of education for the purpose of giving it to the new Universities. The right hon. Gentleman had said that money would be required for the Universities, but they should find it from some other source instead of robbing this fund.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 33. (Division List No. 222.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir S. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)

Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor(Mon., S.)
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, S.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift

MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Francis E.(Leitrim,N.)
Meehan, Patrick A.(Queen'sCo.)
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast')
Nolan, Joseph
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon

Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wason, Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry(Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Clark, George Smith
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Hamilton, Marquess of

Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter-Dublin,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacVeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Moore, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease,Herbert Pike-Darlington
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Hugh Barrie and Mr. Gordon.

MR. BIRRELL moved to omit "Saint" before "Cecilia Street School." This was not a denominational point, but a merely topographical expression.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 1, to leave out the word 'Saint.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. BIRRELL said the next Amendment which he desired to move was for the purpose of securing that persons who had succeeded in passing their degrees at the Royal University should obtain them even after the expiration of the five years on conditions not more onerous than those under which they could obtain corresponding degrees in the Royal University of Ireland.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 37, at end, to add the words and the governing body of each of the two new universities shall, so far as practicable, provide for any such students obtaining degrees on conditions not more onerous than those under which they could obtain corresponding degrees in the Royal University of Ireland.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

In page 11, line 24, to leave out the word 'six,' and to insert the word 'seven.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 11, line 38, after the word 'provided,' to insert the words 'and in conditions specified.'"—(*Mr. Kettle.*)

"In page 11, line 39, at end, to add the words 'and in the case of an existing officer who holds his office during the pleasure of His Majesty shall be so re-appointed if His Majesty directs, notwithstanding anything in the statutes of the University or college.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 12, line 13, at end, to insert the words 'but no such provision need be made by the scheme for any existing officers who are appointed to offices in either of the two new universities, or of any of the constituent colleges of the new University having its seat at Dublin by virtue of the charter of the University or college.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 13, line 4, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'or of any charter granted thereunder.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 13, line 4, after the word 'accepts,' to insert the words 'or is appointed to.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 14, line 22, at end, to insert the words 'The costs of all parties of and incident to an appeal shall be in the discretion of the committee by whom the appeal is heard.'"

"In page 14, line 26, at end, to insert the words 'and the mode in which any costs allowed may be recovered.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In Schedule 1, page 16, line 19, at beginning, to insert the words 'Members of Convocation.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Amendments agreed to, without discussion.

MR. MOORE moved an Amendment to provide that in the case of the Dublin University there should be one member representing the Dublin Chamber of Commerce. In the Belfast University there was to be a member of the Belfast Chamber of Commerce. He did not wish to alter the symmetry of the right hon. Gentleman's numbers, so he proposed to allow three co-opted members instead of four and to have the difference made up by one from the Dublin Chamber of Commerce. He moved this at the special request of the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University who was detained in Ireland. He should not have moved it had it not been on behalf of his hon. friend. They had made the best fight they could and had been outvoted on all occasions, irrespective of argument. At that time of day nothing was gained by doing more than allowing the Government to have their way, which they had insisted on having by the aid of the majority which was at their command.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What about the Dublin Port and Docks Bill?

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 20, to leave out '4,' and insert '3.'"—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That '4' stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL said he could not accept this proposal now. It was discussed very carefully upstairs, and he had already repeated the reasons he had given why it was found impossible to recognise all the various representative bodies, many of whom had as strong claims to be represented as the Chamber of Commerce. He would be very sorry to see the co-opted members reduced even by one.

Amendment negatived.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS moved the Amendment in his name to give representation on the Senate of the Belfast University to the Technical Instruction

Committee, which was the governing body of the Belfast Technical Institute. He said very strong representations had been made by the Belfast Technical Institute that they should be represented on the new University. The Chief Secretary had said it was very difficult, if not impossible, to accede to all the claims for representation, but it was highly desirable that institutions like the Belfast Technical Institute, which was erected at a cost of over £100,000, and had excellent appliances for giving technical instruction, should be closely associated with the work that was now carried on in Queen's College, and would in future be carried on in the University at Belfast.

MR. J. DEVLIN said he would like to join in the appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to accede to the very legitimate request made in this Amendment. As one of the representatives of Belfast who was in favour of the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman, and who resented very strongly the statements which had been made that Belfast was opposed to the University proposals, he pressed upon him the importance of acceding to the large volume of public opinion in favour of the proposal.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, after line 5, to insert the words 'Elected by the Belfast Technical Instruction Committee.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he was quite prepared to consent to the Motion.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) as representing one of the constituencies of Belfast thanked the right hon. Gentleman for the concession he had made. He thought all the Members for Belfast might agree that his readiness to meet their wishes was an evidence of the desire to meet fairness when fairness was put forward. In this case he had certainly met the wishes of Belfast as a whole, and he thanked him very much.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 13, to leave out '4,' and insert '3.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Question proposed, "That '4' stand part of the Bill."

Sir Philip Magnus.

MR. BIRRELL said he did not think the Amendment was at all necessary.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 18, line 2, to leave out the words 'a majority of the Commissioners,' and to insert the words 'at least five members of the joint committee.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS [REMISSION.]

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the remission of the debts due to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland from certain railway companies, in pursuance of any Act of the present session, to grant money for the purpose of certain Local Loans out of the Local Loans Fund, and for other purposes relating to Local Loans."

Resolution agreed to.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered. Bill read the third time, and passed.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1906-7.

Committee to consider the Surpluses and Deficits upon Navy and Army Grants for 1906-7, and the application of Surpluses to meet Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, To-morrow.—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Ordered, "That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented respectively on the 6th and 14th February last, be referred to the Committee."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at fourteen minutes before Six o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Saturday, 25th July, 1908.

The Lord DENMAN, chosen Speaker in the absence of the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Commissioners.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment to each Bill.

Registration Bill [H.L.]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

REGISTRATION BILL [H.L.])

Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with the Amendments.

NAVAL LANDS (VOLUNTEERS) BILL (No. 180); GRAND JURY (IRELAND) ACT (1836) AMENDMENT BILL (No. 181).

Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}, and to be printed.

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed, and to be read 2^{a} on Monday next (The Viscount Ridley). (No. 182.)

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed, and to be read 2^{a} on Monday next (The Earl of Crewe.) (No. 183.)

House adjourned at twenty minutes past One o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Saturday, 25th July, 1908.

The House met at Ten of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Blyth (four); Havant; and Llandiloes; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Mains and Strathmartin; and Riccarton; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 4074 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Forty-fourth detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Marriages, Births, and Deaths in Ireland, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th June, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.

Copy presented, of Report of Proceedings by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, under the Diseases of Animals Acts, for the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The Channel of the Gaine.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Irish Board of Works will now, while the water is low, pile a landing-place and deepen a channel for boats at the mouth of the River Gaine, Lough Derrevarragh, Westmeath, in accordance with their inspector's report.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The Board of Works inform me that they are not aware of any report by any inspector of theirs containing the recommendation mentioned. In any case the Board have no power to do works in this district except in default of the Upper Inny Drainage Board, and neither this Board nor the Drainage Board have power to do anything beyond the maintenance and, if necessary, restoration of the works mentioned in the final award for the Upper Inny drainage district dated 4th April, 1881. This work is not one of them.

Prices of Beef.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what has been the price of beef in the principal markets of this country during each of the past twelve months; and whether he has any official information as to comparable prices in the principal European countries.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Such information as the Board possess is contained in the following tables—

Statement showing the monthly prices of first quality Beef per cwt., at certain markets in England and Scotland from July, 1907 to June, 1908 (compiled from Returns received from the market reporters of the Board of Agriculture).

Month	Scotch short-sides.	Scotch long-sides.	English.	U.S.A. and Canadian port killed.	Argentine chilled hind-quarters.	American chilled hind-quarters.
	Per cwt. s. d.	Per cwt. s. d.	Per cwt. s. d.	Per cwt. s. d.	Per cwt. s. d.	Per cwt. s. d.
			London.			
1907 : July	66 0	59 6	54 0	55 0	46 0	56 6
August	63 6	57 6	52 6	53 0	44 6	56 6
September	63 0	58 6	53 0	53 6	48 0	59 6
October	64 6	56 6	51 0	51 6	45 0	60 0
November	64 6	57 6	51 6	52 0	43 6	59 6
December	63 0	57 0	52 6	54 0	41 6	55 6
1908 : January	63 0	57 0	52 6	53 6	39 6	54 0
February	62 6	56 0	51 6	52 0	41 6	53 6
March	60 6	56 0	52 0	52 0	41 0	53 0
April	63 6	59 0	54 0	56 0	49 0	61 0
May	63 6	59 0	55 6	57 0	50 6	62 0
June	69 0	62 0	60 0	60 6	54 0	64 6
Week ending 16th July	70 0	63 0	57 2	58 4	44 4	60 8

Month.	Scotch short-sides.		Scotch long-sides.		English.		U.S.A. and Canadian port killed.		Argentine chilled hind-quarters.		American chilled hind-quarters.	
	Per cwt. s.	d.	Per cwt. s.	d.	Per cwt. s.	d.	Per cwt. s.	d.	Per cwt. s.	d.	Per cwt. s.	d.
Birmingham.												
1907: July	Nil		Nil		53	6	53	0	45	0	55	6
August					52	6	52	0	45	0	56	0
September					51	0	49	6	47	0	57	6
October					48	6	47	6	44	0	56	6
November					48	0	46	6	43	6	57	0
December					49	6	48	0	40	0	54	0
1908: January					51	6	51	0	39	0	54	0
February					51	6	50	6	41	6	54	0
March					52	6	51	0	40	6	54	0
April					55	6	54	0	48	6	60	0
May					57	0	55	6	50	0	62	0
June					58	6	55	6	54	0	66	0
Week ending 16th July					57	2	54	10	44	0	59	6
Leeds.												
1907: July	Nil		Nil		55	6	53	0	45	0	55	6
August					53	6	51	0	44	6	56	0
September					51	6	48	0	47	0	57	6
October					51	6	46	6	42	6	57	0
November					50	0	46	0	45	0	57	6
December					51	6	48	0	38	0	54	6
1908: January					52	6	49	0	39	0	54	6
February					53	0	49	6	42	0	53	6
March					53	0	50	6	40	6	53	6
April					55	0	53	6	48	0	60	6
May					57	0	55	0	50	0	62	0
June					60	0	56	6	53	6	65	6
Week ending 16th July					58	4	53	8	39	8	59	6

Month.	Scotch short-sides.		Scotch long-sides.		English.		U.S.A. and Canadian port killed.		Argentine chilled hind-quarters.		American chilled hind-quarters.	
	Per cwt.		Per cwt.		Per cwt.		Per cwt.		Per cwt.		Per cwt.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Manchester.												
1907: July	Nil		Nil		54	0	53	0	45	0	55	0
August					52	6	51	6	42	0	56	0
September					49	0	48	0	44	6	57	0
October					46	0	—		41	0	56	0
November					47	0	—		39	6	57	0
December					49	6	47	6	41	0	55	0
1908: January					52	6	50	0	38	6	53	6
February					51	6	49	0	40	0	53	0
March					53	6	50	6	41	0	52	6
April					56	0	53	6	47	0	60	0
May					57	6	56	6	49	0	61	0
June					60	0	56	0	53	0	64	6
Week ending 16th July					58	4	53	8	39	8	58	4
Liverpool.												
1907: July	Nil		Nil		—		53	0	42	6	54	0
August					—		52	0	41	0	56	0
September					49	0	50	0	42	6	56	6
October					46	6	48	6	39	0	56	0
November					46	6	46	6	39	0	56	6
December					49	6	49	6	41	0	53	6
1908: January					51	6	51	6	37	6	53	0
February					—		49	6	39	0	52	6
March					—		51	6	41	0	52	6
April					—		53	6	46	0	59	6
May					—		56	6	48	0	61	0
June					—		58	6	53	0	64	6
Week ending 16th July					—		53	8	37	4	58	4

Month.	Scotch short-sides.	Scotch long-sides.		English.	U.S A. and Canadian port killed.		Argentine chilled hind-quarters.		American chilled hind-quarters.	
	Per cwt. s. d.	Per cwt. s.	d.	Per cwt. s. d.	Per cwt. s.	d.	Per cwt. s.	d.	Per cwt. s.	d.
Glasgow.										
1907 : July - - -	Nil	59	0	Nil	54	0	42	0	57	0
August - -		58	6		52	6	42	6	54	0
September - -		56	6		49	6	43	6	59	0
October - -		55	0		49	6	44	6	58	6
November - -		56	6		50	0	—		58	6
December - -		57	0		49	6	—		55	6
1908 : January - -		59	0		53	6	38	6	54	6
February - -		57	0		52	0	39	6	54	6
March - -		56	6		51	6	—		55	0
April - - -		57	0		54	6	51	6	60	0
May - - -		57	0		53	6	50	0	63	6
June - - -		58	6		56	6	53	6	60	6
Week ending 16th July -		60	8		56	0	51	4	63	0
Edinburgh										
1907 : July - - -	Nil	59	6	Nil	52	0	46	6	57	0
August - -		56	0		51	6	—		56	6
September - -		51	0		48	0	—		58	6
October - -		51	6		—		44	6	57	6
November - -		51	0		—		43	6	58	0
December - -		53	6		—		39	6	56	0
1908 : January - -		55	6		52	6	40	6	55	6
February - -		57	0		50	6	41	0	54	6
March - -		55	0		50	6	43	0	54	0
April - - -		54	0		—		49	0	61	6
May - - -		56	6		—		51	6	63	6
June - - -		58	6		—		52	6	67	0
Week ending 16th July -		59	6		56	0	44	4	60	8

Month.	Scotch short-sides. Per cwt. s.	d.	Scotch long-sides. Per cwt. s.	d.	English. Per cwt. s.	d.	U.S.A. and Canadian port killed. Per cwt. s.	d.	Argentine chilled hind-quarters. Per cwt. s.	d.	American chilled hind-quarters. Per cwt. s.	d.
Dundee.												
1907: July	Nil		58	6	Nil		55	0	—		57	0
August			56	0			—		44	6	57	0
September			52	0			48	0	44	6	58	6
October			51	6			—		45	0	58	6
November			53	0			44	6	45	6	59	0
December			55	6			—		—		56	0
1908: January			56	0			—		42	0	55	6
February			55	0			51	6	43	0	54	6
March			55	0			—		42	0	55	0
April			54	6			—		49	6	61	6
May			56	0			—		50	6	63	6
June			58	6			—		57	6	66	6
Week ending 16th July			58	4			—		44	4	60	8

Statement showing the average monthly prices of Beef per 8 lbs. in London, Paris, and Berlin from July, 1907, to June, 1908 :—

Month.	Average monthly price per 8 lbs.					
	London.*		Paris.†		Berlin.‡	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
1907.						
July	3	2	4	2½	4	9½
August	3	1	4	2½	4	9¾
September	3	2	4	2½	4	9¾
October	2	8¼	4	3½	4	9½
November	2	10¾	4	2½	4	9¾
December	2	11	4	2½	4	9½
1908.						
January	3	1½	4	4¼	4	9
February	3	1¾	4	3	4	7¼
March	3	1¾	4	0¾	4	5½
April	3	3½	4	0¾	4	6¾
May	3	4	4	4¼	4	3½
June	3	7½	4	4¼	4	5¼

* Mean of the prices of four qualities of English beef.
† Mean of three qualities.
‡ Mean of twelve qualities.

Equalisation of London Rates.

MR. DOBSON (Plymouth): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what is the total amount that has been specially raised from the more wealthy districts of London and transferred to the poorer districts in relief of their rates under the Act of 1893 for the greater equalisation of rates in London.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The net amount levied and distributed under the London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894, up to 31st March, 1907, was £3,289,152.

Londonderry Post Office.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that up till 1896 the staff at Londonderry Post Office was divided, *i.e.*, separate staffs for postal and telegraphic work maintained; that after the Report of the Tweedmouth Commission only one staff was maintained for both branches; that, this change proving unsatisfactory, the divided system was reverted to in 1903; and that during recent months the dual system has again been introduced, notwithstanding its previous failure in Londonderry and in other large centres, and whether, seeing that the Hobhouse Committee, 1907, recommended that offices such as Londonderry should have a divided staff, he will reconsider the matter in the interests of local efficiency.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is the practice to have a divided staff only at those offices where the volume of work and the conditions under which it is done renders specialisation inevitable, and the Parliamentary Committee did not recommend any change in this respect. The necessary conditions do not obtain at Londonderry, where amalgamation is desirable not only in the interests of the service but also in those of the staff, as a more equitable distribution of the early and late duties is thus rendered possible, and the hours of attendance can otherwise be made less irksome than if the staff were divided. The amalgamation of the staff at Londonderry was decided upon in May, 1906, as a result of the recommendations of a Departmental Committee. The matter was very carefully considered so recently as January last, and I see no reason for altering the decision which was then given.

Post Office Territorials.

MR. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General if an order has recently been issued to those Post Office servants who are members of the Territorial Army that the cost of providing substitutes during their absence in camp is to be provided out of their civil pay.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The practice that prevailed under the Volunteer system, *i.e.*, that the cost of providing substitutes, if any, was defrayed from the civil pay of the absent officer is continued under the Territorial scheme. If there is any saving the balance is paid to the officer absent at camp, while any excess cost is borne by the State.

Spitalfields Market.

MR. W. PEARCE (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): To ask Mr. Attorney-General if his attention has been directed to the delay in the proceedings instituted by the Corporation of London to acquire Spitalfields Market; if he is aware of the urgency of the matter; and if an amended statement of claim has been presented for his approval.

(*Answered by Sir W. Robson.*) I recognise that the action relating to Spitalfields Market, which is under the control of the Corporation of London, should be brought to trial as soon as possible, but regard must be had to the complicated nature of the case and care taken that all the facts are placed before the Court. Application has recently been made for my approval of an amended statement of claim. I have no reason to believe that there has been undue delay in the proceedings.

Meat Trade Trust Inquiry.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a representative of Ireland on the Departmental Committee he proposes to appoint to inquire into the question of the alleged control by certain trusts of the meat trade; and whether any question will be referred to such Committee affecting the importation of Canadian cattle.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I am reluctant to add to the numbers of the Committee by the appointment of representatives of special interests or views. It is a Departmental Committee. Its reference is strictly limited to the specific financial and economic aspects of the question, and it does not extend to recommendations affecting the conditions of the importation of cattle. If in these circumstances my hon. and learned friend still presses for the appointment of an Irish representative perhaps he will communicate with me again.

Ex-Detective-Constable Cosgrove, R.I.C.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain the circumstances under which Detective-constable John Cosgrove, of Belfast, was discharged on pension from the police force; whether any charge was preferred against him; and, if so, whether any and, if so, what opportunity was afforded him of meeting the charge; whether Cosgrove was entitled to his maximum pension if he had been allowed to remain in the force twelve months longer; whether it was charged against him that he had no cases for the preceding twelve months; whether men are still in the service in Belfast who had no cases for double that period; how long was Cosgrove on the promotion list; why was he not promoted; why was he appointed to the crime special staff if unfit for promotion; did any prejudice exist in the minds of his superior officers towards him and whether he will have special inquiries made into this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Constable Cosgrove, who had served for upwards of twenty-eight years, was reported by his superior officers as being inefficient and unsuitable for further police duty, and the Inspector-General in pursuance of his statutory powers, called upon him to retire on pension. The constable was not charged with any offence against discipline. If he had remained in the force until he had served for twenty-nine years he would have been entitled to his maximum pension of £46 16s. per annum, which is but 9s. 5d. per annum more than that actually awarded to him. It was not charged against him that he had no cases during the preceding twelve months. He was at one time on the promotion list, but was passed over by the late Commissioner in 1905 as being unfit for promotion. It was the same Commissioner who appointed him to the crime special staff, presumably because he considered him suitable to be tried in that capacity. No prejudice existed against the constable in the minds of his superior officers. No further inquiries seem to be necessary.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state how many Whites, Chinese Coolies, and Natives were enployed in the Transvaal mines when the present Government came into office and on 1st July last, respectively.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flintshire; for Colonel SEELY): At the end of December, 1905, there were 18,159 Whites, 93,831 Natives and 47,267 Chinese employed. On 30th June last there were 21,636 Chinese. The figures for Whites and Natives to that date have not yet been received. The average numbers for May were: Whites, 18,011; Natives, 145,007.

Great Britain and Siam.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is now in a position to give information with regard to the new agreement with Siam.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): No new agreement has yet been concluded with Siam, and I cannot say what progress can be made till His Majesty's Minister, who is now on his way home, has returned and till various points which require investigation have been discussed with him, and His Majesty's Government have had an opportunity of considering them.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): When is the Minister expected to arrive?

SIR EDWARD GREY: He is due home soon, but it is obvious the Government will not be able as a whole to consider this question for some time, and presumably we shall not be able to settle it till the autumn.

The Arrest of Mr. Luxenburg.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will lay Papers setting out the correspondence that has passed with the Russian Government in reference to the wrongful arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Luxenburg.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will deal with this matter in my reply to the Question put down by the hon. Member for Monday next.

Alleged Burning of Crofters' Houses.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) asked the Secretary for Scotland whether there was any truth in the Report that crofters' houses had been burned in the parish of Creich, Sutherland, by the sheriff officer; and that, in consequence, great excitement prevailed.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The only information at my disposal on this subject is contained in a telegram from the chief constable of the county, who says. "Wire received. Local constable reports me crofter's house burned by sheriff officer acting under decree of Court."

MR. MORTON: Who is the landlord?

MR. SINCLAIR: I am not aware of his name. If the hon. Gentleman wishes any further information perhaps he will put down a Question.

Suppression of Vermin.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if his attention has been called to the Report and Draft Bill published by the Society for the Suppression of Vermin; and if he proposes on behalf of the Department by regulation, or circular, or otherwise to take steps to stamp out the rat pest in Ireland, or in any event to limit its increase.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): My attention has been called to the Report and Draft Bill in Question. We are very anxious to take all the steps necessary for this admirable purpose

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Has the right hon. Gentleman consulted the President of the Board of Trade on the matter?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish University Grants.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total capitalised amount of the grants to be made under the Universities Bill towards the new University to be established for Roman Catholics in Dublin and its three constituent colleges in Dublin, Cork, and Galway, and the affiliated college of Maynooth.

MR. BIRRELL: The capitalisation of the amount of the annual grant made to the University college is a sum which anybody can do for himself.

Cattle-drives in Antrim and Down.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many cases of cattle-driving have been brought to the notice of the police in the counties of Down and Antrim during the past three years.

MR. BIRRELL: My attention has not been drawn to this matter. I must ask for notice.

Orange Demonstrations.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of cases brought to the notice of the police of serious offences arising out of the recent annual demonstration in Ireland in celebration of the memory of King William of Orange.

MR. BIRRELL: My attention has not been called to this matter.

Captain CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that 300,000 loyal Irishmen took part in this demonstration?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am not.

The Vatican and the Irish University.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, owing to the action of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Dublin and Maynooth, the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland have hitherto been forbidden to enter for the Arts course in any of the three Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Cork, or Galway; and whether he proposes to obtain the assent of the Vatican or its representatives in this country to the Roman Catholic laity attending the new Roman Catholic University to be established in Dublin before the Lord-Lieutenant names the appointed day for dissolving the Royal University and before any of the sum voted by Parliament is spent on erecting the new college for Roman Catholics in Dublin.

Mr. BIRRELL: I have no such intention.

Cranagill Orange Lodge Procession.

Mr. MOORE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the road from Cranagill to Annaghmore station, in the county of Armagh, has from time immemorial been used by all persons on their lawful avocations; if he is aware that on 13th July last the members of the Cranagill Orange lodge were prevented by the police from passing along this road; if he is aware that six Nationalists from this district were sentenced by Mr. Justice Dodd, at the recent Armagh assizes, to two months imprisonment for attacking members of the Orange Order; and if he will state on what grounds the members of this lodge were debarred from their accustomed use of this highway.

Mr. BIRRELL: I must ask for notice.

Mr. MOORE: But notice has been given.

Mr. BIRRELL: I have not obtained the information.

Mr. MOORE: That is a different thing. The right hon. Gentleman shoud ask for a postponement.

Debates on Irish Matters.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what day he intends to give, before the adjournment, for a discussion on the state of lawlessness now existing in the South and West of Ireland, necessitating an increased charge of £72,000 a year for extra police, the questions of cattle-driving, boycotting, firing outrages, and other forms of intimidation.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): The Government do not intend to give any further opportunity for the discussion of Irish affairs other than what may be afforded on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill.

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. GORDON (Londonderry, S.) moved that the Bill be read a third time that day three months. He said he was not at all forgetful of the way in which the Bill had been received by the House, nor was he at all underestimating the opposition which his Motion was likely to receive. He was as deeply interested in the welfare of Ireland as any Member of that House, and he honestly and earnestly believed that the Bill would be injurious to the true welfare and prosperity of Ireland. He felt, therefore, that it was his duty at every legitimate opportunity, and by every legitimate means, to endeavour to prevent its becoming law. He recognised the necessity for some improvement in University education in Ireland, but there was something that might be worse than to leave it even in its present condition. He thought this Bill would make matters worse. It ignored many important matters which the Legislature ought to bear in mind in dealing with such a question. He believed that every man who was really interested in the welfare of Ireland must realise that of all the parts of His Majesty's Dominions, it was the place in which dissensions and disagreements were most accentuated, not alone in political matters, but that there was a vital difference of opinion in reference to the relations of that country to the Empire, and, above all, keenly accentuated racial and religious differences. Wise legislation should have for its object the getting rid, as far as possible, of all those differences which in any way interfered with the material prosperity of the country, and nothing should be done either to accentuate or to perpetuate them. It was of great importance that the young men of the country should be brought together as early as possible, and to respect and tolerate each others' differing views. How could they teach them those principles of toleration and mutual respect if from the very start in life they showed them that there was something so different between the different people in Ireland that they could not even receive their instruction in the same class-rooms? He thought that that was deplorable, and it was a very serious step for anyone to take in connection with Ireland to create three purely denominational institutions in Ireland. There could be no doubt about it. One body in Ireland, who had asked for one of these Universities, had always sought a denominational University, a purely Roman Catholic University, under Roman Catholic control. The other two Universities, once that was established, would be powerless to preserve their non-sectarian character. How could they do it if they created a University which would take all the youth of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland? Could there be anything more calculated to perpetuate and accentuate the religious and other differences which existed between the different sections of His Majesty's subjects in Ireland? He deplored it. Gentlemen in that House might think that was a narrow-minded, bigoted view, held by a few Unionist Members, but he unhesitatingly disclaimed that, and he did not think that the people who knew him would describe him as a narrow-minded bigot or as unwilling to treat fairly his fellow-countrymen. He had the advantage of being educated in a college where most of the students were Roman Catholics; he was educated in Galway, where a large body—the majority—were Roman Catholics, and they lived a pleasant and a happy life there. No questions were raised as to differences of religious opinion, or which could be regarded as being unfair to any one denomination. But was that what this Bill was going to do? Queen's College was one of the constituent colleges of the old Queen's University; it was undenominational and non-sectarian in foundation. It was a place where no tests existed, and where no questions were asked of any student or professor as to his religious views. It was at first accepted by the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, but after a little while it was rejected and banned by them. And why? Because it was undenominational and non-sectarian, and because they could not have that control which they had always asserted they were entitled to in all matters connected with education. Why did they accept this Bill? They were accepting it because they knew, and every man of common-sense knew, that it was in truth and in fact what they wanted to have when they rejected the Queen's University—a purely denominational and sectarian University under ecclesiastical dogmas and control. Let men use their common-sense and draw inferences from facts. No man would venture to say that the Queen's University was not purely undenominational and a good sound teaching University, which also provided what a good many Nonconformists in this country were so anxious about. It provided that each religious body should have its own dean of residence at its own expense if it wished. Why was this Bill accepted and that banned? Those who were loud in their denunciations of denominationalism in England were forcing upon Ireland and the Irish people the most denominational system of University education that existed in the world, and they were doing it at the public expense. Let them face the issue. They were voting public money to create a University which was purely denominational and under ecclesiastical control. He thought that, apart from the inferences they could draw from the history of education in Ireland, they could see from the Bill itself that it was denominational and intended to be so. It provided for the inclusion of the students of a purely theological seminary. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was wise in creating a good teaching University, although it might inflict some hardships perhaps on some of the extern students, but what was he also doing? Let them remember that they were voting £10,000 a year of public money to endow a University. The Bill provided directly or indirectly, speaking of the University of Dublin, for the bringing in of the students of a theological seminary over which the University had no control whatever, which was purely denominational, and they were giving those students the same advantages, the same rights, and the same privileges in their teaching and undenominational University that the students in each of the constituent colleges would enjoy. That was to say, that to the extent of £10,000 a year, given to the University directly for University purposes, they were endowing the theological college at Maynooth, which had already received between £300,000 and £400,000 of public money. The right hon. Gentleman said yesterday almost in terms: "If you pass the Amendment before the House providing that the students in that theological seminary who wish to graduate in the new University should at least attend two sessions in one of the constituent colleges, it would wreck the Bill." That was to say that from the first, and he knew it, the vital question in the Bill was that this theological seminary should have all the benefits which they were asked to give to a purely undenominational University to be created in Ireland. He did not see what answer there was to that. If that was a vital question in the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman knew it. Let them remove all these disguises and look at the naked facts. How could the right hon. Gentleman get out of it, that the £10,000 a year for the Dublin University was to be at the disposal of students educated in this theological seminary in the same way that it would be at the disposal of students educated in the constituent colleges, but that there was no control over them? What was more as the Bill now stood, the new college to be erected in Dublin was to be built out of public money, £150,000 being the sum. Lecture rooms would come into existence out of public money, and the right hon. Gentleman had put in a provision that this new college would have its class-rooms used for the purposes of theological education. If they wanted to have the power of granting a theological degree by the teaching of theology, it would be done at the mere expense, so far as those who wanted it were concerned, of the payment of the salary of the professor, who would have his buildings, his class rooms, and his annual expenditure all coming from the public purse, except the mere salary, which might not be a large one. That was a nice state of affairs for an institution which was regarded as being undenominational. His point was that it was not at all what some right hon. Gentlemen opposite thought. He was dealing with what was presented in that House as an undenominational University, and why should they not have it put straight and clear? The next point was with regard to what had occurred yesterday, about which, to those who knew the facts, there was something really ludicrous. The right hon. Gentleman had put into the Bill a provision enabling chapels to be erected inside the grounds of these colleges. As he understood, a deputation of Members of that House, who apparently were getting a little bit alarmed, waited on the right hon. Gentleman, and wanted him to consider this matter. And then the Chief Secretary, with a show of reluctance, agreed, as a great concession, to strike out the provision about erecting chapels and places of worship inside the college grounds. What were the facts? Really the right hon. Gentleman had been long enough in Dublin to know the locality of this particular college; he must know that adjoining the present Catholic University college—that was its full name—was the University Chapel, which was one of the best known Roman Catholic chapels in Dublin. If it was not absolutely adjoining, it was also in the closest proximity to the new buildings of the Royal University. [NATIONALIST Cries of "Oh," and MINISTERIAL laughter.] He understood his hon. friends from Ireland perhaps a little better than most Members of that House. There was no one appreciated, as he had to appreciate, when he met him as an antagonist, the great readiness of his hon. and learned friend the Member for North Louth in turning away attention from any particular point. But the point here was not the question of these places of worship being where they were. He thought it was quite right to have them near the colleges. Who could for one moment quarrel with that? The point was that the right hon. Gentleman knew that the chapel was practically part of the new college, when he made this concession. That was the true state of affairs. In every stage of the Bill, in the statement on the Second Reading, in the statements made in Committee, and in the farcical dealing with Amendments on the Paper, in every way possible it had been sought to impress upon them that this measure was unsectarian and undenominational, and that it was absolutely free from ecclesiastical control, of which no one would be so willing to see every semblance removed as the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. Surely, hon. Members who sat on the other side of the House, even at that last hour, would recognise the situation they were bringing about, in view of the position they occupied when they were dealing with education in England. They should remember, when they were helping to create a denominational University for Ireland, how in this country they poured the vials of their wrath against people who were the real owners of the schools having anything to do with their management and control. He was opposed to this Bill in principle for the reasons he had given. He did not want to be misunderstood. He hoped he was a loyal enough son of Ireland to wish that if the Bill did become law his fears about it might turn out to be groundless, and that the right hon. Gentleman and those who were helping him to pass the Bill would be able to say that it had conferred the benefits which they who were on the other side of the House honestly believed that it would confer. But he implored them to say first, whether it was a wise, right, or proper thing to perpetuate those differences which unhappily existed in Ireland. Although he was met sometimes with jeers by friends from Ireland —he did not think that he was jeered outside—he would say honestly, that Presbyterian as he was he was as much opposed, as he had frequently stated in that House, to the establishment of a Presbyterian University as he was to the establishment of a Roman Catholic University in Ireland. To his mind the same principle applied to both, and to all denominational Universities established or sought to be established. He thought that they were going on wrong lines and on wrong principles, lines and principles which made for the perpetuation of dissensions and differences, and were at the same time a retrograde step in University education.

*MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) in seconding the Amendment, said his hon. and learned friend had referred to the fact that they were regarded as a narrow and bigoted section from the North of Ireland, but he thought it well to remind the House how far that was from being correct. He desired to quote the utterance of one who in the campaign of the last general election was the militant high priest of the Radical Party, now responsible for this Bill. He referred to Dr. John Clifford, who in a speech delivered in London said—

> "When he turned over the pages of past history, he read some very sinister interventions in human affairs on the part of the Church. To-day in connection with the Irish Universities Bill, it was said the Bill could not pass if the Pope of Rome objected. For himself, he hoped the Pope would object, as he could not help regarding the Irish Universities Bill as a betrayal of Liberal principles, and with all the strength of his nature he was bound to protest against it."

He thought that that was an English opinion which was still of some value, though apparently the Party opposite did not hold it in such high consideration as they held the opinions of Dr. Clifford in the months preceding the last general election. The words he had read confirmed the views the Ulster Members had expressed on this Bill. [AN HON.

MEMBER: Dr. Clifford was not speaking of this Bill.] It was exactly this Bill that Dr. Clifford was referring to, and the speech in which Dr. Clifford made the reference he had quoted was delivered recently. If they turned to Scotland, an important public body called the Scottish Reformation Society, at a meeting they held recently, had dealt with this Bill, stating their objections in a series of Resolutions, with which he entirely agreed. They opposed this Bill—

> "(1) Because the proposed university in Belfast is not desired by those for whom it is specially intended, while large numbers of the enlightened Roman Catholic laity are strongly opposed, in the interests of education itself, to the setting up of a new Roman Catholic University in Dublin. (2) Because the proposed measure would establish an extensive scheme of concurrent endowment in a very aggravated and objectionable form, wholly at variance with the spirit and purpose of former legislative enactments in the matter of Irish education. (3) Because the proposed constitution of the new university in Dublin is such that it would be speedily brought entirely under the control of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, so that it will in reality mean a further huge endowment to Roman Catholicism at the public expense. (4) Because the manifest and main design of the Bill is to satisfy the demands of the Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy, and, as experience has shown, these demands involve concessions which the Government of this Protestant country is bound, on principle, to resist in the interests of civil and religious liberty."

He was bound to admit that their arguments in opposition to this measure had been somewhat handicapped by the fact that the Chief Secretary had secured in advance approval of the Bill by a certain section of the great city of Belfast. They knew something of the methods by which that approval in advance was secured; but they held firmly to the opinion that that approval was confined to certain academic circles, and that the great body of the people in the North of Ireland were as bitterly opposed to the Bill and all that was being done under cover of the Bill as they were to all previous attempts to endow a Roman Catholic University in Ireland. They admitted that they were handicapped by the approval of the authorities of Queen's College in Belfast having been secured in advance. They were sorry to have to say—they had said it before and they would have to say it again—that that approval had been gained by a lavish expenditure of public money. If the object in view was to be attained by a process of bribing the different authorities and institutions in Ireland, then the bribe to the city of Belfast under this measure was a very poor one indeed. Under the Bill, notwithstanding that the declared policy of the Government was against all endowments of religion, the Romish Church got a sum which capitalised meant at least £1,500,000 of public money. The total that went to Belfast was something like £18,000 per annum, as against a grant of £20,000 for the city of Cork alone. Not only was a Roman Catholic University secured in Dublin, but the Bill was so framed that in the course of a few years institutions which had a comparatively free atmosphere at the present moment would also be Romanised. Queen's Colleges in Cork and Galway would be Romanised, and there would be a denominational University at Belfast for which they had not asked and for which no important body of people in Belfast were ever likely to ask. He entirely associated himself with his colleague as regarded the Belfast University. It would, undoubtedly, be a Presbyterian University just in the same way as Trinity College, Dublin, would be more and more in the future a University for the sons of families belonging to the Church of Ireland. The policy of the Irish Presbyterians, like the policy of the vast majority of the people of England, had always been and would always be the policy of the open door. They resented most strongly the prospect of three hostile educational camps being set up in Ireland. That was what was being done under the Bill. The Irish Unionists considered it was a retrograde Bill, utterly at varianec with the professed principles of the Liberal Party, and he could only regret that their numbers were so few that their opposition had been so unsatisfactory in its results so far as weakening the more pernicious proposals of the Bill were concerned.

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'" —(*Mr. Gordon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question.'"

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he did not rise for the purpose of entering into any argument as to the merits or demerits of the Bill. The time for argument had passed and the House as a whole, he assumed, had made up its mind that the Bill should pass into law. He did not feel the slightest inclination to speak bitterly about the opposition of hon. Gentlemen above the gangway. It would be most ungrateful if he did because he recognised that all through the various stages of the Bill they had done a great service to the promoters of the Bill. He regarded this as a very great measure. It was a measure which had its blots from their point of view, and if they had been called upon to draft the measure themselves, probably it would have been different in some important respects. It was one of the great blots on the Bill against which they protested and against which he must enter his protest again, that sufficient provision was not made for the creation of residential quarters so as to make sure that they would have a residential University. That blot was a serious one, but he did not regard it as a permanent disqualification of the University, because he felt certain that in the future other Governments would be willing when the scheme proved that it was going to be a success to come forward and to set an example to private philanthropists and educationists in providing sufficient funds to enable residential quarters to be built. But looking to the Bill as a whole he could not help regarding it as a very great measure indeed. It was thirty-five years since a British Government proposed seriously to deal with the question, and during those past years they had been waiting and working and hoping for some such measure as this. All during those years the young men of Ireland had been going out into the world without the advantage of a University education, and their nation, therefore, all this time had been handicapped in its competition with other nations and their people had been handicapped in every walk of life. Although the Bill might not be in all its particulars pleasing to the feelings of other Members in various parts of the House he would impress upon them the consideration that it would be indeed a serious responsibility for any man to take to do anything or to say anything which would deprive Ireland of this great boon. If she was deprived of it now, Heaven only knew when the opportunity would occur again, and therefore he desired to acknowledge—and he was sure that in saying this he was speaking the sentiments of his colleagues—most truly and most gratefully the action of those Members in various parts of the House, very many of them on the opposite side, who had put aside their own strong predilections rather than see this great opportunity lost for Ireland. He was bound to say that taking the treatment of this Bill as a whole by the House there had been exhibited not only a friendliness to Ireland but a toleration which was eminently creditable to every section in the House, which he could assure the House would not be forgotten by the people of Ireland, and which would have its effect in Ireland in promoting toleration and good feeling between different creeds in the country. It would also be unjust and ungrateful if he did not express their feeling of gratitude to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. There was nothing that the Irish people respected more than courage, and the right hon. Gentleman's attitude with reference to this question from the very moment that he went to Ireland had been characterised by the highest courage. He remembered last year when in a public speech in Ireland he declared that he considered this, after the want of Home Rule, really the greatest of all Irish grievances, and that although he was precluded from dealing with Home Rule he was not precluded from dealing with University education, that he would deal with it, and that if he did not succeed in settling it he would no longer remain Chief Secretary. That was a very unusual declaration to make, and it was a very courageous one, because he was speaking about the most thorny and difficult of all Irish problems, of that problem on which there was most difference of opinion amongst different classes of people in Ireland. He indeed then took his courage in both hands and risked everything upon the course he was going to take. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the result of his courage. The appeal that he then made to Ireland was responded to in every quarter. He had not satisfied Gentlemen representing a certain part of Ireland who sat above the gangway, but with the exception of them, and those whom they represented, he had practically satisfied public opinion—Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian—all over the country. That was a great achievement, and if the right hon. Gentleman never did anything else for Ireland, if he never did anything else as a legislator in that House—he hoped Fate would reserve for him to do many great things for Ireland, and that there might be many legislative achievements before him—his name would go down to posterity as a man who had conferred upon a long-suffering and patient people one of the greatest benefits that human power and wisdom could confer by opening to them the gates of higher education and giving them the opportunity of competing in the battle of life. That would not be forgotten of the right hon. Gentleman. He and the Nationalist Members might have differences. No one could forecast the future. They might even have sharp differences and, as had happened so often before, even with friendly Liberal statesmen, be driven into an attitude of conflict with him. He hoped not, but whether they were or not, nothing could deprive him of the sense of gratitude that they felt to him for his courage in this matter, and, therefore, he thought he was justified in saying in the name of his colleagues that they would not forget to him the service that he had rendered to Ireland. All he had further to say was to express the fervent hope and prayer that this great measure might result in complete success in working. When measures were passing through that House critics always foretold their failure in this and that respect. Those prophecies of evil he was convinced would be falsified by the working of this institution. He believed it would be worked in a spirit of toleration and of good fellowship between the different classes of people in Ireland. He believed it would create once more in Irish history a great central seat of learning. The history of Ireland was remarkable in nothing more than in that portion of it which dealt with the question of education and learning. Ireland in the old days was one of the centres of learning for the whole of Europe, and when the bad times came and educational institutions were struck down, when it was made even a penal offence to educate the youth of Ireland, all through that period the love of learning of the Irish people made itself manifest, as those who had read the history of the poor scholars at the hedge schools would realise. The love of learning was still there, and he was convinced that when this great institution was established and was in full working order the love of learning would spring up as brightly in Ireland as ever it did before, and he looked forward to the future when this institution created by the right hon. Gentleman would become, not only an honour to Ireland, but one of the greatest educational establishments in Europe.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he had not opposed the Second Reading of the Bill, and he could not oppose the Third Reading, but he desired to point out the position which many Nonconformists had occupied in regard to this measure and to enter a final word of protest against one or two of its provisions. Of course they had had to listen to a considerable amount of banter from hon. Members opposite because they had not made a more determined opposition to a measure for the creation of a so-called Roman Catholic University. He thought some of the arguments and statements that had been used were justified from their point of view, and he found some difficulty in answering them. But he would ask the House, and every hon. Member opposite, who might fitly use this opportunity for chiding them, to consider the position in which the great body of Nonconformists were situated in regard to this Bill. There was no section of the House who took a deeper interest in higher education than the Nonconformist and who would do more to further the interests of higher education in England or in Ireland. Then also they as a body were in favour of Home Rule, and a great body of them had been quite willing to let this question be dealt with by a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland. Therefore they had to regard the question from these two points of view. He profoundly believed that an educated priesthood would be a great deal better for Ireland than an ignorant priesthood. He had an equal belief in an educated laity taking a more intelligent part in a body like this and its government than an uneducated laity. Therefore from these two points of view they were bound to look very kindly upon any efforts made to settle a question which had been unsettled for so many years, during which the educational interests of Ireland had been sadly neglected. These were principles which had served to make the Nonconformist party in the House less disposed to argue about first principles than they otherwise would have been. They had endeavoured to do something to amend the Bill. In the first instance they accepted the Bill on its own professions as being an undenominational measure, and so far as the clauses which referred to this side of the question were concerned they were very distinct, and apart from collateral considerations they regarded the Bill as undenominational. He had supported the Second Reading of the Bill desiring and hoping to make some changes which would have safeguarded its professed undenominational character. Very few of those changes had been accepted beyond one or two which were perhaps not altogether without sentiment and which probably would not have any very important relation to the issue. He did not intend to go into any details, but he did not agree that the objection to the erection of a chapel in the University precincts was merely one of sentiment, because they felt that whether it was a Roman Catholic or any other chapel which faced the student when he entered the University the effect would be to give it more or less a stamp of denominationalism in accordance with the religion represented by the chapel. Therefore it was not altogether a matter of sentiment. He knew that it had been said on this point that it would be difficult to erect a University anywhere without having some place of worship close to it, but notwithstanding that they felt that the erection of this particular chapel was a step in the wrong direction. Their only desire was to help to preserve the undenominational character of the University, and they thought the erection of the chapel was a step in the other direction. He was bound to say that the concession made by the Chief Secretary for Ireland was of some value from this point of view. Having made these efforts to amend the Bill in certain directions the Nonconformists were not prepared as a body to take the responsibility of endeavouring to wreck the measure. Moreover, on the part of some of them a strong sentiment came in because they regarded this as a great effort on the part of the Chief Secretary, and one upon which he had set his heart. Even from that point of view many of them felt that if they could help to frame the Bill and amend it in certain respects they would like to save the measure and let the right hon. Gentleman have the credit, because it certainly would be to the credit of any statesman to have established a University in Ireland into which the great bulk of the youth of Ireland were able to obtain entrance. Such a University would be a standing monument to the statesmanship of the Member of the Government who had been able to carry it through. Therefore, it was partly sentiment which had led them to look as kindly as possible upon this great effort of the Chief Secretary. The chief fault he had to find with the right hon. Gentleman was that he had shown too consistent a determination to satisfy the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The right hon. Gentleman felt that unless he did so the University would be practically useless. While appreciating that motive, he thought he might have paid somewhat greater regard to the convictions of many Members who sat on the Ministerial benches, and not have yielded so much to this dominating class. The Nationalists were not unwilling to fight the clerical element in politics, and he believed the time would come—indeed, a great number of the Irish laity already recognised the fact—when they would find it necessary to fight the clerical element in education. The Nonconformists had made some attempt to help them in that House; but they must now leave the matter to be fought out in Ireland. There would undoubtedly be a struggle, if the University was to be kept on the lines which it was intended to follow. Nonconformists would watch that struggle with some doubts, but with a great many more hopes. They hoped that the two new Universities to be established would conduce to the advancement of that higher education which alone would do for Ireland what they all desired should be done, and would set her free on the path of progress, a path which she had not had the opportunity of pursuing for a great many years.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down expressed some misgiving that we on this side of the House should taunt him and his friends with a certain inconsistency of behaviour which even the most careless observer would hardly fail to see in their comparative treatment of Irish and English education where religion is concerned. I do not mean to taunt the hon. Gentleman or any of his friends at the present moment. The only thought in my mind when I heard his speech was that if this Bill, or anything at all comparable to this Bill, had been passed by a Unionist Government his speech on the Third Reading would have been of a different character.

Sir GEORGE WHITE: I think the circumstances would have been very different.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The circumstances would have been different as regards Ireland?

Sir GEORGE WHITE: The relative position of the two countries.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Ireland would have been, under a Unionist Government, an island lying to the west of England, with a majority of Roman Catholics who have very little practical opportunity of obtaining University education. I fail to see how the educational problem is different when dealt with by a distinguished member of a Radical Administration from what it would have been if dealt with by a member of a Unionist Government. The problem as regards Ireland would have been the same; the only difference would have been in the attitude of the hon. Gentleman and his friends. It is largely owing to that difference, I think, that the credit of dealing with this question has fallen to the right hon. Gentleman, when under other circumstances it might have fallen to others. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman, as I think he deserves to be congratulated. I have always been a supporter of a really serious attempt to give that form of higher University education in Ireland which can alone, as I think, satisfy the majority of those in Ireland who at present have no practical opportunity of obtaining that higher education. I am glad to think that the particular solution adopted by the Chief Secretary is in its main outline of a character that I have always hoped to see passed. I have always hoped to see a scheme which would, in the first place, give three Universities to Ireland, I have always believed that, of the many suggested solutions of this problem, that solution was the right one, and I am glad it has been adopted by the Government. I am glad that Belfast is to have a University; that Trinity College is untouched; and that there is to be another University, which will, I hope, have in time a great academic tradition behind it. The Government have clearly expressed their preference for a residential form of University as against an examining University. Their wishes and theories have not been wholly supported by their practice, but I shall have a word to say on that directly. At all events, they have clearly expressed their idea, and it has been accepted by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway. Their idea is that higher education in Ireland should in future be carried on in the main as it is carried on in England and Scotland, in Germany, and in America—by a residential rather than an examining organisation. I suppose I could hardly allow this Third Reading to go by without expressing some of the misgivings which portions of this Bill raise in my mind I am sure the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary will not complain of any such course. The hon. Member for

East Mayo yesterday, in reference to certain controversy then going on between the two sides of the House, asked us to define the word "undenominational," and I think it was a very reasonable request. The truth is that in this case, as in every case where there is a dispute about the meaning, words are used, and legitimately used, in quite different senses, and it is the confusion between those varying senses which produces all the cross-arguments and misunderstandings between controversialists on the two sides. In one sense the Bill, as distinguished from the Charter, is undoubtedly undenominational—that is to say, it plainly follows certain well-known and well-understood principles of legislation. There are all sorts of provisions laid down in Clause 3, I think it is, which broadly and clearly express the undenominational character of the Bill from the technical and legislative standpoint. There is another view, however, in which this Bill is, and in my opinion ought to be, denominational. It is intended to meet the needs of denominations, and to see that it is intended and framed for that purpose, and that it is denominational in that sense, you have only got to ask a plain and simple question. If you interchanged the governing body which you are giving to Belfast by giving it to Dublin, and if again you gave to Dublin the governing body which you are giving to Belfast, would you or would you not be altering the character of the Bill? You would be transforming it and you would be making it equally revolting to Belfast and to Dublin. You would be altering its whole character, and in what respect? You would be making it unsuitable to the religious beliefs of the persons whom you want the Universities to serve. In other words, although Clause 3 carries out all the approved legislative and formal conditions of an undenominational Bill, which this Bill is intended to be, if you look deeper, it is, and, in my opinion, ought to be, denominational in some wider and in some deeper sense. It is intended by the constitution of the governing body of Dublin to secure that it shall be different in the case of Dublin College from what it is in the case of the Belfast University, and it is idle to say in these circumstances that your new scheme is undenominational in that sense, that you are indifferent to denominational considerations, or that in each of those two places of learning you hold the balance equal between denominations. You do nothing of the kind. and you do not mean to do anything of the kind. I think it will be better on all sides to look a little below the mere drafting of Clause 3 and consider what the Government intend, what those below the gangway intend, what I, who mean to support the Third Reading, intend, and what we ourselves know will be the effect of the Bill. It is in that deeper sense undoubtedly a denominational measure. I make no complaint of the Bill on that account. I confess, however, there is one form in which the denominational idea has taken shape in the Bill which does give me some moments of really great anxiety—I mean the affiliation arrangements with regard to Maynooth. I am not sure that if the right hon. Gentleman had thoroughly explained on the Second Reading exactly what the result of that affiliation would be, he really would have been able to carry with him the great bulk of opinion in the House, and if that be so, much as I dislike the affiliation clauses, so anxious am I to see this question settled that I can hardly regret that the right hon. Gentleman did not explain that. I do not say he was uncandid. I am sure he was not, but he did not take us quite fully into his confidence, if indeed he himself at that stage of the proceedings thoroughly realised the ultimate form this measure would take. The hon. Member for East Mayo and other speakers yesterday, when this question was discussed, pointed to the Charters and the Acts constituting the new English Universities, and said: "Why do you complain of this provision by which Maynooth may be affiliated, considering that the provisions in the Bill and the Charter which render that transaction possible, are textually the same as, or in no substantial sense different from, the Charters and the Acts which constitute the new English Universities?" That is a perfectly good, sound, technical, legal form of argument, but we all know that no English University would ever think at this moment of affiliating to itself a seminary containing a larger body of students than the parent University and permitting the students in that seminary to have all the advantages of a University degree, all the dignity and privileges arising from being members of what is called, though it is called by courtesy, a teaching University, and at the same time giving them the power in the future government of that University which is conferred by the possession of a degree. No English University would ever think of doing it. It never was necessary to guard against a danger which never existed. Everybody knows not only that the danger, if it be a danger, exists in Ireland, but that it is absolutely certain that within a few years, it may be within a few months, Maynooth will be affiliated to the new University in Dublin, and that the students of Maynooth will get degrees without having to put in one week's residence at the University, that they will obtain the degrees of the University without ever having lived there and, having obtained degrees, they will have a large controlling influence on the future of that college. I do not think that anybody will deny, however technically parallel may be the new Charter of this University and the Charters recently given in England—nobody will deny that, however close that parallelism may be, there is a substantial and operative difference which is almost incalculable. Looking at the reality, and not the form, I cannot believe that is otherwise than a real danger to the educational future, not for the denominational future, in the wide sense which I have indicated. I am in favour of denominationalism in that sense, but I cannot conceal from myself that this provision does constitute a real danger that the new University may actually fall under what is called clerical control. It must be remembered—and this is no criticism, hon. Gentlemen below the gangway will believe me, upon the ecclesiastical organisation of the Roman Catholic Church—that that ecclesiastical organisation is quite different from the rather looser organisation which exists in all Protestant Churches which carry with them clerical organisation. We heard in the debate yesterday a great deal about the conditions in the older English Universities of Cambridge and Oxford before the Act of 1870. I was an undergraduate of Cambridge during the three or four years which immediately preceded that Act. There were all sorts of statutes which made it difficult for Nonconformists to have what I regard as their fair share of the great educational advantages of those Universities, but although by statute the Church of England had a position of preference and pre-eminence there, so far as the students were concerned it is ludicrous to talk of clerical control in any sense whatever. It never existed, at all events, not for many years has it existed in either Cambridge or Oxford, and the real advantage of the great Act of 1870 was not to turn a clerically managed University into a lay managed University; the advantage of that Act was not to alter the complexion or character of the teaching which an undergraduate received, but that it admitted a much larger circle of undergraduates into the Universities and allowed Nonconformists and persons of a different religion from the Church of England, or of no religion at all, to obtain the highest academic l positions. That was the advantage of the Act. I do not think that such a thing would be possible under the much more elaborate and vigorous co-ordination of authorities which obtain in the ecclesiastical system of the Roman Church. It never has. Their view has always been that their responsibility extends to spheres of education which the Protestant clergy would never touch, and would never desire to interfere in. What is the enormous advantage obtained by an undergraduate at Cambridge or at Oxford? It is not so much the coaching, the teaching, and the examining; it is the independence and the mutual education of young men brought together, absolutely free to say what they like and to think what they like, to discuss all questions of heaven and earth and under the earth, knowing that no superior authority will concern themselves in what they are doing. That is the great and enormous advantage which existed in our older Universities even before they were thrown open to all sections and which I do not think is likely to exist to the same extent in any University which is under what is called clerical control. I must say, considering the great number of undergraduates which Maynooth turns out every year, that those graduates belong to this vigorous and highly centralised ecclesiastical organisation, that if you are going to give them a controlling influence in the University, and if you are not going to exact from them that modifying influence which collision at the most malleable period of life with their lay fellow-countrymen would give them, I think that is a real blot on the new scheme. Do not let me be told that, after all, the graduates of the new University are only a fraction of the governing body. I am sorry of the possibility of their being brought under clerical control. In itself I regard it as an evil. I have heard it described as a democratic University. Democratic is a word which we all utter with great self-satisfaction. It either means nothing or many things, and it certainly means many different things on many different occasions. But I do not call a University democratically governed if it is governed by county councils. I regard that as the worst possible form of University government. A University is democratically governed when it is governed by its own graduates; and I am convinced that what the right hon. Gentleman has put, not in his Bill, but in his Charter, cannot permanently stand. The great Universities of this country are governed by themselves, and I cannot conceive why this University, except in a transitory period, is not to be governed by itself. Autonomy is the criterion of academic freedom, and autonomy is the last thing you are giving by this Bill. I do not wish to argue in detail the question of this intervention of the county councils. May I say, however, that the University of which I have the honour to be Chancellor—the University of Edinburgh—is probably historically and by traditions more closely connected with the town of which it is one of the ornaments than can ever be the case with a new University started in these days. In former times the town council of Edinburgh had an immense position of influence in the selection of professors and in other matters connected with the government of the University. But the whole tendency of reform in Edinburgh has been to diminish the effective control of the city over the University. I think it is now represented *ex officio* by the Lord Provost for the time being on the governing body. Has that had the effect of dividing the interests of the University from those of the city? Not in the least. Every successive body of governors in Edinburgh have felt equally a patriotic interest in their University, and they have been equally liberal where they can be. But they have been excluded from a function for which I venture to say a county council as such is unfit, and their exclusion has not in the least diminished, rather it has improved, the harmonious relations between the University and the city of Edinburgh. I frankly say, therefore, that I dislike the hybrid body which the right hon. Gentleman has put in to govern the new University, to govern the University through the colleges. I do not like it, and I believe that the provision is transitory and provisional; and from that point of view I regard it with satisfaction. When a true ideal of University government is upheld, when a University is really governed by its graduates, then your Maynooth, important as it is now, would become doubly important. If these evils exist now, then they would be redoubled with every reform which makes your new University more autonomous. I confess that, compared with this ideal, I am absolutely not of the frame of mind of the hon. Member opposite who regards with satisfaction the prohibition of a chapel within the precincts of the new University. I cannot conceive why that should be so. In respect of the chapels of Oxford and Cambridge and of Trinity College, Dublin, no one can allege that they hurt the conscience of any man or do anything in the direction of proselytising those who attend. They are centres of sentiment which I think add an additional charm to the memories that have always surrounded our great Universities. How anyone who is prepared to accept the affiliation scheme of Maynooth can regard it as a triumph of undenominational Protestantism that there should not be a chapel, passes my comprehension.

SIR GEORGE WHITE: I do not accept the affiliation college of Maynooth.

AN HON. MEMBER (on the IRISH Benches): That is shocking!

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought, at any rate, that I should not be doing my duty to the House if I did not make this criticism on the Bill, but I do not wish to dwell upon its dangers. It has come to pass; and I am going to support the Third Reading. That being so, I should wish to dwell in a more cheerful key than I have couched the inevitable criticisms which I felt compelled in honesty to pass on one of the provisions of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman, I think, would have a perfect right to get up and say to me: "Well, you have passed your criticisms on this Bill; you have always been in favour of higher education in Ireland; you have not passed it, but I have. It is very easy for you to criticise a Bill which is new, and as to which I have found the difficulties to be almost insuperable; you must not complain of me because I have been obliged to make some concession to forces which in this practical world of ours had to be dealt with if the Bill was to pass at all." If the right hon. Gentleman chooses to make that criticism, I think it is a perfectly fair one. I do not think, however, that I can reconcile myself to the Maynooth clause. The right hon. Gentleman has undoubtedly had immense difficulties to contend with, difficulties, indeed, which his predecessors found to be immense; and if that be so, then I am ready to accept his work as being what it is—a great and courageous effort. In dealing with what I individually have long considered to be a crying scandal of Irish education, it certainly does not beseem me to take up a superior and critical attitude towards the statesman who has himself fought the fight and brought it more or less to a termination. But let me add this. I think that there are dangers to the true interests of higher education deeply embedded in this Bill; but if the laity of Ireland—by which I mean the general public opinion increasing among Irish Roman Catholics—share, as I think they will probably share, my views, I believe that they will be able either to work this Bill effectively as it stands or to get it changed. We have seen in our own time the efforts of the educated Roman Catholic laity, with no disloyalty to the Church of which they are members, to obtain in this country and in America the most absolute freedom of University training quite apart from any ecclesiastical traditions which may stand in the way of that wider University culture. I believe that in this country among the lay division at Oxford, large numbers of Roman Catholics attend a hostel under the members of their own fold. But I believe also that in America even that limitation is absolutely ignored, and ignored with the consent of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in high places there. That is because, I believe, the American Roman Catholics, while perfectly loyal to their Church, insist on this absolute freedom for obtaining higher education, and in the same way the Irish lay Catholics could insist upon obtaining the same privileges without any breach or chance of friction with their Church, and with the full consent of the ecclesiastics of their own country. But it rests with the laity of Ireland, and all of us must hope, and many must believe—and I am sanguine myself—that the movement of public thought all over the world is in the direction of free University training irrespective of ecclesiastical control of whatever kind and whatever complexion. If, and as, that condition grows in strength and extends its beneficent influence to Ireland, then whatever the particular provisions of this Bill, I am confident that the sound and educated lay public opinion in Ireland will take advantage of all that is good in this measure and will take care that everything of evil, if anything of evil there be, will be remedied in practice by your legislation. I shall support the right hon. Gentleman.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) If I ever had any desire to be disagreeable to the right hon. Gentleman—and sometimes one has a desire to be disagreeable—the speech he has just made has completely disarmed me. I think that we are all now pleased at having reached this pleasant period of our labours, and speaking on a day usually unsoiled by political work I think that as far as I am concerned the least said the soonest mended. The right hon. Gentleman is a master of analysis, and he approached the question of whether this was a denominational or undenominational University, and I am quite content with what he says. I think I could say in one of the senses of the word that people may assume that this University is denominational. It may be assumed, but I do not know why. We have heard Dr. O'Dwyer's name mentioned a great deal in this debate. The hon. Member for the University of Cambridge quoted him to a very great extent. Dr. O'Dwyer is a great man for breaking down barriers, and he also is a very lively writer. What does he say? My hon. friends behind me will hear with surprise that he considers that this is a Nonconformist University. A Nonconformist University founded on a Bill framed by a Nonconformist Chief Secretary in combination with, in collusion with, and in constant discussion with, the leaders of the Free Churches, and that we have palmed off, or are palming off, upon the Irish people a rank denominational institution of a Nonconformist character, full of all the faults of Nonconformity, and that we are asking the Irish people to accept it. Well, I think that a jaundiced view. I put it forward to those persons who assert that this is a Bill that from first to last aims at giving the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Roman Catholic churches control. It is a complaint of this eminent ecclesiastic that by the constitution of this Bill it is not necessary for there ever to be any clerical member upon the governing body. He says the author of the Nonconformist Education Bill of 1906 is now the author of this Nonconformist University measure, and he complains bitterly that the clergy have been excluded from what he considers to be their right, in taking any active part or official part in the higher education of the sons of Ireland. I only mention that as some excuse for myself. I think nobody will take Dr. O'Dwyer's view in this House, at all events as to the part which I have played in this Bill, but they must not too hastily assume that this measure will work out in a rank denominational form. I do not quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman opposite that the Bill is framed to meet the needs of a denomination. It was framed to meet the needs of education. It was my great desire to obtain access to this University for the larger part of the people of Ireland who do undoubtedly belong to a particular denomination.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I meant to say that it was intended to meet the educational needs of the members of a denomination.

Mr. BIRRELL: It is intended to meet the educational needs of the people of Ireland, the large majority of whom are members of a particular denomination, I gladly hail the frank recognition from the right hon. Gentleman that so far as it is possible by law we have secured that this should for all time be an undenominational University in this sense. Supposing the Protestant clergy had a great preaching tour in Ireland (they have not been very successful in that in the past) in the course of the next few years, and the majority of the people in Ireland became Protestants and members of a great Protestant community, this University would require no alteration. Nothing need be said or done, it would still remain an undenominational Universty. The great thing is that the great majority of the students who flock to the University would possibly in time alter from the character they are now likely to have. In other words, we are setting up a University which protects no one, which says that no denomination as such shall be protected, which allows free scope and free play in the governing body, and those who are for the time being the vast majority of the graduates and undergraduates are not excluded from having that proper share in the governing of the University which everybody must have if the University is to reflect the opinions of the majority of the people. Now the two things which give the right hon. Gentleman cause for anxiety are, in the first place, the affiliation proposals. When I introduced the Bill I introduced a Bill which made it perfectly plain that it was within the power of the Senate to recognise—affiliation is the better word—

to affiliate institutions of a University type, subject to any conditions and limitations they chose to impose upon them. I had very little doubt that Maynooth would be affiliated, and I said so in so many words, but it was impossible for me then as it is now to say what terms the Senate may impose upon the affiliation of Maynooth. It may for a time impose none, and it may after a time if it grows stronger impose anything it likes. It may require complete residence for the whole of three years. It may require residence for one, and it may require residence for two. That was the position I took up when I introduced the Bill, and I could not do more than express my conviction that the Senate would exercise its powers in favour of Maynooth. But as to the conditions under which they would affiliate Maynooth, they were not in my mind at the time. I gave the House reasons why I thought it would be most undesirable to raise this question in the acute form in which it was raised by the Amendment yesterday. I still say it is undesirable for us here under these circumstances to say definitely and positively that the Senate should not take any power to impose what terms it chooses upon Maynooth. It would be possible for the Senate at any time to impose or change any conditions; therefore I think that on the whole we did a very wise thing yesterday in rejecting the Amendment which was moved with so much clearness and force of argument by hon. friend behind me. The other great objection of the right hon. Gentleman was as to the representation of the civic authorities on the governing body of the colleges. I perhaps ought to say that the notion that Maynooth students will overwhelm the Senate is not quite accurate. These Maynooth students will only have the power to elect eight members out of a body of thirty-five. The right hon. Gentleman rather objects to the restrictions and limitations of convocation. A nice academic distinction is raised here. Many people think that the non-residential graduates scattered all over the face of the world are not altogether the persons who keep themselves most closely in touch with the University questions of the day. I am rather of opinion, as a Nonconformist and a Liberal, that on the whole we suffer much at the University of Cambridge from the inclusion of those who have long since left the University. But it is better to leave the position as it stands, and after all I rather agree with the right hon. Gentleman that a graduate of University ought not to be cut off more than you can help from some influence in the governing body of his University. As the Bill stands, these Maynooth students will only have the opportunity of electing eight gentlemen out of thirty-five. Now about a civic authorities' representation on the colleges. They are not of course direct representatives of the University at all, and the only way they can come in is upon the governing body of the new college at Dublin by electing six members, three of whom have to be members of the Academic Council. Consequently, the civic influence is not likely to be very large. There would be four from the Queen's College of Cork, of whom two are academic, and four from Galway, two of whom have to be academic. It is pushing the thing far too far to anticipate that on the governing bodies of the colleges, these six civic gentlemen will have very little influence. But the question is as to the part they ought to play in the governing bodies of the colleges. I agree there is a great deal to be said on both sides, and that is the reason why I could not accept the Amendment moved by the Member for Cambridge University, who wanted to put into the Bill a modified representation. I much prefer to leave the governing bodies of the colleges in the charters, where it will be easier to make alterations if necessary from time to time. There is a very strong feeling indeed, and I confess I have derived a certain amount of pleasure therefrom, particularly in the localities of Cork and Galway, that we should enlist the sympathies of the local authorities in what I may call the taxable areas of these two new colleges, so that no part of the great Province of Munster should be left out of consideration in the working of these new colleges, and that is the reason there is such a large proportion of the local councils in Cork and Galway. If you want these colleges to have the least foundation in the hearts of the people it is essential that you should secure local sympathy. For a considerable time the colleges must struggle with an adverse fate, and in a country like Ireland full of local feeling—and it follows almost to the same extent as local prejudices—it is most necessary if you want these colleges to be successful that they should be in sympathy with the people, and the people should take some share, some lot, in making the fortunes of these establishments. That was the reason why we adopted this course — an experiment which will be watched in Ireland by all academic persons, and I believe by all the people of Ireland generally, very carefully. And if the civil authority is excessive, well, it can be modified. Now I will not detain the House any longer. I have had to work very hard for a great cause, and I am bound to say I have received nothing but kindness and consideration from all the persons concerned. I should particularly like to refer to the frank and loyal support I have always received in this measure from the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for the University of Dublin, who has only had some small objections to find in the Bill, and who has from first to last given me his frank and loyal support, and I am all the more grateful because in other aspects of my administration he is sometimes rather harsh. Reference has been made to the fact that I have for the future left the Royal University entirely out of consideration. I have from first to last communicated with members of its Senate and have received communications from Lord Castletown, and I must say that that nobleman, although the University of which he was some time Chancellor is now disappearing, has worked most loyally with me and has afforded me every assistance, and there is no feeling whatsoever about the fact he is left out of the new institution. Such instances of self-denial and self-effacement are most peculiarly gratifying. I can only say generally that we all of us —the hon. Gentleman who moved the rejection of the Bill ended his speech by expressing the same opinion—hope that these Universities we are founding to-day, which will last long years after everyone of us has crumbled into dust, will have before them years of usefulness and pride and distinction and glory, and that they will keep a light in Ireland, a country which has ever, and in the most distressing circumstances, had the warmest feeling and respect for letters, that will play a great part in revivifying, educating, and I hope unifying, a famous race and a great people.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said he would not discuss whether the Bill was denominational or undenominational. He thought the last and the truest word on that subject had been said by his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition. The real problem was how to frame a University which should be Catholic in tone and spirit and yet academic in principles. He could not but congratulate the Chief Secretary on his adroitness in reconciling those two difficult conditions. The right hon. Gentleman had to unite in his own person the views of a Roman prelate and a Nonconformist minister, and he had performed that difficult task in a way which he believed nobody else in that House could have done. They congratulated him on the courage he had shown in the inception of the scheme, and thanked him for the courtesy he had shown in carrying it out. He would like to sum up in a general view what to his mind were the distinctive merits and also the flaws of the Bill. The great merit of the Bill was that it sought to remove a long-standing disability; it recognised that the State had an obligation, not yet paid, to the majority of the Irish people. The Bill was an attempt not only to repair an educational defect, but to redress a wrong, unintended on the part of this country, but yet a real and national wrong. What the remote effects of the Bill would be in the sphere of politics and in the social and administrative spheres, nobody could say. That it would have the most far-reaching effects in every department of Irish life, he was certain. His own hope—a confident hope—was based upon the power of knowledge in the direction of emancipating and enlarging the mind and producing a spirit of toleration. The next reason why he welcomed the Bill was that it got rid of a false University ideal. It displaced an Examining Board and set up in its stead two Universities framed on the whole on academic principles. He ought to qualify that by saying that while it displaced that false ideal in the case of the laity of Ireland, it did not do so in the education of the clergy. In the case anyhow of the laity it laid down the principle that examination was to follow the lines of teaching, and not teaching to follow the lines of examination, and he rejoiced that the Chief Secretary had held out firmly against the admission of externs to the privileges of a degree. The next point was that the constitution of the governing bodies was free; there were no *ex-officio* clerics on any of them. There were, however, *ex-officio* politicians, who he wished were there in much smaller numbers. If the Universities wished to have clerics on their governing bodies—and he thought it was right there should be some—it rested with them, of their own free choice, to have them. The Bill had the merit of leaving the future of these bodies entirely in the hands of the laymen of Ireland, and it rested with the laymen to show whether they were worthy of that trust. He had no misgivings whatever as to the future of Belfast University. It was a much more compact unity than the new University at Dublin, and it would be unvexed by the highly controversial questions which they had been discussing for weeks past. It consisted of a single college with homogeneous elements. He was confident that the founding of that University in Belfast would have upon the whole of the business community in Belfast and the outlying industrial districts of the north of Ireland the same sort of effect as the founding of the new Universities in England had had upon the industrial communities here. The men who represented the commerce of the north of Ireland would take the same pride in their University as had been shown so marvellously in the case of the newer Universities of England. He knew that the work done and the teaching given in the University of Belfast would be largely of a technical and professional kind, and rightly so. The great need of Ireland, not only of the north but of the south too, was that science should be applied to industry, and he believed the new University of Belfast would serve that end. But he would express the hope that all these specialised studies might be carried on in a truly liberal way, that they might be based on scientific principles and have that larger outlook which alone could produce original research leading to discoveries in science within the walls of the University. The other hope he had was that humane learning might still continue to exist side by side with this technical teaching; that it would be the pride of that University in the midst of a commercial community to give literary and philosophic culture, and that students there might learn what the thoughts and doings of civilised man were in other regions of knowledge. The new University in Dublin raised some grave and difficult problems. It was a Federal University; it was therefore a complex structure; but the hopeful thing about it was that it was established on the only lines on which a Federal University could now be constituted. That was to say, the constituent colleges were given the largest possible freedom as regards their own courses of study, and their own government; they would have as few interferences from the Senate of the University as was compatible with maintaining uniformity of standard and general University principles. Such were the merits of the Bill. He would next turn to its blemishes. Two of them had been mentioned that afternoon, and he would not discuss them further. First there was a form of affiliation, under which it was possible for the clergy, who were to be cut off entirely from academic life, yet to have a share in the government of the University. He had had his say on that question upstairs and on Report, and he only now wished to express his cordial agreement with every word that had fallen from the Leader of the Opposition. The other flaw lay in the constitution of the federated colleges. He thought there was an undue proportion of the civic and county representation on their governing bodies, and that it would be very difficult to carry on government, to appoint professors, to regulate the University courses, in any free and academic way, if these professed politicians exercised the right given them to interfere in every detail. But there was another blot, the gravest of all, and that was that there was no provision in the Bill for the establishment of a residential college in Dublin. From various points of view that was a most serious defect. In the first place, it seemed to him a doubtful question whether parents or their spiritual advisers would recommend young men to go to Dublin from the country. They would have the prospect of going into lodgings; they would live scattered through a great metropolis without any kind of discipline or organised academic life. The argument for affiliation, too, would be immensely strengthened by the fact that there was no residential college in Dublin; in fact, the only strong argument for it that could be adduced remained so long as there was this defect. It would be said: "If you had given us a residential college to which young men could go, we should then have been content, and would have encouraged them to go to the University; but as it is, you must affiliate our provincial colleges in order to save our students from the moral dangers which beset them in the midst of a great city." Then there was another side to this question—the absence of that social life which was connected with a residential college. Hitherto Irishmen had asked for a University, and they had been given an Examining Board; they had been given something in which there was no human element, a piece of cold and impersonal mechanism. He would put it to hon. Members that if the memories of their own college days centred round examinations which they had passed or in which they had failed, what a different thing a University would mean to them from what it did to-day! Now the Bill, it was true, gave a college, but it did not give college life. They were given lecture rooms and laboratories, but what they needed in order to make the University a reality was the human and humanising influence of college life. The Irishman was sociable and gregarious; he had an instinct for comradeship, a love of discussion, a rich capacity for friendship. He had powers which could not be fully developed by solitary study, but must be fostered in the intimacy of daily companionship. He craved the society of equals and the stimulus of kindred minds. Society he must have of one kind or another. There were some persons with whom you got at the heart through the head; others with whom you got at the head through the heart. In Ireland the heart came first, the head second. Head and heart, intellect and emotion, working together produced a finer intellectual product than intellect alone. That union could hardly be produced except in the society of friends and equals. Without all that belonged to college life and college friendships they would never be able to call out the special qualities of the Irishman, which depended upon love of friends and upon appeal to the head through the heart. The Chief Secretary had done his best to get money for college buildings. It was shortsighted and niggardly action on the part of the Treasury to spoil a great gift for lack of capital outlay. A sum of £100,000 given once and for all would probably have met the case. He thought it was a foolish bit of parsimony, but they would go on knocking at the Treasury door until they obtained a sum which would start the University under prosperous and hopeful conditions. Without a residential college it was doubtful whether the new University in Dublin could come into being. What he insisted on was that learning was not a mere abstract thing, but that it was realised through personal relations, and above all through the organised social life of fellow students. Under the Bill such social life was impossible, and it would still remain for Parliament to complete the work it had now begun by providing funds for true collegiate life.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork) said that before the Motion was carried he desired to say one or two words. Auspicious as the passing of this Bill was to Ireland, the circumstances and almost general consent with which it was passed constituted a still more auspicious event, not only for Ireland, but for England, because although credit was richly due to the Chief Secretary, the right hon. Gentleman would, he thought, be the first to acknowledge that the passing of the Bill was practically the work of all parties, and the result of a certain amount of sacrifice and of amicable compromise on all sides. The Nationalists had had something to sacrifice. They, in Ireland, were accustomed to positions which were not second, but only fourth or fifth in matters concerning

Irish affairs. He recognised, as his hon. friend had done, that the Nonconformists in that House, for whom the hon. Baronet had spoken, had to a certain extent to do violence to their own prepossessions in order to allow this Bill to go unmolested. If they had thought more of their own preference, their own internal searchings of heart, than of the magnitude of the blessings this Bill would undoubtedly diffuse among young Irish men, and young Irish women, they might unquestionably, even a small body of them, at any moment, have cut short the career of the Bill. They had resisted the temptation, and had made themselves a party to one of the best and, he believed, most fruitful contributions to the regeneration of Ireland with which the name of the Liberal Party would be associated. He must recognise no less cordially, forgetting one or two little lapses into Party recriminations, and remembering only the generous speech made that afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition, that the fate of the Bill had to a very great extent depended upon the sincerity and policy and magnanimity of the Unionist leaders, and some of the most eminent men of the Unionist Party. Although in their active opposition they had thrown out no hint of great hostility, yet they might easily have sealed the fate of this Bill, if not in that House, in another place. But he was bound to say that both publicly, and so far as he knew privately, their co-operation in bringing about the success of the Bill had been sincere and decisive. He did not forget the struggle of the few hon. Members for Ulster. He did not wish to say one word of an uncomplimentary character about them. They had fought a dogged and gallant battle, though discountenanced to a certain extent by the Leader of the Unionist Party, and, later, by the Leader of their own Ulster Party. The Irish Party had been so often in a minority, so often in a folorn minority, that they could not fail to recognise and to honour the tenacity and courage of hon. Members above the gangway. He hoped that their experience for a couple of months in the Committee room upstairs, on both sides, had left no unkindly memories, and had helped hon. Members, even the hon. Member for East Down, to realise that they were in no immediate danger of being burned at the stake for their opinions at the hands of their Nationalist fellow-countrymen. Strongly as he approved of the Bill, he regarded the circumstances in which it had passed through the House as a matter of still higher consequence to the future relations between this country and Ireland, and for this reason: that this perplexed sectarian controversy, like the still angrier agrarian controversy, had been placed at all events on the road to a solution by, in the first place, the spirit of friendly compromise and cordial regard amongst Irishmen themselves, a spirit which had prompted eminent Irishmen like the hon. Member for Cambridge University, and the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Dublin University, although still differing from them in some things, to meet them on common ground, as sons of a common country, of which he was sure they were all, in their own way, equally proud. In the second place, that happy agreement amongst Irishmen had been sealed and endorsed by practically speaking all parties in that House. He congratulated the Chief Secretary most heartily on being the beneficent wizard, by the move of whose genial wand these magic results had been produced. He only hoped the right hon. Gentleman might be equally able in the future, by similar methods, to bring about similar results of co-operation among Irish parties and among English parties. All he could say was, that if he could only get the House to regard Irish questions, the great agrarian difficulty and the national difficulty in Ireland, in the same way as that House was willing to treat the question of the Navy or of foreign affairs, namely, as questions sacred from the mere petty momentary interests of party, and as matters in which both parties were entitled to claim a legitimate share of the credit, then he would not despair of living to see the day when they would reach and solve the final problem of the Irish difficulty in a friendly way, and when even the hon. and gallant Member for East Down might accept the situation with the same good humour with which he was sure they would now set to work to make a rattling success of the Belfast University, which they had made so gallant a semblance of rejecting in England.

*Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said he never felt more unlike a man who was about to die in the last ditch than at that moment. He recognised that in a very short time the last stone would be put on one of the most gigantic monuments of Nonconformist hypocrisy and inconsistency which that House had ever seen. The hon. Member for Waterford had said the Nonconformist portion of the party opposite had put aside a great many of their predilections, but that was putting the case very mildly. He would say that they had swallowed one of the most nauseating draughts it was possible to conceive. Some philosopher, he forgot whether it was Shakespeare or not, said that when they told a lie they should tell a good big one. If they were going to do a thing they should do it thoroughly, and he congratulated hon. Members opposite. They had certainly done this business very thoroughly. They had thrown over in the most absolute way all the professions in which they were brought up and a good many of the professions which had secured them admission to the House of Commons, and if they felt happy in their minds after having done so it was not his business to criticise them further. His hon. friend who moved the rejection of the Bill had said that no doubt the action and speeches of himself and his friends would be looked upon simply as the narrow-minded and bigoted views of Ulster. Hon. Members opposite, when they cheered that remark, forgot for the moment that their views on this question were exactly and precisely those which they themselves held up to about three months ago, and if they were the narrow-minded and bigoted views of the Ulster Members they were also the narrow-minded and bigoted views of the Nonconformist Party up to the time the Bill was introduced. They had had so much unreal discussion on the denominational question that he was getting tired of it and had almost hoped it would be left out of the Third Reading discussion. It had frequently been asked what an undenominational University was, and he admitted it was a very difficult question to answer, but his idea of an undenominational University was the present Queen's Colleges in Ireland, had the ban which was put upon them by the Roman Catholic hierarchy never been imposed. That ban was only imposed by the narrow majority of one in a meeting of thirteen or fourteen bishops. It was a mere toss up whether the bishops forty years ago had accepted the Queen's Colleges in Ireland and allowed Roman Catholics to go to them. If they had, the Queen's Colleges in Cork and Galway would have been as successful seats of learning as the Queen's College in Belfast had been, and they would long ago have extracted very large sums of money out of the British taxpayer and would have been very much better equipped and larger institutions. Could anybody say that this Dublin University would be undenominational? It had been set up precisely because the bishops refused to recognise these other institutions because they were not sufficiently denominational, because they were Godless. In 1871 the bishops were calling out as they had always done for a denominational University, and they passed a series of resolutions, among them one in which they pledged themselves to oppose the return of any candidate for Parliament who would not uphold the principle of denominational education for the Catholic people, and they knew perfectly well the bishops had not changed their attitude in any way. They had all along stigmatised this as a purely denominational proposal, and all the feeble attempts of hon. Members to dispose of that accusation had been futile. It was because this was a denominational proposal that hon. Members below the gangway were thanking the Chief Secretary for giving it to them. *The Times*, on the First Reading of the Bill said—

> "The fiction that the measure is anything but denominational is too gross to deceive anybody, or to soothe any but the most adaptable consciences."

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Mr. Pigott's friend.

*Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said that Mr. Pigott had some friends who discerned the political situation with wonderful accuracy. The leader of the Nonconformist Party on the back benches liked the Bill just about as much as he did, but owing to pressure from various quarters he felt compelled not to oppose it. He said he was envious for an educated priesthood in Ireland. But he would like to ask how under the Bill the priesthood were going to be better educated than they were at present. The students of Maynooth who were to some extent synonymous with the priesthood of Ireland had a right which they freely exercised of obtaining their degrees from the Royal University. As they had refused to accept an Amendment providing that the Maynooth students were to take part in the life of the new University in Dublin the situation was precisely the same as before, with the difference that instead of taking their degrees at the Royal University they were going to take them at the new University at Dublin. Nineteen-twentieths of the year they would be at Maynooth and they would go up to Dublin possibly for a couple of days at the end of the year to pass their examinations. The hon. Member was under a misapprehension when he thought there would be any difference in the quality or quantity of education given to Maynooth students, because it was all a question of the standard that was going to be set by the new University as compared with that which had been set by the Royal University. He had always understood that at the latter it was very high, and it was improbable that the standard set by the new University would be any higher. If that was the hon. Member's chief reason for withholding opposition he might just as well vote against the Third Reading. He had certainly damned the Bill with as faint praise as he ever heard and had not a good word to say for it. His last attempt to satisfy his conscience was that it would be a great pity that the Chief Secretary should not have the credit of passing a Bill over which he had taken such an amount of trouble, and that the right hon. Gentleman had stated publicly that if it did not pass he would resign office. That he thought was rather a reason for throwing out the Bill. He did not consider the Chief Secretary had been at all a success in that very responsible office. The hon. Member was no doubt of a different way of thinking, but it was surely a very small and a very dangerous argument to use, that no matter how questionable the Bill itself might be or how little good the hon. Member was able to see in it, it should pass simply because to throw it out would be a serious blow to the political reputation of the Chief Secretary. As far as he could see, and that was the only speech they had had from a Member of the Nonconformist Party, they were going blindly to vote for the Bill though there had not been a single argument adduced in favour of it. He could understand hon. Members below the gangway, and the Leader of the Opposition who had been for many years in favour of something of the sort, but they had yet to hear from the great body of the Nonconformist Party any argument by which they could reconcile their support of the Bill with every declaration they had made in the past on this question of denominational education. He wished to criticise two statements made by the hon. Member for Waterford. The hon. and learned Member said that the Bill had received the sanction of everybody in the House, and practically of everybody in Ireland with the exception of a few hon. Members sitting on the Unionist Benches. But however small their numbers might be in that House, at least they all held their seats by a very substantial majority, and according to all the ideas of Parliamentary representation they represented the vast majority of those who sent them to the House of Commons. It was perfectly well known that in the North of Ireland and in Ulster the people were as much opposed to the general provisions of this Bill, which set up a denominational University, as they were themselves. It was true that the Chief Secretary by hard work had been able to stifle the opposition of a certain number of persons in Belfast, including the professors and their *entourage* of Queen's College in that city, but they did not represent the feeling in the North of Ireland in regard to the Bill. In the North of Ireland the Bill was detested just as much as they had shown their detestation of the measure in the House, and the attitude of the Ulster Members towards the measure was only a reflection of the feeling entertained in Ulster. Therefore, for the hon. and learned Member for Waterford to try and make the House believe that the opposition to the Bill only came from a small section of Ulster was very misleading. On the affiliation clause the hon. and learned Member for Waterford said he could not understand how the British House of Commons could treat this question in the way they had done in the past after reading the Report furnished on the subject two or three years ago as to the provision made in foreign countries for Roman Catholics. It was extraordinary that the hon. and learned Member should furnish that as an argument in favour of a denominational Roman Catholic University. The opponents of the Bill had been relying upon that document in support of their case for years, and every page of it showed that the proposal to be carried out under the Bill was one which had been refused in almost every country in the world, and in those countries where frankly denominational Universities existed. As time went on every one of them had been swept away, and with the exception of one in Belgium and Austro-Hungary there was not in the whole of Europe a single University which could be said to be denominational. He was greatly surprised that the hon. and learned Member had found himself able to get out of that document an argument in support of his views, because it was a document which had been relied upon by those who were opposed to the Bill. But the Bill, whether right or wrong, was one which affected very closely Unionist Members from Ireland. [Cries of "Divide."] He thought that when hon. Members opposite were getting all they wanted they might at least tolerate a few words from an opponent. While he had fought the measure, and was extremely sorry it was about to pass, he cherished a hope that the Roman Catholic laity in the course of time would share the desire to see Catholics and Protestants working together in the Universities, regardless of religious or political differences. He and his hon. friends would do all they could to make the scheme a success, and, although they had their doubts, since the denominational system was to be stereotyped, his colleagues and he hoped that notwithstanding its drawbacks and disadvantages, the system would be successful.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.) said that as a Belfast man and as the oldest Member of the British House of Commons he desired to say a few words upon the Third Reading of this Bill. In reference to Irish measures, it was not often that an Irishman in that House was justified in using language of congratulation. After centuries of educational starvation, after years of injustice to the majority, after numerous ineffectual efforts and Ministerial defeats, that a solution to the University problem should have been discovered must be pleasing to the accomplished Chief Secretary and eminently satisfactory to the Irish nation. All efforts hitherto had failed because they were directed on lines unsuited to sectarian denominational Ireland. The people must be governed according to their desires, which was the constitutional method. Although the country was sectarian the Chief Secretary had contrived to construct the two Universities on purely academic lines, and at the same time he had created by Senates in Dublin and Belfast an atmosphere in which the inhabitants of both cities could live and breath with pleasure,and thus he had solved a difficult question which had baffled the wit of man for centuries. As a Belfast man he could say that every man in Ulster whose opinion was worth having was favourable to the Bill. The measure was greatly appreciated in Belfast—which was a young town that had risen rapidly to wealth and importance. Until late in the last century it had no reputation for learning, much less for culture, but the generation of toilers who had passed away, who devoted themselves only to the accumulation of wealth, had left behind them new tastes and new aspirations. At present in the city and throughout Ulster there was a growing desire for literary and scientific study which could only be fostered by University life. In Dublin the new University must be still a greater boon. It would afford the Catholic people for the first time in centuries the opportunity of competing with their fellow countrymen for positions of place and power and at last remove one of the disabilities under which they had too long suffered. There was room in Ireland for three Universities. In Scotland, a smaller country, there were four, which had enabled the Scotsman to take the foremost place in every region of the world where money was to be made or responsibility acquired. The three Universities in Ireland with pending reforms in elementary and intermediate education, would tend to flush the channels of intellectual life, widen the boundaries of thought, afford the means of participating in the extension of human knowledge, and enable her brainy sons to take their place in competitive examinations for the best appointments of the Empire. It was admitted that education, secular and religious, was absolutely necessary for the progress and elevation of a nation, and he had no doubt that this legislative measure would be largely availed of, to acquire that useful knowledge necessary even in agricultural pursuits as well as in all other industrial enterprises in Ireland. That any representative of an Irish constituency should venture to oppose this educational measure for his country was to him a marvel. It was a mercy there were so few. The enemies of Ireland were happily diminishing in number all over Great Britain and Ireland, but there were still a few to be found in the North-East corner of Ireland. Even there they were rapidly diminishing. The trend of public opinion led one to believe that the dawn of a brighter day was nearing for that beautiful but hitherto ill-governed country.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme) said that Nonconformists had been twitted with having stifled their prejudices in allowing this Bill to pass, while the Nationalist Members had not repressed their prejudices and allowed the Education Bill for England to pass. It seemed to him that when Nonconformists had allowed Ireland to have Home Rule in this matter, and to have the higher education they wanted, they might have reciprocated and allowed the Nonconformists to have their Bill. He was sure that feeling was widely felt throughout the country. He had received a letter in which a leading Primitive Methodist light in his own constituency said—

> "I am now expecting in a few days to be again summoned before the magistrates for the non-payment of the objectionable educational rate. . . . The Government's silence is aggravated by contrast, for while we are apparently abandoned and expected to take it lying down, Ireland is to have its University Bill, a measure in flat contradiction to all Nonconformist principles here. The Catholic hierarchy in Ireland gets its price, while we, who worked as for more than life or death under promises that three years ago were to be fulfilled at the earliest possible period, have been outwitted by lords and bishops and over-reached by the Irish Party."

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): The Irish Party voted for the Third Reading of the Bill.

Mr. WEDGWOOD: After the Bill had been so modified that it was useless to Nonconformists.

Mr. DILLON: It was your own Government's Bill.

Mr. WEDGWOOD said they had heard from the eloquent Leader of the Irish Party and from the hon. Member for Cork City of the gratitude which Ireland would feel for the passage of this Bill. He hoped that the hon. and learned Member for Waterford and his friends would remember when legislation on the subject of education was proposed for England that England ought to be allowed to legislate for herself.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 207; Noes, 19. (Division List No. 223.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bellairs, Carlyon
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Brooke, Stopford
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.

Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Arthur (Durham).
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordon, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael

Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N)
Meehan, Patrick A.(Queen's Co
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.

Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards,T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmarthe
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Master of Elibank and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn Sir Alex.F
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cox, Harold
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey

Gordon, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter(Dublin,S)
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Seaverns, J. H.

Sloan, Thomas Henry
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Moore.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

FINANCE BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): When the history of this Parliament comes to be written I should not be surprised if it should be found that the Finance Bill of the present year is the most important with which this Parliament has had to deal, alike in the precedents which it sets up and in the effect which it has on our future fortunes. The first of these precedents is connected with the circumstances under which we have been called upon to discuss the Bill. The Government has taken the discussion at a later period of the session than, I think, has ever before been the case in a session of Parliament which was interrupted by no Government crisis or a dissolution of Parliament, and they have placed the Third Reading of the Bill as the second Order at a Saturday sitting towards the end of July at a time when it is impossible to expect the House, as is perfectly obvious from its appearance at the present moment, to give serious attention to the great problems involved, and when it is impossible to take the sense of the House fairly and representatively upon the merits of the measure. Under these circumstances, I do not propose to follow the course which, during the Committee stage of the Bill, I had indicated I meant to take, and shall not make the Motion for the rejection of the Bill, the hope of doing which was at once the excuse and justification for taking no detailed part in the discussions and divisions which accompanied the Committee stage. I take note of the action of the Government in this respect and of the new precedent which they are creating for Finance Bills. Finance Bills as we go on are not likely to become less important, less complicated, or perhaps less contentious. But the Government with all their responsibility have set a precedent for the treatment of such Bills from which probably neither this Parliament nor future Parliaments can escape. More important than the procedure in relation to these Bills are the intrinsic merits of the Government's financial proposals themselves, and in that respect this Bill stands out as one of quite exceptional and extraordinary importance. It is one of an unparalleled character, I think, in our financial history. The Government this year have been engaged in laying financial burdens upon the country in pursuit of a great scheme of social reform of a character and of an amount which are wholly unparalleled in our history. They have, I had almost said, by a stroke of the pen, but I would say by a single measure, laid these great financial burdens upon the country and on the future taxpayer, but what constitutes the most remarkable feature of their policy is that whilst by a single act they have assumed these great burdens they have made no provision for meeting the new liabilities that are created, and they have given no intimation of the way in which they propose to make good the gap yawning before us between expenditure and revenue. Of the many expectations held out by the Government and its supporters at the last election, and whilst they were in opposition, none was more constantly repeated than the assurance that they would reduce the expenditure of the country. They have failed in the two years that they have been in power to reduce that expenditure, and now by their action in the present session they have made reduction of expenditure in future an impossibility. They have remitted here and there a tax or a portion of a tax, but they are collecting a larger revenue than any of their predecessors have ever attempted to collect in time of peace, and that revenue is, by confession of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, wholly inadequate to the burdens which the House of Commons have already laid on the people. At what moment are they doing it? They are doing it at the close of a succession of prosperous years in which the revenue has advanced by great leaps, but when already the signs of a reaction are everywhere patent around us, when by the Chancellor of the Exchequer's confession taxes are yielding less than they did before, and when there is, therefore, special reason to regard with jealousy and suspicion all new burdens which we have not yet decided how to meet. It used to be the boast of the Liberal Party, and under Mr. Gladstone it was a boast that the Party could rightly make, that they steadily pursued in office a reduction of our expenditure, and that though reduction can never be sudden, as increase may be, when they had a fair field and a reasonable time before them they did do something to reduce the annual national liabilities. The present Government are acting on an entirely different principle. They are not merely extending liabilities beyond the provision that they make this year, but they are encouraging hopes and expectations which subsequent Parliaments will be expected to fulfil, and which must themselves involve an increase of the very liabilities for which the Government are at present failing to provide. There is another aspect of the case which renders this matter one of increased gravity. I have spoken of our domestic situation, of the want of elasticity in the existing taxes, and of the need for caution, therefore, in regard to our national finances. But is not the international position one which also requires and demands our careful consideration in respect of this matter, having regard to the liabilities which may arise out of our international relations, which do not depend solely upon our action, and yet may at any moment involve us in the heaviest expenditure which the country has ever seen? I do not know whether other Members of this House have read as I did the speech which Lord Cromer delivered on the Old-age Pensions Bill in another place. I differ widely from Lord Cromer as to the proper basis and character of our fiscal system, but although the President of the Board of Trade accused tariff reformers of having spoken in ignominious terms of Lord Cromer at the moment he chose to differ from them on the fiscal question, not one of them has ever used language about Lord Cromer which did not recognise his great authority and the wealth of experience which he brought to the consideration not merely of fiscal but of political questions. Hon. Gentlemen opposite are very glad to quote the authority of Lord Cromer on behalf of his fiscal views. Will they pay any attention to his warning as to the result of the financial course on which they are now embarking. He said the other day—

> "What, I would ask, in the present condition of Europe, is the main duty which devolves on the Government of this country? For my own part, I have no sort of hesitation in replying to this question. Their main duty is to make provision betimes for the European conflict which may not improbably be forced on us before many years have elapsed. I am aware that the mass of the people of this country, who do not follow foreign affairs with any very close attention, are not alive to the possibility of any such conflict taking place. I say it is the duty of a Government gifted with both patriotism and foresight, who have means of information at their disposal which is not available to the general public, to provide betimes for that danger—a danger of which I, in common, I believe, with most people who can speak with real authority on foreign affairs, am very firmly convinced."

Now, what provision are Government making for a time of possible danger of that kind? They are making none. Their attitude is not purely negative; their attitude is one of positive destruction of the resources on which we should count. It has been a favourite thesis of the Party opposite—and not confined to them, for at different times Mr. Disraeli lent the weight of his authority to it—that the surest preparation for the emergency of a great international conflict in which this country might be engaged, is not the piling up of armaments, but the piling up of financial resources with which to meet them. I accept that statement only with great qualification. War in recent times, perhaps in all times, has not been a matter of improvisation. Least of all is it possible to improvise either the material or the *personnel* of war in the highly scientific and highly trained day in which we live. Therefore, in my opinion, it would be short-sighted indeed if we allowed our defensive forces to fall below the highest standard of efficiency that we are able to obtain. But I do not for a moment deny that second only to our naval and military forces for the purposes of a great war are the financial resources, which indeed depend on the efficiency of naval and military strength to give them time to develop and us time to use them, but which are rather the life blood of a struggle of any long continuance. How are these affected by the financial policy of the present Government? When Mr. Gladstone studied economy and not less the reduction of the naval and military preparations of the Empire, he was careful so to husband the financial resources he set free, that in the case of a great emergency they might be readily available to meet the financial pressure that might come upon us. But that is not what the Government are doing now. The financial resources which the Government have abandoned are of two kinds. There are the taxes which they have abandoned, not primarily on the ground that they are unnecessary, but on the ground that they are intrinsically and on principle bad and ought never to have been imposed. The tax on the export of coal was abandoned, not because we did not want the money that it provided, but because the Government objected to it on principle and held it to be a tax to which we ought in no circumstances to have recourse. The sugar tax which they are reducing this year fell, in their eyes, into the same category. The only reduction which has been made, which, in their opinion, according to their principles it would be legitimate to go back upon, is the small reduction of a penny in the tea duty. The other reductions which have been made on sugar and on coal have been possible only by maintaining the direct taxes at the full rate at which they stood when the Government assumed office. They have provided no additional resources; they have, in fact, destroyed or abandoned part of the resources on which we had to draw when they came into office if we were faced with a new war. Now, for the purposes of war we have two great financial resources. We have the amount which we devote under normal conditions of peace to the annual reduction of the National Debt, and which on any great emergency of war we can suspend and devote instead to the prosecution of the war. We have, in addition, the amount by which the taxes which we levy can be raised without impairing their yield and without inflicting too great a hardship on our people. To the resources of taxation the Government have added nothing. From them they have subtracted much. The resources of the Sinking Fund they had announced their intention of applying next year, not in order to meet a great emergency, but in order to help them over the financial difficulties which they and their policy have created. What the effect of the policy they have pursued may be on the public opinion of the country I do not know. I observe that Lord Cromer, approaching the question, as I have said, from a very different point of view from mine, accuses the Government of making a great breach in the walls of the stronghold that they were put there to defend, and I think it is not improbable that the great and intolerable strain which the Government are placing upon our present narrow fiscal resources will make more converts to fiscal reform than all the speeches which fiscal reformers have been delivering in the country. For my own part, whatever may be the effect of the Budget in helping forward the question of tariff reform, of which I am anxious to see the fruition, I regret—I more than regret, I view with great anxiety, the financial situation the Government has created, and the financial liabilities left for other years to meet. I do not think it is consistent or honest finance to offer to the poorer classes of the country the great boon of old-age pensions, coupling with it at the same time relief from part of the taxation they now pay. When such a proposal, essentially confined to the poorer classes, so costly, so vast in its character is made, while the Government has a right to call on every class in the community to contribute to this great social reform, it is the bounden duty of responsible statesmen to call on those who will be the beneficiaries under the new scheme to make some contribution towards the expenditure instead of teaching them that they can not only receive this boon without contributing towards it, but receive it in conjunction with relief from taxation which they have shared with others who will be excluded from any benefit under the scheme. From the point of view of national and domestic politics this is an unwise step for the Government to take; it sets a bad precedent, and in the hands, if not of this Government, of those who may follow them, will lead to the temptation on the part of those seeking entrance to the House to purchase the support of the masses in constituencies by raising hopes of progressive relief in the same direction. On this ground, and because it goes dangerously near inaugurating a vast system of national political corruption, I regret the Budget proposals. I regret them because of the strain placed on our financial resources at a critical time, and because of the encouragement given by action and speeches—notably by the Chancellor of the Exchequer—to those who are seeking now still further to reduce our naval and military forces, and to rely not on defensive preparations, but on soft words and good intentions in a situation where our contemporaries trust to stronger measures. Viewing the Budget in this light, I regret that circumstances, and the way in which the Government have used their control of business, prevent me from taking the opinion of Members in a full House. I do not qualify what I have said on the Report stage and only regret that the circumstances of the time have led me to confine my protest to speech.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) noted as a curious accompaniment to the right hon. Gentleman's argument against the action of the Government in passing the Old-age Pensions Bill that he voted for that Bill. It was a position not easy to understand. The right hon. Gentleman had laid great stress on the duty of the Government to retain taxation upon those who were to receive the benefit of pensions, and, on the surface, the argument was attractive; but, looked at closely, it would be seen that, as this was not a proposal that the taxpayer should provide his own pension, but that he should provide other people's, it would be absurd to place a burden upon those who were considered too poor to pay their own pension. If taxation was to be used as a means for redressing the inequalities of fortune, clearly it would be absurd to tax people to provide money for others less poor than themselves. That was what they were going to do, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer remarked to the friendly societies deputation that an extra shilling would be given to the man with 12s. a week, which he might spend in tobacco. He did not know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer regarded tobacco as a necessary of life. Surely it was absurd to tax families who had only 12s. a week to live upon, and to snatch away some of their food, in order to give 1s. a week for tobacco to an old man who already had 12s. and only himself to keep. If this was to be the destination of our taxes it was unjust to impose any taxation at all upon the very poor. On the other hand, if taxation was confined to providing for common national purposes, he held that, however poor a man was, he ought to contribute something to the upkeep of the nation to which he belonged, and from what he knew of the poorer classes they were willing to do so. They realised they were part of the nation as a whole, and were not merely concerned with the necessities of life; they did not live for bread alone; they had a pride in their country, and were willing to contribute towards national purposes; but, if the new principle was to be adopted and taxation used to subsidise the moderately poor, it was absurd to tax those who were yet poorer.

*SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) moved: "That this House declines to proceed with a measure which, while reducing substantially the tax on sugar, the produce of foreign countries, does nothing to relieve the burden of the tax on tea, an infinitesimal part of which is imported from possessions other than our own; and, while parting with a large part of revenue, renders the discharge of prospective obligations of unknown magnitude embarrassing to the finances and injurious to the credit of the State." He assured the House that he was not actuated by any considerations of a party character, but rather that he was filled with unaffected misgivings as to the trend and tendency as much as to the actual scheme which this year's Budget represented. His hon. friend the Member for Preston had just taxed his right hon. friend the Member for East Worcestershire with inconsistency in not opposing the Old-age Pension Bill, and yet with condemning the Budget. The inconsistency was only apparent. He himself followed exactly the same course, and what they objected to was that the Government, in view of the colossal commitments in which they were involved, should light-heartedly part with revenue such as the sugar tax. That was the whole point, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would on consideration see that there was some method in the plan which they had pursued. If there was one feature which more saliently stood out than another in this Bill, it was the determination, implied if not avowed, to afford no relief to the payers of direct taxation. That justified their belief that it was in pursuance of a settled policy on the part of His Majesty's Government gradually to exonerate and ultimately wholly to relieve those who contributed to the indirect taxation, those who represented four-fifths if not seven-eighths of the population, in order to maintain the present burdens, and to impose fresh charges upon the remaining one-eighth. That might be magnificent, heroic finance, but it was neither business nor practical politics. Anything but a moderate income-tax used to be considered a sort of reserve, a kind of nest egg for periods of emergency. Under the new dispensation we appeared to have changed all that, and he could not, therefore, resist the conclusion that when times of stress and trouble arrived, as they must in the chances and changes of European or international politics, we should find that that egg would assume attenuated and shrunken proportions. The Prime Minister had somewhat lightly repealed the coal tax, every shilling of which practically was paid by the foreign consumer, because he was unable to obtain that hard, smokeless coal elsewhere, and basing himself upon the well-accepted maxims of political economy, he (Sir Edward Sassoon) said without fear of challenge that the incidence of the tax inevitably fell upon the foreigner. [Dissent.] If that was doubted he would go to the highest authority in the House. It would be within the recollection of hon. Members that when the Prime Minister was asked to abolish the tax for the few months that remained in 1906, the repeal having been already decided on, he distinctly refused, on the ground that it would mean anything over £800,000 to the foreigner. Sir George Livesey, also an authority, the Chairman of the South Metropolitan Gas Company, employing 5,000 hands, and the inaugurator of co-operative profit sharing, told his shareholders that their gas bill for the year immediately following that repeal showed an increase of no less than £250,000 sterling. So that a prime ingredient in all industries, an article of necessity to every hut and cottage, had been raised in price by the direct action of the Government, while a clear present of £2,000,000 sterling a year had been made to foreign manufacturers. That was a curious frame of mind on the part of the Government. Whenever they were moved by a spirit of generosity, it seemed that it was towards the foreigner that their yearnings instinctively turned. He had already alluded to the coal tax. They had refused to renew the registration duty upon corn, which brought in millions without in the slightest degree affecting the price of bread. But let that pass. Now they had the tea and the sugar tax. Which of these did the right hon. Gentleman select for relief? How did they stand relatively to each other? Both were articles of universal consumption. Both had become commodities of necessary luxury to the poor, but whereas tea was imported from our own fellow-subjects, which gave employment to hundreds of thousands of lowly agriculturists in India and Ceylon, sugar, with the insignificant exception of what was imported from our West Indian Colonies, we got from possessions other than our own. The Prime Minister told them that the sugar tax was bringing in six millions of money, and that that was the soundest argument against its being lightly touched. Might he ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it brought in less now? Under this benevolent administration what were they going to do? Did they relieve tea? Not a bit of it. It was sugar that was the object of their affections, and as regards tea, there was none so poor to do it reverence. This incorrigible sub-conscious bias to benefit the stranger and to ignore one's own people was revealed to the House in the altruistic psychology of the Government with an amazing and a monotonous consistency. The Government were engaged, and properly so, in punishing those who were endeavouring to foment sedition among the ignorant and ill-balanced minds in India. But what were they doing for the peaceful, the law-abiding, and the staunchly loyal portion of the people? They talked of conciliating them, and he was convinced they talked sincerely. Here was a chance. Let them remove the extra tax upon tea, imposed for the purposes of the war, and they would have done more to convince the Indians of their earnest desire to encourage them in the arts of peace than any number of those vague and nebulous schemes which, from their very nature, must take years to develop and to come to fruition. The Chancellor of the Exchequer deluded himself into the belief that capital was accumulating in this country at a rate which he called colossal. But it was notorious that capital was leaving, and had been leaving the country. When he ask the Prime Minister a question across the floor of the House on that very subject, he seemed to belittle this remarkable phenomenon, and said it was to be accounted for by the return of capital, by greater vigilance and stringency in the collection of revenue, and he would make him a present of a further admission, that some securities held abroad had now entered the dividend paying list, but after all was said and done, and after all these deductions had been made, there still remained a huge amount which had been driven out of the country. The figures supplied by the Board of Inland Revenue testified to this. It was true they were getting the interest on the capital, but did the right hon. Gentleman not see that the capital went to fertilise and irrigate foreign industries abroad, to the detriment of the British workman at home? Why, we were fast becoming rent chargers. We were creating a sort of absentee landlordism in British capital. Was that a prospect so alluring and so satisfactory to the right hon. Gentleman's financial conscience? Then there was another gross misconception. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he went upon that ill-starred pilgrimage to the shrine of free trade, North-West Manchester, indulged in several statements—promises to working men, thick as the showers of Danae, sops to the Jews, doles to the Catholics, free bets taken and offered about old-age pensions—but there was one point which it would qe a pity not to rescue from unmerited oblivion. He talked about the expansion in the exports of cotton fabrics. He said, with that picturesqueness of language of which he was so great a master—

> "Look! See how your industry has prospered during the last year! There was more business in one district of Lancashire than in the whole of the United States put together."

If the right hon. Gentleman had been addressing some befogged and benighted electors in the backwoods or the backwaters of the Lake District, he could have understood it, but he was addressing the most enlightened and the most wide-awake electors in this country, and the best proof of their perspicacity was seen in the fact that they had returned his hon. friend whom he saw near him to represent them in this House. They knew what he must charitably assume was removed from the purview of the right hon. Gentleman's knowledge, that the average price of middling American cotton in 1907 was something like ½d. a pound higher than it was in 1906, and that this increase in the price of the raw material represented almost within the sixteenth part of a ¼d. the 11 per cent. increase in the imports over 1906 to which the right hon. Gentleman called attention. To be quite accurate, the increase worked out at 10·08. This represents no increase in trade profits, not a penny more in wages, not an ounce of extra employment. Let him now revert for an instant to the problem of fresh sources of revenue. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's name was indelibly identified with three enactments on the Statute-books of the realm which, by universal admission, had enured to the industrial interests of the country. He (Sir Edward Sassoon) was only a humble searcher after the truth. He was disposed to sit at the feet of this modern Gamaliel, and was tempted to ask him why, if it was right to protect the outcome of a man's brains and skill, as was done in the Patents Act, it should be so frightfully wrong to protect another man's unskilled work. Again, why, if it was permissible to protect the British seaman from the competition and the lower standard of living of his foreign and Asiatic rival, it should be pure anathema to protect his fellow-worker and fellow-subject from the competition of the Californian fields, say hops tended by Chinese cultivators, or from the sweated, certainly tariff-protected and bounty-fed, manufactures of the polyglot population of the United States. These phenomena were sinking into the minds of the people here. They were beginning to puzzle things out for themselves. The Sphinx-like attitude of right hon. Gentlemen opposite afforded them neither light, leading, nor guidance. He knew they did not like the bother of thinking out solutions for novel aspects and phases of devolution of economic manifestations going on all the world over. They could do that with impunity when trade was brisk and manufacturers were prospering. But now that they had entered upon a period of slackening activity and deflated trade, when they had launched the ship of State upon a career of ambitious social reform, now that our colonists, tired of knocking at our doors, had started arrangements with foreign nations, the inevitable effect of which must be enormously to reduce the preferential advantages they spontaneously offered us, were the Government still going to rub along, to muddle through upon their restricted schedule of taxation, or were they going to tamper with the normal operations for the reduction of debt in times of peace? From some observations which fell from the Prime Minister, he feared he had given a direct incentive to his successor at the Treasury to embark upon some such predatory enterprise. With heavy Naval Estimates looming before us if the Prime Minister's pledge was to be carried out, as they hoped and believed it would be, because no one in his senses believed that Germany, who had shown so marvellous a tenacity in adhering to her naval programme, to the point of borrowing at 4 per cent. on onerous terms, to the point of straining her credit, was likely to relax her efforts in that direction; with considerable prospective demands for education, both in its technical and social aspects, with large liabilities for the Rosyth and Plymouth harbours, the lines of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not fallen on pleasant places. Let them embark upon the amelioration of the lot of those who toiled and earned their bread by the sweat of their brow, certainly, but let them not embark upon that by means of quack nostrums and empirical panacea. Let them throw wide their financial net. Let them tax moderately the goods upon which foreign labour and enterprise had been expended, rather than those which, from climatic or other reasons, we or our fellow-subjects abroad do not or cannot produce. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had shown great resource and responsiveness in helping British trade. He had the knack of assimilating profitably, novel ideas. He implored him to look with a tender eye upon the state of our finances, and in order to emphasise his protest he begged to move.

*Mr. JOYNSON-HICKS (Manchester, N.W.) said that after the references to North-West Manchester he could not do otherwise than second the Amendment, which seemed to involve two propositions. First, it raised the question of fiscal reform, and, secondly, the question of how the money was to be found to meet the large increase of expenditure in this country. He should have thought that the question raised by the Amendment would have appealed to those free traders who had the Imperial instinct. The proposals did not cut across the main line between free trade and protection. If the Amendment had raised the question of protection he would not be voting for it. He was not in the ordinary acceptation of the term a protectionist, but he had a strong belief in that form of Imperial co-ordination which we could establish between ourselves and the Colonies. What they proposed by this Amendment was to relieve the taxes on commodities which were grown in our own Colonies and Dependencies, and keep them on those which were grown in foreign countries. They had lately had a debate on India; they were all proud of India, and they were all desirous that the condition of our Indian fellow-subjects should be improved in every way possible. Well, here was an opportunity for the Government. It was just as easy for them to take the tax off tea instead of off sugar. There had been as much agitation about the tax on tea as about the tax on sugar. Tea was just as much an ingredient of the free breakfast table as was sugar. Every Member opposite had spoken in bygone days in support of the free breakfast table, and he had always understood that it involved the remission of the tax on tea, which was one of the principle ingredients of the breakfast table. In giving away a large slice of revenue, surely our Colonies and Dependencies should have the advantage of any relief rather than sugar, which was grown almost entirely in foreign countries. He did not like to suggest to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the decision of the Government had been arrived at in view of the pressing emergency of a particular bye-election, but at all events he thought that the Government might have paid some attention to the exigencies of our own Colonies and Dependencies. He went further than the Amendment, and would exempt, so far as he could, Indian tea, and levy the tax on China tea. That would not be an infringement of the principle of free trade, though it might be an infringement of the Cobdenite free trade of fifty years ago. Without in the slightest degree being protectionist, and without in the slightest putting a tax on the people of England to bolster up English industries, he could see nothing whatever to which the consistent free trader, brought up in the strict school of Manchester, could take objection if instead of taking the tax off sugar they had taken some of the tax off Indian tea. He had been frequently challenged both in that House and in the country to show how they were going to give a preference to the Colonies without putting a tax on wheat. This Amendment did not raise the question of the tax of wheat, and he did not propose to discuss it; but here was an opportunity to the hand of the Government to give preference to one of our Dependencies without imposing on the British public any single further tax on food stuffs. Many of them on both sides of the House were Imperially inclined, and put a high value on the relations between Great Britain and her Colonies. They realised, moreover, that the Colonies were in earnest in asking us for some closer commercial union between the Colonies and the Mother Country. There would be other opportunities in time to come where taxes could be taken off, and he appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he was to continue to occupy that position, and introduce more than one Budget, and had money to give away, to take the taxes off the commodities grown in our own Colonies and Dependencies rather than off commodities grown in foreign countries. The second part of the Amendment raised a wider issue than the fiscal question in the first portion of the Amendment—namely, as to the undesirability of parting with a large part of the revenue before they knew how far the obligations of the Government went. Old-age pensions, of course, involved a very large expenditure in years to come. He represented a constituency with very large commercial interests, and he was bound to tell the Chancellor of the Exchequer that commercial men and bankers in Manchester and in Lancacashire were very seriously troubled with regard to the commitments of the country in regard to old-age pensions. He knew that it was not beyond the wit of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to provide a scheme of contributory old-age pensions; there were rumours that the right hon. Gentleman himself would have provided such a scheme, only that a scheme had been provided for him by his predecessor, the Prime Minister. But in regard to the finances of the country, having passed a non-contributory scheme, it was of no use going back upon that. The hon. Member for Preston had challenged the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, his right hon. friend the Member for East Worcestershire, and some others for having voted for the Old-Age Pensions Bill. He saw no inconsistency in it. He had been in favour of old-age pensions for years past. They would have preferred a contributory scheme, which they believed to be perfectly possible—it had been done in other countries, and surely it could be done here. However, that had been ruled out by the Government, and when they brought in their non-contributory scheme those of them who were in favour of old-age pensions, knowing that they could not get a contributory scheme, were of course obliged to vote with the Chancellor of the Exchequer in favour of such a system as he was prepared to give them. He thought he was consistent throughout the consideration of the Bill in voting for the eliminaton of all those blots upon it which restricted the pensions. He would be prepared to vote in another session for a further removal of restrictions on the issue of old-age pensions. He very strongly objected to the system which prevented a man who had benefited his country by saving 10s. a week from having a pension. He would give a man a greater pension for having done good to his country by saving out of the 15s. or 20s. a week he had earned than to the man who had just slipped through life without coming on the Poor Law, though in every other respect he had been practically a waster and had done no real good to his country. He thought that they would be bound to recognise sooner or later that there would be a very large increase in the cost of these pensions; it would be eight, ten, or fifteen millions a year. That was why he was strongly supporting the second portion of the Amendment, and resisted the idea of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in giving away this large amount of indirect taxation, which he thought they would be bound to put back again as soon as old-age pensions came into operation, unless they had some undiscovered source of income which at present had not been brought before the House. This system of finance, he wished to point out to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, did not commend itself to the merchants and bankers and traders of the country, though it might commend itself to some of those remoter constituencies where the finances of the country were not considered; but in the City of London, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and the great financial centres there was very considerable unrest at the present moment. They had all been told that Consols would go up when the price of money went down, but money was cheaper to-day than ever it had been since the Government had come into power, yet the price of Consols had not risen in accordance, as was expected, with the cheapness of money. Income-tax remained as high as it was before, and his hon. friend had told them that there was a falling off in trade in all the great commercial centres of the country. Therefore, he suggested that it was an inopportune moment to dispense with the revenue from sugar. At all events they might have kept it as one of those nest-eggs, about which the Prime Minister had told them some years ago, for old-age pensions. But when they came to the Old-Age Pensions Bill this year the nest-egg did not exist. About a million and a quarter had to be provided (and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had thrown away a portion of his revenue), partly for old-age pensions, partly for the Navy, and partly for expenditure on education. They should think twice and thrice before dispensing with indirect taxes which were not felt half as much as direct taxation.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'This House declines to proceed with a measure which, while reducing substantially the tax on sugar, the produce of foreign countries, does nothing to relieve the burden of the tax on tea, an infinitesimal part of which is imported from possessions other than our own; and, while parting with a large part of revenue, renders the discharge of prospective obligations of unknown magnitude, embarrassing to the finances and injurious to the credit of the State.' "—(*Sir Edward Sassoon.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The right hon. Gentleman who introduced the debate has complained amongst other things that the Bill has been postponed to a very late period of the session. I do not think it is absolutely without precedent, and I am not sure that he himself is not responsible for a precedent even worse than ours. In 1904 I understand the Budget did not secure its final passage until about 1st August. I do not think there is really very much in it this year apart altogether from precedent, because practically we have been discussing nothing but the Budget in one shape or another for the last two or three months. The old-age pensions were discussed on the First and Second Reading and then we had very prolonged discussions upon the Old-Age Pensions Bill, and practically the whole of the summer has been taken up in the discussion of the Budget. We have really had nothing else, and I do not think, therefore, the Opposition can complain that we postponed the debate on our financial proposals to so late a period of the session as not to afford a full opportunity for criticism. When I come to the more substantial part of his criticism, I am not sure that I quite understand what it is. It is rather vague, if I may say so. He has used phrases about the intolerable strain and about no provision being made for it, but what does he mean? There is only one strain upon the taxpayers in the Budget beyond what this Government inherited from its predecessors, and that is the strain of old-age pensions. Is that what the right hon. Gentleman objects to? Because if not I really am absolutely at a loss to know what his criticism is directed against, and I think it would have been fairer to the House and to those who take an interest in our debates, if the right hon. Gentleman were to formulate distinctly what his grievance is against the Government. If he thinks we ought not to have made the old-age pension proposal he ought to have said so.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am very loth to interrupt, but I do not wish the right hon. Gentleman to be under any misapprehension as to my views. I did not divide the House against the Old-Age Pensions Bill. I should have voted for the Third Reading if I had been in the House at the moment. But it is not that Bill standing by itself which is the gravamen of the charge I made; it is the imposition of large though uncertain liabilities which are bound to grow, simultaneously with the remission of a large part of our resources for the financial burdens.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I now understand. The right hon. Gentleman does not object to the imposition of the burden; what he objects to is to pay for it. The right hon. Gentleman representing the Opposition on this occasion does not protest against the addition to £6,000,000 or £7,000,000 to the burdens of the country at all. He objects to the absence of any provision to meet that burden. I think he also rather hinted that he objects to the indefinite character of the burden. Really he has close acquaintance with the subject, and he must realise that that is not a fair criticism. I do not care what Government brings forward a scheme of old-age pensions or what the character of the scheme; it is bound to be more or less indefinite in the actual amount of the burden, whether it is a contributory scheme, a Danish or French, a Belgian, or a Colonial scheme, or a scheme of the right hon. Gentleman's distinguished relative. Any scheme that has ever been submitted is bound to be more or less conjectural in amount. £1,000,000 or even £2,000,000 one way or the other must be a matter of experience of the first two or three years. Every scheme is liable to that. That might be an objection to undertaking the thing at all, but the right hon. Gentleman does not say so. He does not object to our having old-age pensions. He will not bind himself down to that. The right hon. Gentleman next said that the situation in Europe is such that the pension scheme ought not to be entertained now but ought to be put off. That is really a very serious thing, especially when you are dealing with old people. I never recollect a time in politics when the situation in Europe was not serious. It is always the present state of Europe. You may shift the particular quarter from which the menace comes. At one time it might be the East or the Far East; the next it would be nearer. I have seen it as near as the French coast. Within the last five or six years people were talking glibly and solemnly about the prospect of war with France. There were prospects of invasion and plans for invasion. But that has shifted and now nobody ever dreams of that. Now there is another Empire which is supposed to be just as threatening. But this will go on from year to year and generation to generation, as it has done in the past, until nations realise the folly of scowling at each other and sharpening their knives to plunge into each other, and spending gigantic sums of money which might be more profitably utilised for the purpose of improving the condition of their own people. There is no nation which has not got its social problems, its poverty and destitution, and it would be far better for all countries if, instead of spending £400,000,000 a year on munitions of war, they would come to a mutual understanding that two or three reasonable individuals could easily have arrived at long ago for the purpose of improving the condition of their own poor population. You cannot wait until this thing passes over. I hope it is not a permanent phase of human character, and that it will eventually pass away. But when the right hon. Gentleman talks about the present menacing condition of things I must point out that the condition has improved. Formerly there were three or four nations which were said to be hostile to us. We were always half-quarrelling with Russia about the Far East, and with France about Africa and other parts of the world. The differences have now all been removed, and so far from the condition being worse than it has ever been it is very much better. And what is the use of trying to create an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust and ill-will by constantly talking about some Power going to attack us, as if we are on the look-out to strike them or they to strike us? That is the way people come to blows. I am perfectly certain that if social reform is to be postponed until foolish people cease to write wild articles in newspapers to create distrust and malice and enmity between one nation and another, human hearts may well despair, for nothing will be done. I think that if we were placed in the position of having to defend ourselves against any foreign nation that wanted to make an attack upon us our resources are ample—should there be such persons—and we have enough and to spare afterwards to look after our own people at home. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman's argument, or Lord Cromer's, with every respect to Lord Cromer, is a good and sound one, that we should put off all social reform until people have ceased to write leading articles about prospective invasions of each other's territory. The right hon. Gentleman proceeded to say that it is not so much the fact of old-age pensions that he objected to but that it is not the way he would have done it if he had been responsible. He said what he objects to is that although we impose this burden on the country we make no provision for it. Here again what does he mean by making provision? Does he mean that the Government should have brought in a Bill this year to impose a burden of seven millions upon the country when we do not require more than one or two millions? What is the use of raising taxation, not to meet a burden, but in order to show you can do it when the occasion arises—to show Germany and everybody else that if you did want it you really could do it? The Government do not want to put on more taxation than is really required to meet the burden of the year, because they do not want to withdraw that six millions from trade. Surely the right hon. Gentleman does not mean that we ought to raise the six millions of taxation this year? Then what does the right hon. Gentleman mean by an "intimation"? Of one thing I can assure the right hon. Gentleman, and that is that the Government are not going to follow the example of the late Government in meeting the current liabilities of the year by borrowing. But if the right hon. Gentleman means by "intimation" to go beyond that, then what sort of tax will he impose? Surely the right hon. Gentleman knows, as a former Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the last thing which a Chancellor of the Exchequer can do is to "intimate" that he is going to tax a certain commodity. If I did this, then the right hon. Gentleman ought to know that in a short time there would be no commodity to tax. Is it to be urged also that I should indicate clearly now how I am to distribute my direct or indirect taxation next year, and to what extent I shall tax any particular commodity? The right hon. Gentleman knows well that that is impossible. No such grotesque demand has ever been made upon a Chancellor of the Exchequer. What then does the right hon. Gentleman mean by "intimation"? I can give no "intimation" for the sufficient reason that I am not so simple as to tell people in advance what exactly are the things that I am going to tax. I am, therefore, at a loss to know what this "solemn fact" of the Budget means. The right hon. Gentleman does not object to old-age pensions, which is the only additional burden, and I cannot understand the motive of the right hon. Gentleman when he urges that taxes ought to be raised and that information should be given of the tax that I shall impose.

The hon. Member for Hythe objected to the sugar tax. But the difference between tea and sugar is that one article is a raw material of industry and the other is not. Sugar is the raw material of some very important industries. It is by our supply of cheap sugar that we get our start in the competition with foreign countries, and therefore a tax on sugar must to a certain extent impair our chances of competing in one of the markets at least for our custom.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman forgets the drawback.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The existence of a drawback does not really make a difference. There are drawbacks in America, but the Americans have no chance of competing with us in foreign markets because we have no tax on imports.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: Does the reduction reach the consumer?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I know it is urged that the tax does not reach the consumer. If the tax had been reduced only a half, the reduction might not have reached the consumer. It would have got into the pockets of the middleman; but the Government made the reduction over a half so as to make it certain that the consumer obtained relief. Then the hon. Member said it was notorious that capital was leaving our shores for foreign countries. But a good deal of our trade depends upon that system of investment. Take the case of Argentina, where we have invested very heavily. Our trade with Argentina has grown enormously within the last few years, due very largely to the fact that every great investment in Argentina is an investment of British capital. This country is supposed to have invested between £100,000,000 and £200,000,000 there; and the result is that our trade has gone up to £20,000,000 a year. No country in the world can touch us in respect of trade with Argentina.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The comparative trade return with South America and the Argentina does not bear out that statement.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, it does. If the right hon. Gentleman takes the Argentine alone he will see that there has been an enormous increase during the last few years in trade with the Argentine, and I attribute that fact largely to the circumstance that we get the advantage of being a free trade country, combined with the investment of enormous sums of money in that country. The Argentine does not send us cash to pay dividends on capital; it pays in goods. The same fact is seen in our shipping trade. There has been an enormous increase of trade between Argentina and this country in shipping. Thus it is not a circumstance to be deplored that we have invested capital abroad. We are the richest country in the world, and therefore we have much more money to spend, and we can invest it abroad. The hon. Member is wrong when he imagines that it has been only in the last two or three years that there has been a great flight of sovereigns from this country to other parts of the world. On the contrary, there is a return of capital which showed that the greatest increases were in 1903, 1904, and 1905. Indeed, since the Government came into power there has been some arrest in the progression of increase. Since the Government came into power the confidence in British industry seemed to have been restored to such an extent that the investment of British capital on British soil has rather increased in comparison with the rate of investments abroad. The adventures in "industrials" outside the United Kingdom have been £14,000,000, £17,000,000, £19,000,000, £20,000,000, and £21,000,000 in respective years; and "industrials" are a far more important test than Colonial and other securities. British capital, therefore, instead of being invested at home, was being invested abroad in the earlier period; but the former increase of about £5,000,000 has since been £2,000,000 in the return from abroad. There are only one or two more points I wish to refer to.

*SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is not possible that the decrease is due to the disturbed industrial condition in the United States during the last year and a half? It is not a normal period, but an abnormal period, on which the right hon. Gentleman has based his contrast.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am glad of the interruption. The hon. Gentleman, who is a pronounced tariff reformer, has confessed that the conditions are so bad in the greatest Protectionist country in the world that really they cannot meet the interest on the money we have invested in their industrial concerns.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I said "disturbed industrial conditions."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I say that disturbance diminishes profits, and that I should not like to see the cause of that disturbance encouraged in this country. I am not sure but that the disturbance is the result of protection, and that is why I do not wish to see the trade of this country disturbed by the introduction of such a system as exists in the United States. It is perfectly true that the industrial condition is disturbed there. A very good word! It creates such a sense of insecurity to trade and industry that profits are diminished, and there has been an arrest of the progress of investment from this country. People are afraid of it, and they prefer to retain their money in a free trade country.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that that is due to the protective conditions in the United States?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Certainly, that is largely what produces these great fluctuations. It is an artificial state of the industrial system. The temperature at one moment is very high, and the next moment it is below normal. It is due to this artificial system. They have closed the windows, pulled down the blinds, and stopped all the ventilators, and they are living in this heated atmosphere produced by tariffs with neither light nor air. That sort of thing does foster the growth of certain fungi. These are the conditions under which they are grown—artificial manure and artificial heat and light. That is the cause of the suffering which we witness there while our industries are going up enormously. There is a constant arrest of profits in protected countries which it would be worth while for the hon. Member for Gravesend to study more than he has done. I come back to the point with which I was about to deal when I was interrupted by the hon. Member. I come back to Lancashire, to which the hon. Member for Hythe confined himself—back to Lancashire with its prosperous cotton industry from the United States with its troubled finance.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the reduction of wages in Lancashire?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is another of the lessons which the right hon. Gentleman has yet to learn. All countries depend on markets either at home or abroad. Where you get all these microbes away from the natural light and heat you get the state of the markets which has been described. It reacts upon us, but to nothing like the extent to which it exists in the protected country. You have not here an enormous amount of railway rolling stock lying idle, and you have not 30 or 40 per cent. of the working classes out of employment. In France they have actually had to start distress committees in the textile districts. We have not come to that yet.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: You may next year.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The hon. Member is making himself very happy over the prospect of having relief and distress committees next year. I hope he will be disappointed, and I am sure that will be the feeling of every right-minded man, whatever opinions we have on controversial matters one way or another. The fact is we cannot support a gamble in suffering for the sake of any system. Let me point out to the hon. Gentleman who said that the increase in cotton was entirely due in Lancashire to the increase in the price of the raw material, that it is not merely an increase in the price, but an increase in the yards.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON: You mean in the quantity.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, in quantity. It was not necessary to go to Lancashire for that information. If the hon. Member had only taken a walk as far as the library he would have found it out. If he will study the statistics, he will find that there is an enormous increase in the yards. There is an increase of 38,000,000 yards. The hon. Member gave me a piece of information, and I am very glad to return the compliment.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON: May I remind the right hon. Gentleman that the increase in the price of the raw material is nearly 11 per cent.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is where the skill of Manchester comes in. They are able, in spite of the price of the raw material, still to sell all these commodities to the world, and at the same time to keep their customers perfectly happy. That is really the system of an intelligent free trade community, and I hope the hon. Member will not press me for any further explanation. So much for the past. The right hon. Gentleman said that this is not the time to restrict the schedule of taxes. Here again you increased your burdens. Well, we have been diminishing our burdens. My own view is that you ought to diminish your unproductive expenditure and increase your productive expenditure. That is the first principle of business. You do not always benefit a business by merely cutting down. On the contrary, you can wreck a business by cutting down. I agree that the first principle of business is that you should not spend a penny piece more upon any branch of a business than is absolutely necessary. You should not spend anything for what is unproductive if you can avoid it, and you should spend freely and boldly upon every extension of business which is of real benefit to your trade. That is the principle we have followed here, and that is why I have watched with a jealous eye and scrutinised rigidly every penny spent on armaments. I hope that that will be the first principle of every Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was the principle of the greatest financier this country has ever produced, Mr. Gladstone, that every penny spent beyond what is necessary for absolute security is money thrown away, and that every penny spent unnecessarily is a menace to other countries. It provokes and irritates, and creates other expenditure which may end in disaster. That has been the lesson of every unnecessary expenditure which has been incurred. That does not mean that any Chancellor of the Exchequer is ever going to propose to cut down our expenditure on armaments below the level of absolute security, and I should be the last to propose that. When the right hon. Gentleman says that this is not the time to restrict the schedule of taxes, he hints that you should increase the number of things you tax. It is not the goods you tax that pay the tax. A tax on a parcel of sugar does not pay the tax; a tax on a canister of tea does not pay the tax. It is the person who consumes the article who pays. [An Hon. Member: Or produces it.] Well, I will not go into that argument now. The consumer is the man who pays, and if, instead of having six taxes, you had 600, you would not be increasing the resources of the country by increasing the number of things you tax. It is one of the most fundamental, and one of the crudest errors ever advanced that the moment you begin to tax 1,000 instead of ten commodities you are by some magic means increasing the resources of the country. The right hon. Gentleman talked about destroying our resources. We began by taking more than half the duty off the sugar duty, by taking a penny off the tea duty, and by remitting the tax on coal. Then we are told that we are destroying our recources. It is the first time that I have ever heard of a country destroying its resources by taking away a tax. If it is a resource at all it is still there. The right hon.

Gentleman talked about the safety of the State as being far more important than reductions in the expenditure on the Army or Navy. If it is necessary to reimpose the taxes we have taken off for armaments or war, the commodities are there, and we can do these things again. The people of this country will consume sugar although the tax is taken off. They will drink tea although the tax is only 5d. instead of 6d., and they will drink it if the tax is 7d. instead of 5d. if the time ever comes when you require these resources. I do not understand the right hon. Gentleman when he talks about destroying the resources of the country by taking off taxes. On the contrary, we say that you do not. What we do at the present moment is to set them on one side.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am glad to hear you say that, but it was very different from what was said by the spokesman of the Government when they took the taxes off.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I think the right hon. Gentleman has been presupposing a sort of Armageddon when we shall be fighting everybody in the world, when it will be necessary to tax everything. I deprecate all this lugubrious talk, as if we are at the end of our resources. It is not true. As a matter of fact, our taxation is much less than it was when the right hon. Gentleman left office, and during the last ten years the income which has passed under survey for income-tax has increased to the extent of £220,000,000 a year. Our taxation during that period has increased probably by £20,000,000 or £30,000,000, or about one-tenth; but the taxable resources of the country have increased by nine-tenths of that amount, so that to talk as if we are at the end of our resources is not doing justice to the power of this country. And, if anything, it is doing harm to this extent—that it does encourage foreign countries to imagine that, now we have got to the end of our power, we have got to choose between social reform and the end of our country. This country is not put to that option. We are a long way off that. And really to say, when we propose to give £7,000,000 to the old people of this country, that we are either to leave them to starvation or to abandon the country to the mercy of Germany or any other Power: such wild talk has nothing in common with the facts of the case. We need do neither. We are not yet driven to the resource of Germany—to borrow money for defence. But if there were a real danger, there is no Chancellor of the Exchequer who would hesitate for a moment to pledge the credit of the country to make it secure from prospective attack from any quarter. We have got command of the sea and are free from invasion. Nobody can calculate what that means to the country and no Government, whether Liberal or Conservative, is ever going to run the danger or even the risk of forfeiting that for a moment. I agree with the hon. Member that there is a temporary lapse in our trade; but trade is like a tide—it comes and goes. You have got your ebb and you have got your tidal wave which sweeps away much. The spring tide has passed; we are in for the neap, but the spring will come again. That is the history of our trade. We have got our winters and summers, but every time that there is a bit of a lapse in trade there is a considerable number of people who say our trade is going. If they would only look at the experience of the past they would know that their fears are groundless. And, at any rate, if this is a time when trade is on the down grade for the moment, it is not the time for a great country like this, sure of its resources, with its industrial powers founded on the most solid foundations that any industrial country of the world has ever seen, to say; "We will begin to economise, to stint, to draw in—not in armaments, but in providing for the aged poor." This project is a great one. It is not my conception. It belongs to the Prime Minister. It has been my pride that my right hon. friend has given me the privilege and the opportunity of taking a humble share in piloting through this House a Budget which is the one Budget in my recollection in this House in which money has been raised for the poor, the unfortunate, and the destitute.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said there was one thing quite certain, and that was that the change of office had not changed the right hon. Gentleman's charm of style, or the influence of his speeches upon his audience; but even while they fell under the spell of his eloquence the natural, and, should he call it, the tariff reform intelligence, reasserted itself. He was therefore disposed to make one or two criticisms on what the hon. Gentleman had just stated. He would not follow the right hon. Gentleman in his peroration on old-age pensions which had naturally moved all of them; and if the Opposition did not criticise the provision for the poor of which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken, it was not because they believed that the measure put forward by the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues was the best for relieving the necessities of the poor. They had asked the hon. Gentleman and his colleagues to show the House and the country the sources, not the resources, from which the Government was going to get the money for the old-age pensions. The right hon. Gentleman made play with the term "resources," but he knew perfectly well that what the Opposition meant was the sources from which the right hon. Gentleman said he was certain he knew where he was going to get his money.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he really did not know what the hon. Gentleman meant, or what he wanted to know from him.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he thought he was quite clear in saying that the Opposition did not know the sources from which the right hon. Gentleman was going to get his money to pay for old-age pensions. The Opposition said there was a very narrow basis of taxation on tea, sugar, and certain other necessaries of life. They said that the income-tax was at a war rate, and that the liquor trade was taxed heavily. It was quite possible that the right hon. Gentleman was going to find a new source of taxation, a new foundation of finance, and he thought that the Opposition were entitled to ask the right hon. Gentleman where he was going to get the money for this vast scheme, this far-reaching permanent demand on our fiscal system. The Prime Minister had never answered the question, nor had the right hon. Gentleman. In referring to the subject of indirect taxation, he did not think the right hon. Gentleman had put the case quite fairly. They on the Opposition side said that if taxation was placed on a very few articles, by increasing that taxation consumption was lessened, and therefore the return from the taxation of those articles which was needed to make up the annual Budget was lessened. Did not the right hon. Gentleman see that it would be better if the taxation were placed upon a series of articles which would not press heavily on the individual article, and therefore would not necessarily lessen consumption? The Opposition were reasonable in showing that such a system was found effective in almost every other country in the world. The right hon. Gentleman was an Imperialist; he did not shrink from that term being applied to himself; did he not think it, therefore, strange that there was not a single British Colony which, starting with free trade, had not come ultimately to adopt the principle of indirect taxation? All that the Opposition asked was that the arguments which they put forward might be treated with due respect. They were not a handful of people advocating a policy of indirect taxation. They represented far greater constituencies and a far greater number of people than the right hon. Gentleman. They might be wrong; it was quite possible; but at any rate, they ought, when they were bringing forward their views, to be listened to with common courtesy. The right hon. Gentleman's reference to the United States was not entirely felicitous from his own standpoint. He did not think that his remarks were very well founded. Hon. Members below the gangway were aware that unemployment in this country was last month 8 per cent., which was double what it was for the same month of last year. It did not become the Chancellor of the Exchequer to talk as if we were free from embarrassment in this country from want of employment whilst the United States were suffering. He himself had only recently returned from the United

States, and knew the disturbed conditions there. But the right hon. Gentleman suggested that the disturbed condition of the United States was due to protection. After all, there was no sharper statesman in this country than the right hon. Gentleman, and he made that point. Whether the point did true justice to his knowledge of the information conveyed to him by the Department over which he presided was another matter. The United States was passing through a crisis which this country would also have to pass through. We also had trusts. Trusts were growing and developing under our system of free trade every day. There were British trusts which were springing up in various parts, syndicates which existed for controlling prices, in restraint of trade. In the engineering trade particularly had these great trusts and syndicates sprung up in restraint of trade. They were absolutely opposed to the free trade which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite so strongly and properly, as they believed in it, advocated. He suggested that it was such trusts in the United States, trusts which the President had strongly attacked by the passage of laws to restrain them, that had been the cause of the disturbance of trade and want of employment in America. Did anybody with any sense—did the right hon. Gentleman with the information at his disposal really believe the United States was in a paralysed condition with regard to her industries or her trade? The United States had suffered a check, but she would recover from it. Her vast resources would enable her to do so, and the right hon. Gentleman was neither fair nor just in suggesting that this momentary check, this disturbance of trade in the United States was due to the fiscal system there. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of investments abroad. He spoke of the Argentine, with his usual brilliancy, as the most gorgeous flower of the bunch of the South American republics. The Argentine was precisely the country where money was invested because it was an agricultural country. As the right hon. Gentleman had observed, and entirely accurately, the interest of the money invested was paid in goods. But did he seriously suppose that nothing was lost to this country when this £200,000,000 went for investment to foreign lands? Certainly the interest was paid in goods, but was nothing lost in the wages which would have been paid if this money was invested here? He did not quarrel with investments abroad, but he did say that the right hon. Gentleman was wrong when he argued that the only thing we had to consider was the dividend that came from that investment. He ventured to say, and many free traders in the House would agree with him, that if we could have kept the money, that £200,000,000, in this country——

AN HON. MEMBER: We had nothing for it to do.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: The hon. Gentleman said we had nothing for it to do; that was exactly the point to which he was coming.

MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said we had plenty of capital for all our industries and then £200,000,000 to spare.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked if the hon. Gentleman suggested that there were no wide opportunities for developing British industries. Did he know that what the right hon. Gentleman said in 1903 was true; that some industries had disappeared altogether; that some were disappearing, and that others were only holding their own by meeting competition by a strenuous fight to the death. Was not there a disappearance of industry if we had not the raw material worked up from the lowest to the highest? The United States admitted nearly as much raw material free as she taxed. If we worked up all our raw material in this country, would the hon. Gentleman or any other Member of the House suggest there would not be more scope for British capital? They thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer treated this matter far too lightly. The right hon. Gentleman never did himself justice in his conduct in the House, because his attitude was bound by conditions imposed upon him at the last election and by his followers behind him. It was only in his own Department that he gave his mind that opportunity which some day, if they were not mistaken, would lead him and others into the path of indirect taxation in order to seek revenue from sources which had been too long disregarded, and which, until they were regarded, would exclude from the National profit those sources of taxation.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) quoted an extract from the Report of the American Consul at Manchester.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) pointed out that the amount of bales of cotton used in America and Germany largely exceeded the amount of bales used in this country and that the proportion of bales used in Germany and America increased in greater ratio than the bales used in the country.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are the figures?

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER said he had not the exact figures, but they were given recently in the *Outlook* and they had never been challenged. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, towards the end of his speech, had dealt with the fact that the Opposition supposed that he was at the end of his resources of taxation. Where that charge had come from he did not know, but it was an easy one to set up a howl at. Their complaint, however, was not that this country was at the end of its resources for taxation, but that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had so arranged the finances of the country that they were going to attack the income-tax payer and the Sinking Fund in order to meet the enormous deficit which must arise on the expenditure next year. It was a very serious point to be met. With regard to the sources of taxation from which this new expenditure was to come, the Prime Minister in his speech as Chancellor of the Exchequer when introducing the Budget had distinctly mentioned those sources as the sources from which he desired to obtain the monies to pay for old-age pensions. Though the right hon. Gentleman did not directly state that the Sinking Fund was to be one of them a reference was made to the Sinking Fund which suggested that the right hon. Gentleman or his successor might go to that source to carry the pension scheme further. The complaint was that such a statement as that, combined with the reduction of the sugar duties, showed that the money for the expenditure for old-age pensions was to be found by one particular set of taxpayers. Labour had had its day and was now earning its full reward from the benches opposite, and one of the reasons why the City was so depressed was that men would not lend them money; and why ships were going without cargoes, and railways without full wagons, was because there was not a capitalist now who had the slightest confidence in what was going to happen to this country, because of the financial attacks which were made on them. It was very rare that a word was said on behalf of the capital interests of the country. In his opinion they were the saving classes, and it was the savings of capital which created the money which was found to pay labour. They had nothing this session except a tax on every interest connected with capital, and the result was seen in the depressed state of trade. One of the great pioneers of industry told him recently that he wished he was out of this country, because it was almost impossible now not to feel that any man who had any interest in looking after the diffusion of capital was the enemy of the Government. That was his reason for saying that with reference to the reduction of the sugar duty it was premature, and in face of the enormous expenditure to be incurred next year, it was unwise. Had the gold reserves been touched by the present Parliament? They all recollected the dreadful panic that afflicted the commercial world during last winter, and at that time the outcry was that the gold reserves should be dealt with. The bankers on the opposite side of the House had not been able to influence the Government, and nothing had been done to alter the position that were the enormous amounts due from the savings banks there was not an atom of gold in the Bank of England to represent them. The Government would have been better advised to deal with that question, and not to reduce the sugar duty. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had talked a great deal about the reduction of liabilities of the Sinking Fund, but what did that mean? He paid so much off and said he was clever and had paid off money running at 2½ per cent., but in Transvaal Loans, local loans funds, and Irish Land stock he was incurring on British responsibility equal amounts with interest at 3 per cent., so that the debt was not diminished in any way whatever. As between the Government and the public the debt remained the same. He would like to congratulate the Government on the clause which related to the duty on tobacco produced in Ireland, because that was a breach of free trade which they knew must in the end bring down the wall of free trade. One of the laws of free trade was that if they had a duty for revenue purposes they must impose an equal excise duty on any article of that description manufactured or grown in the country in which the tax arose, and the result had been shown in Egypt in the crushing of the cotton mills and in India in penalising the poor natives for the benefit of the Manchester manufacturers. But now for Ireland a breach had been started of that law to which he had referred. For once in a way the Government had adopted the theory that it was possible in order to protect an industry to differentiate between Excise and Revenue duties; and in that way they had started what he hoped they would carry out in the future, the idea of abolishing the Excise in Egypt and in India. The Finance Bill imposed an enormous liability on the taxpayer, it attacked every interest of capital which was capable of being attacked, and it showed that in the future there was to be no mercy in the House for anyone except the one Party which sat on the benches below the gangway.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said he wanted to correct an impression given to the House by the hon. Member for Gravesend, who seemed to think that because £200,000,000 had gone from this country to Argentina and other foreign countries, that money had been lost as capital in this country. But he would ask the House to consider what the money was for. In the case of Argentina, for instance, the money was principally for the development of railways owned to a very large extent by the people of this country. The money was spent in this country in making engines and railway carriages for those railways. But even if it were not so spent, that money was our extra money that we did not require. A little while ago Irish stock was put on the market, and it was subscribed four or five times over, and that alone showed that there was plenty of money left for industries in this country. Because trade went down people did not throw their money into businesses and concerns that were not remunerative. We had plenty of money left and almost unlendable at the present day. He would point out that there was at the present time a bank rate of 2½ per cent., and that meant that for every British industry which could show a reasonable prospect of success there was ample and sufficient capital left in the country.

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read the third time, and passed.

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL [LORDS].

Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

CRAN MEASURES BILL [LORDS].

Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at seventeen minutes before Four o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 27th July, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that in the case of the following Bill compliance with the further proofs required by the Standing Orders Committee has been proved before them :—Ards Railways.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

LIVERPOOL CORPORATION (STREETS AND BUILDINGS) BILL.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES (Lord Balfour of Burleigh) : My Lords, I have to ask your Lordships to suspend the Sessional Order, which provides that no private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after 18th June, in favour of the Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill. The circumstances under which I ask for this indulgence are that, although the Bill was introduced at the proper time by the promoters and no fault rests with them, it was not found possible to take it in the Police and Sanitary Committee of the other House of Parliament until a very late date. In fact, the Bill was only reported to the other House on 17th July; it was read a third time on 22nd July, and no time has been lost in submitting it to your Lordships. If your Lordships will be good enough to suspend the Standing Order, the Committee stage could stand over until the meeting of Parliament later in the year.

Moved, "That the order made on the 25th day of March last, 'That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to, and Bill read 2ª accordingly.

DOVER GRAVING DOCKS BILL.

Lord BRASSEY : My Lords, I rise to move that the Order made on 25th March last, that no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after 18th June, be dispensed with. The Dover Graving Docks Bill is the result of negotiations which have been pending for some time, and I am glad to say that the opposition which was threatened to the Bill has been withdrawn. Graving docks are urgently needed at Dover. There are no dry docks between Southampton and London, and the English cross-Channel steamers are sent to Calais for repair. Those responsible for the management of the port of Dover agreed with the promoters of this Bill that it was desirable that the scheme as originally submitted to a Committee of the other House of Parliament for the construction of two large graving docks should be approved, but in deference to the view of the Admiralty the scheme has been reduced, and it is now proposed to construct only one graving dock. Those interested in the port of Dover are hopeful that at some future time the present restrictions may be withdrawn. In conclusion, I have to inform your Lordships that all the local authorities of Dover, the harbour board, the town council, the chamber of commerce, and the railway companies, have petitioned in favour of the Bill, and I therefore hope your Lordships will suspend the Standing Order and give the Bill a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the order made on the 25th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Brassey.*)

Lord GLANTAWE : My Lords, I wish to support the Motion which the noble Lord has just moved, and I hope the Admiralty, on reconsideration, will not place a limit on the size of the docks. I have had considerable experience in these matters, having been a member of the Swansea Harbour Trustees for nearly forty years. Graving docks have been constructed there from time to time, and the result has always been that a dock

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

constructed to meet present requirements has invariable been found in a few years to have been too small; and unless there is special reason for limiting the size of the dock at Dover, I hope, for the benefit of the people who are taking an active part in its construction and the shipping community generally, that the restrictions as to the size of the dock will be removed. I am glad that the opposition to the Second Reading has been withdrawn, but I would strongly press upon the Admiralty and those who are in authority at Dover to consider very carefully the question of the size of the dock to be constructed, so that no capital may be wasted, and that the port may benefit from the experience of other ports in the construction of docks of a similar nature.

*LORD WEARDALE, who had given notice, on the Motion for the Second Reading, to move "That the Bill be read a second time this day three months," said: My Lords, I think I ought to explain that in putting on the Paper this Amendment, which I have since withdrawn, I had no desire to place any impediment in any way to the construction of these graving docks at Dover. My object was to avoid anything like obstruction in the future to a Channel ferry service being established, and we consequently approached the promoters and have been able to arrive at a satisfactory agreement on this matter. In those circumstances I do not intend to move the Amendment standing in my name.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH): My Lords, I had the opportunity of some conversation with the noble Earl the Chairman of Committtees upon this matter last week, and I am glad to be able to respectfully advise your Lordships to agree to the Motion. In this case, again, there is no fault lying at the door of the promoters. The delay was caused on account of objections taken by the Board of Admiralty to some of the provisions of the Bill, objections far-reaching and in the nature of public policy. These matters have been adjusted to the satisfaction of the Admiralty, but the negotiations have had the effect of delaying the presentation of the Bill to your Lordships. In these circumstances, and as it will now pass, I understand, as an unopposed measure, I hope the House will agree to the Motion.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, I wish to state in a few words the view of the Admiralty. In the first instance the Admiralty objected to the Bill, for the reason that if the dock was made the size originally proposed, it would take away a large amount of water from the naval harbour. Since then the promoters have modified their original proposal, and the Admiralty now see no reason to oppose the Second Reading. The Admiralty, however, intend to submit a number of Amendments of a protective character when the Bill goes before the Select Committee. With that reservation, they offer no opposition to the Second Reading of the Bill.

On Question, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2a accordingly, and committed for To-morrow.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Read 3a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Gosport Gas Bill; Central Ireland Electric Power Bill; Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill; Holderness Water Bill.—Read 3a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be considered To-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Honourable Artillery Company Bill [H.L.]; Leith Burgh Bill [H.L.]; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments agreed to, with an Amendment, and Bill returned to the Commons.

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill; Tyne Improvement Bill; Widnes Corporation Bill; Margate Corporation Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2a (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3a To-morrow.

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments; committed to a Committee of the Whole House Tomorrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Return of the number of steam trawlers registered at ports in the States of Western Europe in the year 1907.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.

Report of proceedings as regards Ireland, for the year 1907.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Statement showing for each secondary school in respect of which waive resolutions were passed by the local education authority under Article 43 of the Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1907, the articles which the board were asked to waive, and their decision as regards each article.

TREATY SERIES, No. 20. (1908).

Agreement between the United Kingdom and Italy, respecting commercial travellers' samples; signed at Rome, 30th May, 1908.

MISCELLANEOUS.

No. 5. (1908). Further correspondence respecting the Second Peace Conference, held at the Hague in 1907 (in continuation of Miscellaneous, No. 1, (1908) [Cd. 4081.]).

No. 6. (1908). Final act of the Second Peace Conference, held at the Hague in 1907, and conventions and declaration annexed thereto.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4074. Peru.

BASUTOLAND.

Report of proceedings of the Basutoland National Council, 1908, and correspondence as to affairs of Basutoland.

NATAL.

Further correspondence relating to native affairs in Natal (in continuation of [Cd. 4001.], May, 1908).

Despatch from the Governor of Natal forwarding a Bill to make special provision for the trial of natives accused of certain crimes (in continuation of [Cd. 4194.], July, 1908).

CUSTOMS.

Fifty-second Report of the Commissioners of Mis Majesty's Customs, for the year ended 31st March, 1908.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Annual Report of the Registrar-General, for the year 1907.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th June, 1908.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

Annual Report of the President for the session 1907-1908.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.

Annual Report of the President for the session 1907–1908.

POST OFFICE.

Fifty-Fourth Report of the Postmaster-General on the Post Office.

METEOROLOGICAL COMMITTEE.

Third Annual Report for the year ended 31st March, 1908.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY.

Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy, during the six months ended 30th June, 1908.

BANKRUPTCY.

Twenty-fifth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 131 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883.

General Rule, made pursuant to the Bankruptcy Acts, 1883 and 1890, Warrants and arrests, under Section 27 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883.

MINES AND QUARRIES (FIRE AT HAMSTEAD COLLIERY).

Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by R. A. S. Redmayne, Esq., on the causes of, and circumstances attending, an underground fire which occurred at Hamstead Colliery on 4th March, 1908.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF APPEAL, ETC.

Account prepared in pursuance of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, showing the receipts and expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended 31st March, 1908.

SUPERANNUATION.

Return, for the year ended 31st March, 1908, of the Army and Navy officers permitted under Rule 2 of the Regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the "Superannuation Act, 1887," to hold civil employment of profit under public departments.

LAND REGISTRY.

Account of receipts and payments in respect of the Land Registry, for the year ended 31st March, 1908.

CLERGY (WEST INDIES).

Return of the amount payable on 5th January, 1908, out of the Consolidated Fund for Ecclesiastical purposes in the West Indies.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

IRELAND (PROCLAIMED COUNTIES).

Return respecting: laid before the House (pursuant to Order of Friday last), and to be printed. [No. 184.]

FINANCE BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Wednesday next.—(*The Earl of Crewe.*) [No. 185.]

SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA.

Lord MUSKERRY rose to call attention to certain modified regulations which have been adopted recently by the Board of Trade in respect to the qualifying time in charge of a watch required of those candidates for Board of Trade certificates as mate or master who have served an apprenticeship on approved sea-going training vessels; to refer to the protest against these new regulations which has been entered by the Imperial Merchant Service Guild; to ask why the opinion of the Board of Trade Advisory Committee was not firstly ascertained before the new regulations were adopted; and to move "That, in the opinion of this House, these modified regulations are a departure from assurances given in this House by the Board of Trade, and that it is desirable that the new regulations should be withdrawn before they can become in any way operative."

The noble Lord said: My Lords, in calling attention to the Notice which stands in my name, I am bringing before your Lordships what, I feel, is a very serious matter. We are all deeply concerned in the question of safety of life at sea, and I am sure your Lordships will agree with me that we should discountenance in the strongest way any changes or alterations which may minimise the safety of our sailors or the sea-going public. If there is one thing more than another which is absolutely essential in promoting or ensuring safety it is that the ships which fly our Red Ensign should be commanded and officered by the most competent, capable, and experienced men. At the present time, thanks to the efficiency of the certified commanders and officers of our merchant fleet, we can feel nothing but pride at the way in which our ships are navigated in all quarters of the globe. Therefore, I contend that the Board of Trade have no right whatever to tamper with the existing conditions, thus subjecting our merchant ships to greater risk and converting efficiency into possible disaster.

I know that the standard of the examinations for Board of Trade certificates of competency has been improved of late years, but I do not know that, even yet, it is by any means perfect. It may also be said, and I do not disagree with it, that the possession of a certificate does not necessarily ensure ability and efficiency in the particular sphere which the certificate enables the holder of it to enter. A good mathematician may not be a good seaman or *vice versa.* It is the same in all professions, whether the sea or otherwise. But I do claim that a certificate of the kind imbues the holder of it with a due sense of his responsibilities, and that he is directly answerable to the Government for any misdoings or for any culpable negligence in carrying out the duties and responsibilities vested in him. What makes the certificate of even more value is that it proves that the holder of it has had sound practical experience at sea for a number of years. And, in the case of certificates for the higher grades, they indicate that the owners of them have had considerable experience in sole charge of a watch—that is, they clearly understand what it means to be in charge of the bridge and *de facto* of the ship during certain watches each day.

I trust that your Lordships will agree with me when I say that no man should be granted a certificate as first officer or captain of a British ship until he can produce the necessary testimony that he has had experience of this kind, for it is only then that by practical experience he is thoroughly alive to the most serious responsibilities which devolve upon him in occupying a position of enormous trust on board ship. Until the present time the Board of Trade have evidently been of a similar opinion. Finding that their previous regulations were being evaded, the Board issued a special circular to their examiners laying particular stress on the necessity of candidates proving that they had been in regular charge of a watch, or watches, during each day. The Board state that, in the foreign trade, the time served in charge of a watch must amount to not less than eight hours of each twenty-four hours of service, and in their official regulations relating to examinations they say that it must be distinctly understood that occasional service in charge of a watch should not be accepted as qualifying service for certificates as first mate or master. The Board warn their examiners that great care must be exercised by them in regard to such service, and unless the candidate produces a satisfactory certificate, setting forth these facts, from the master or owner of the vessel in which the service was performed, it must not be accepted.

In years gone by the Board of Trade insisted upon candidates showing actual experience on board ship in a similar capacity to the certificate they held. For instance, before a candidate could be examined for a master's certificate he was required to produce proof of twelve months service as chief officer. But the Board of Trade have modified these regulations from time to time, with the result that service in quite junior capacities is considered sufficient to qualify candidates to take out a certificate enabling them to command a ship. The new modifications which the Board of Trade have introduced by a stroke of the pen, just as they did in regard to the deeper immersion of British ships, constitute a step which compels me to enter an emphatic protest.

It is not necessary for me to go into all the different details as to qualifying time required for Board of Trade certificates. To put the matter shortly, before a candidate can present himself for examination for a first mate's certificate he must show that he has had at least twelve months experience in regular charge of a watch. Candidates for masters' certificates must show at the very least two years—usually it is two and a half years—experience of a similar kind, twelve months of which must have been in a grade not lower than second mate. To show you what has been the Board's view hitherto, the words "in charge of a watch" are emphasised in the regulations in order to lay special stress on them. To make my point clear it is, that under the latest regulations issued by the Board to meet the case of a few favoured ship-owners owning very large ships, those who have served in what are to be known as "approved sea-going training vessels" will be permitted to sit for a master's certificate without ever having had charge of a watch. Their experience need only have been in very junior capacities on board ship where, when on watch, they have been subordinate to the officer actually in charge. It is proper for me to say that such candidates, after passing their examination, will not be given their certificates as master until they can prove that they have had twelve months service in charge of a watch, though candidates for certificates as chief mates need not show any experience in charge of a watch whatever, and their certificates will be granted on completion of the examination.

I say without hesitation that it is a very serious and a very wrong thing for the Board of Trade to make such drastic changes when, as usual, they have not consulted those who are chiefly affected—that is, those who are responsible for the efficiency and safety of our merchant ships. When candidates of very limited and immature experience have obtained certificates of the highest grades they are not in any way bound to remain in the company in which they have been serving. It is quite open for them to transfer their services. And it is very likely that they will do so on the ground of better prospects or higher inducements elsewhere. The Board of Trade are thus a party to creating a supply of officers possessing by no means the same practical experience in responsible capacities as those we have at present, and what the dire results of this will be in due time will be perfectly obvious to your Lordships. I do not say that the youths serving in these new "approved sea-going training ships" will not get a very good training in the technicalities of their profession, but I do say that it is just as essential with them as with others that they should be compelled to show that they have had actual experience in responsible capacities on board ship before being granted the higher certificates from the Board of Trade.

Under the new scheme of the Board these favoured applicants need only have served in very junior capacities provided their service has been on vessels of not less than 8,000 tons gross making an average speed of sixteen knots and upwards and carrying a crew of not less than 130 men, including six deck officers besides the master. I do not think that the term "deck officer" is a proper one for the Board of Trade to use, for an officer is an officer of the ship from truck to keelson and his duties and responsibilities extend over all parts of her. I may say that in very large ships, such as those of over 8,000 tons, it is all the more important that the very best and most experienced officers should be carried. Presumably more officers will be created by the shipowners through the medium of these training ships when, as a matter of fact, there are already more than an ample supply of officers in the mercantile marine. Even up to the present time shipowners have usually required applicants for junior positions on board ship to hold certificates of the highest grades from the Board of Trade, and thus ensure that they have had good practical experience in charge of a watch.

Now, thanks to a hollow and absurd cry about a shortage of ships' officers, the Board of Trade and shipowners are going on the other tack, and officers of the most limited experience will be considered as amply sufficient to act in responsible capacities on board ship. My Lords, there is no shortage of officers for our merchant service. I have it on the best authority that there are a large number of highly qualified captains and officers out of employment at present and that much distress exists in consequence. But there is a shortage of British seamen in the forecastle of our ships, and this does require the attention of the Government. I do not say that training schemes should be discouraged, although the efficiency of our present-day captains and officers seems to indicate that there is no immediate necessity for any such schemes.

The Board of Trade's new concessions to shipowners are, of course, of advantage to, for instance, the American International Combine comprising the White Star and other lines who, on their new training-ship "Mersey" intend taking cadets and charging high premiums for so doing. I may say that as the "Mersey" is a sailing ship this is a very much better scheme than any of those that propose to train boys on steamers, where they cannot learn all the details of their profession, and therefore can never become thoroughly efficient officers. I have worked it out and estimate that, providing a youngster first puts in two years on a stationary training-ship such as the "Worcester" or "Conway," and then three years in an approved seagoing training-ship such as the "Mersey," it will take from eight to ten years before he—or perhaps I should more correctly say, his parents—will be able to show a single halfpenny on the credit side of his account. The cost of his training up to obtaining his first Board of Trade certificate will be not less than £400, and then after it has taken him five years to get his certificate he may consider himself lucky if he starts to earn £8 a month, upon which he has to keep up the position of a gentleman on it, and pay for the expensive uniforms he must wear. This, my Lords, is what is held out as inducements to go to sea nowadays in the merchant service.

Mr. Lloyd-George made provision in the last Merchant Shipping Act for a Merchant Shipping Advisory Committee, and it was expected that the Board would seek the opinion of this committee of experts when any important questions arose which affected shipping interests. It seems to me a very curious thing that on this particular question the advisory committee was not asked to express an opinion, though matters of comparatively minor importance have been brought by the Board before this committee from time to time. I cannot see what use it is to have a committee of the kind and put the country to a good deal of expense in connection with it when, in a matter of this sort, it is never consulted. Affecting, as they do, the position and the interests of the commanders and officers of our merchant ships, surely they have a perfect right to be allowed to express their views when such changes are suggested. I may say that I am chiefly moving in this matter on the urgent representations of the Imperial Merchant Service Guild. The guild, on learning of the new regulations, addressed a vigorous protest to the Board of Trade, characterising the change as one most injurious to the profession which it represents and most certainly calculated to reduce the high standard of safety and efficiency which is at present such a distinguishing and gratifying feature of the merchant service of this country. I am with them entirely in this view.

There is another very serious aspect of this question. Some little time ago I had the honour to bring to the notice of your Lordships a proposition of shipowners that, under certain conditions, the qualifying time shown by candidates for the lowest Board of Trade certificate—that of second mate—should be reduced from four to three years. It was with very sincere gratification and appreciation that I found that the spirit of this House was entirely with me in strongly opposing a proposition of this kind, and I was equally gratified to receive the assurances of my noble friend who then represented the Board of Trade, that the Board had no intention whatever of departing from the present rule as to sea service before a man is able to take up his certificate. The noble Earl, as I thought, very properly supplemented this by saying that the only way to get boys to go to sea was to make the calling of the sea attractive, and until that was done he was afraid that we should find it very hard to increase the number of British subjects serving in the mercantile marine. My noble friends the Marquess of Lansdowne and Lord Ellenborough welcomed this assurance on the part of the Board of Trade, and the noble Marquess warned the Board of Trade as to being extremely careful not to in any way relax the requirements in regard to the efficiency and competency of ships' officers.

I want to know why there has now been such a distinct departure from the Board of Trade's assurance as given in this House? A change as to qualifying time for responsible positions on board ship has been made, and it is most certainly a relaxation of the requirements hitherto existing in regard to the efficiency and competency of ships' officers. I do not at all like these tinkering methods of the Marine Department of the Board of Trade, especially when they are so dangerous, and done so quietly. Your Lordships will inflict no hardship on anybody in expressing the opinion that the new regulations I am referring to should be withdrawn. Approved sea-going training-ships have not as yet started, and the regulations, therefore, are not operative as yet. The Marine Department of the Board of Trade have informed the Imperial Merchant Service Guild that they do not consider it necessary to modify the regulations in question in any way. Fortunately, the Marine Department are not the final court in matters of the kind. There is no need whatever for the new regulations, and there is no reason why favouritism should be shown to candidates who have served in sea-going training-ships, where the service would be much more pleasant and congenial, whilst the less favoured ones going through their apprenticeship in the ordinary way—though decidedly none the worse off in the end—must comply with the old regulations as heretofore.

I trust your Lordships will support this Motion. I must repeat that it is our duty to prevent any mischievous or dangerous propositions or schemes which tend to minimise the efficiency and safety of our merchant ships. We must have men to command and officer them who have had the necessary practical experience in responsible capacities, and no man should be granted a certificate of competency as chief officer or captain of a British ship unless he can produce proof of real experience in responsible capacities. On these grounds and on the ground that assurances given in this House have been departed from by the Board of Trade, I submit my Motion for the consideration, and, I hope, for the support of your Lordships.

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, the modified regulations which have been adopted recently by the Board of Trade in respect to the qualifying time in charge of a watch required of those candidates for Board of Trade certificates as mate or master who have served an apprenticeship on approved sea-going training vessels are a departure from assurances given in this House by the Board of Trade, and that it is desirable that the new regulations should be withdrawn before they can become in any way operative.—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

*LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, the noble Lord has been for many years a regular questioner of the Board of Trade in this House, and the Department had come to look upon him, if not as one of its oldest friends, at all events as one who understood them and whom they understood. It came, therefore, as rather an unpleasant surprise that the notice of Motion which he had placed on the Paper should contain an accusation of breach of faith against the Department. I would submit to your Lordships that the modified regulations which have been introduced cannot be so described, and I hope your Lordships will agree to that view.

LORD MUSKERRY: I beg the noble Lord's pardon.

*LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: I said that the modified regulations are in no sense a departure from the assurances which have already been given. I gather from the letter which was written by the Merchant Service Guild to the Board of Trade that the particular assurance which the noble Lord and the Merchant Service Guild have in their mind is one which was given in this House by my noble friend Lord Granard on 10th July last year. That assurance was given in a discussion upon a Motion which had been made by the noble Lord, in which he called attention to the alleged shortage of officers in the merchant service and asked that in any steps which might be taken to remedy that deficiency, the existence of which he did not admit, the Board of Trade would not include amongst those remedies any curtailment of the period of service at sea which is necessary before candidates can present themselves for examination for second mates' certificates. The Board of Trade had no intention of doing anything of the kind, and therefore, my noble friend had no hesitation in giving the assurance which was asked for. My noble friend is here, and I have no doubt is ready to answer for himself. I merely mention this for the purpose of saying that the Department thoroughly endorse everything which was said by my noble friend on that occasion, and also maintain that these new regulations are in no sense a departure from that assurance. In fact, it does not matter what assurances were given, because the modified regulations, where they alter the period of service which candidates for these certificates must undergo, in every case lengthen that period and in no case shorten it; and, where the nature of the service is varied, I hope to show your Lordships that something is substituted for it which is at least as valuable as, if not more valuable than, that which was required under the old regulations.

These modified regulations have been issued in order to adapt the regulations to a new system of training which has recently been instituted by one of the great steamship companies—the White Star Line. That system was alluded to by my noble friend Lord Brassey and my noble friend Lord Granard recently in this House. It has been adopted after consultation with the Board of Trade, and it has the full approval of the Department. I will describe, very briefly, how it differs from the old system of training, which consisted, as your Lordships are aware, of four years' service at sea, either as an apprentice or as a deck hand in any capacity. The defect of that system undoubtedly is that in these days of steamships it is very difficult for the officers of the ship to devote very much of their time to the teaching of apprentices. Under the old system of sailing ships they had more leisure to do so, and I think it is universally acknowledged that the apprentice system is more valuable on a sailing ship than on a steamship. In order to carry out a new system of training on a sailing ship the White Star Line have recently purchased a sailing ship of, I think, 1,800 tons. She has been fitted up to carry sixty apprentices, who will work the ship with the assistance, I believe, while it is necessary, of ten deck hands. Besides a full complement of officers and a doctor, this ship will carry two schoolmasters who will instruct the cadets or apprentices in various subjects extremely useful to them in their career in the merchant service, such as foreign languages, navigation, nautical astronomy, and other subjects of a technical character. The more technical part of their education will be undertaken by the officers of the ship, and I believe there will be included in the course instruction by the surgeon in ambulance work. In fact, the instruction which will be given will be of the most complete character, and it has the thorough approval of the Board of Trade. This is the new system of instruction to which the modified regulations are to be adapted.

I quite agree with what the noble Lord has said, that there is no finer body of men in the world than the officers of our merchant service. I quite agree with him that we are all very proud of them and that they command the greatest confidence and respect; and it is quite fair to say that a system of training which has produced such good results cannot have very much the matter with it. But even the best of systems is none the worse for being brought up to date, and that is what this new system of instruction will do. The new modified regulations deal with the qualifications necessary for candidates for the three certificates issued by the Board of Trade. The noble Lord has correctly stated what those modifications are. In the case of second mates' certificates, they allow the necessary qualifying period of four years at sea to be spent on one of these approved training-ships, on which I think there can be no doubt that the instruction which will be received will be very much superior to what is likely to be received by a man who serves as a deck hand or apprentice.

For a first mate's certificate and for a master's certificate certain further modifications have been introduced in order to meet a difficulty which arises. The gentlemen who have introduced this new scheme of training officers at very considerable expense are naturally anxious that those officers should be able to serve the whole of their service on board their ships. The old regulations did not permit of their doing so, and I will show why. In the case of a candidate for a first mate's certificate it was necessary that he should show that he had been in complete charge of a watch on a foreign going vessel for a space of one year. As your Lordships are aware, on these great liners watches are invariably kept by two officers, and it would follow, therefore, that in order to comply with the regulations the officer would have to leave the service of the company and engage on a smaller vessel where only one officer kept watch. A similar difficulty arose with regard to the examination for the master's certificate. What has been done is this. The period during which the officer must have served in possession of a second mate's certificate has been doubled. He now has to serve two years instead of one; but it is provided that if he is on board a ship complying with certain conditions as to size, speed and number of crew, that is to say, a liner of considerable size, he may put in that service as the junior of the two watch-keeping officers instead of being in sole charge of the watch. The modification with respect to the master's certificate is of a very similar nature. It is considered—and I think considered rightly—that the fact that the period of service is twice as long, that it must have been passed on board a ship where the standard of efficiency and discipline is so high as it is on these great liners, and that the candidate must have had in the first instance the advantage of the very complete system of training I have described, makes this qualifying period fully equal, if not superior, to what was required under the old regulations.

Then the noble Lord asks why it is that the Advisory Committee was not consulted. My answer to that is a very simple one. In the first place, the time of the Advisory Committee was fully occupied. It has been fully occupied ever since it was appointed. In the second place, Mr. Lloyd-George, the then President of the Board of Trade, in the exercise of the discretion which, I think, is invariably granted to the head of a great Department, considered that this was a matter which he could quite well settle himself. I have given details of the new regulations and an outline of the new system of training which they have been adapted to meet, and I have only one word to add. The purchase and fitting up of this ship has cost the White Star Company a very considerable sum of money. I am informed that, in spite of the fact that the ship will carry cargo and that apprentices will pay fees, she will be run at an annual loss of several thousand pounds. This very considerable expenditure can only have been incurred with one object—namely, the provision of officers who will have had a better training, and will, therefore, probably be even more competent than those who fill the positions of officers on these ships at the present moment; and I contend that for that reason, if for no other, the Department are thoroughly justified in the course they have taken, and in the encouragement which they have given to this very valuable new undertaking.

*LORD LYVEDEN: My Lords, in regard to most things connected with this mercantile marine I am in full agreement with my noble friend Lord Muskerry, but to-day I am sorry to say I cannot agree with him. For a long time past there has been great difficulty in getting officers in the mercantile marine who have a thorough knowledge of sailing ships, owing to the large number of steamers now afloat. Your Lordships have heard how Mr. Ismay, of the White Star Line, formed a committee to consider the question, and these gentlemen decided that the best course was to purchase a full rigged ship of 2,000 tons, in which sixty cadets could be carried, with a large number of instructors. Then a difficulty arose as to what could be done when the cadets had completed their term of apprenticeship. It is the rule in the White Star and similar lines, that all officers should have master's certificates; and when an exception is made it only applies to the junior officers of the watch. Thus the regulations of the Board of Trade could not be complied with, as, according to those Regulations, the candidate must have had full watch on the bridge. The Committee met the officials of the Marine Department of the Board of Trade, with the result that the concessions referred to, which only apply to these training ships, were made. These concessions enable cadets to pass from the training ship into such steamers as junior officers, and to go forward with a continuity of employment to the examination for mate's certificate and master's certificate after a proper interval. This variation is not intended in any way to make it easier to obtain these certificates, but to provide for those who are specially trained passing to steamers where two or more officers are engaged and going forward to a higher certificate under all the advantages appertaining to a modern liner. My friend Captain Reedman, of the S.Y. "Argonaut" told me the following story. An uncle who wished to see his nephew once asked the quartermaster on the bridge: "Is my nephew, Mr. Smith, on board?" "Mr. who?" inquired the quartermaster. "Mr. Smith, a fair-haired boy," was the reply. "Oh, you mean young Carrots. He is in the galley with the cook, peeling potatoes. Where else do you expect an apprentice to be?" That was the sort of training apprentices received in the old days. Seeing the splendid training these boys will receive on these ships I think the slight concessions in the regulations are justifiable, and I hope no alteration will be made. I feel sure it would only hamper these young men who are doing the best they can to get a thoroughly good education to qualify them for the position of officers in the mercantile marine.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I am sure those of your Lordships who have listened to this debate will agree with the noble Lord who represents the Board of Trade, that it is for the advantage of the country and of the merchant service that the methods of training should be brought up to date, and in much that he said on that head I think your Lordships will be disposed to concur. We can all agree that a superior kind of education and a more scientific training are all for the best. I confess that when I came down to your Lordship's House this afternoon I had hoped it would not be necessary for me to say anything in criticism of the statement to be made in reply to Lord Muskerry; but I must say I do not think that in every respect my noble friend behind me will be satisfied with the answer which the noble Lord has given. I quite understand, and I think he probably will agree, that the effort which the White Star Line has made is a patriotic effort which they intend to be of great advantage, not only to themselves, but to the great service of which they form a part; but I do not think personally I should be disposed to deny that the period of service which is exacted falls short of what ought to be expected. There is, I understand, rather longer sea service provided under the new rules than under the old rules.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: Twice as long.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Well, that is, of course, so far very satisfactory; but it seems to lack one particular quality—namely, that a second mate who comes up for a first mate's certificate will never have been in a position of absolute responsibility. I may have misunderstood the noble Lord, but that is what I took to be the case, that owing to the new arrangement he is never in sole charge of a vessel. He undoubtedly is one of the two officers in charge of the watch, but he is to be the junior of his rank. I do not profess to be an expert in this matter, but I certainly should have thought that the matter above all others in which training and experience are required by officers of the merchant service is in the exercise of that complete responsibility which sole charge alone can confer. I do not mean to say that the new regulations will not produce a very fine article, but I confess I question whether anything in the way of scientific training or of longer sea service will make up for the experience which is conferred by the knowledge that you, and you alone, are responsible for the fate of the ship. I gather from my noble friend, that, although the examination may take place before a chief mate has ever been in sole charge, yet before he is actually certificated he must have been a year in sole charge of a vessel. So that there is a concession made with regard to the master, though the sole charge even in his case is not so long as has hitherto prevailed.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: It is quite as long.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Then I am reassured to that extent, but as between second mate and first mate the criticism I have ventured to make seems to hold good. I think your Lordships would have been happier if the noble Lord had been able to inform the House that the Board of Trade had acted in this matter with the complete assent of the Advisory Committee. The noble Lord himself will admit that on that his answer was not complete, because all he had to say was that the President of the Board of Trade, in the exercise of his discretion, thought there were some subjects which he ought to decide himself, and that this was one of those subjects. For my part, I should have been happier if Mr. Lloyd-George had thought it right to consult the Advisory Committee. Then if he had come to Parliament and said that what he proposed had the unanimous support of his Advisory Committee, a better case would have been made out for it. However, these matters are very technical. I only rose to make that one observation. I cannot say that I think this is quite a matter upon which it would be wise for your Lordships to override the decision of the Board of Trade. There are very few men in this House who are really capable, if I may say so with great respect, of appreciating the point, and, therefore, I hope my noble friend will not press his Motion to a division, though I think he was fully entitled to make the criticisms he has made to your Lordships.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, after what my noble friend who has just sat down has said, I will not press my Motion to a division; but I should like to say one or two words. The noble Lord who answered me did not quite grasp what I was driving at. I fully admit that the lads in the new White Star training ship will get a very admirable training. I think I said so in my speech; but no amount of training will give them the practical experience that a man must have if he is going to be a really trustworthy officer. The Board of Trade seem to imagine that a junior officer on board a big steamship, by just being there, will absorb this experience. They do not know the usual place the junior officer occupies. He may be on the bridge going down channel, but after that he may be anywhere but on the bridge, and when he is on the bridge he is a perfect cipher. Though I am not going to press my Motion to a division, I cannot help saying that the innovation which has been made is a dangerous one, and I think it will be found that the whole of the sea-faring community are with me in that.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

CAVALRY FOR SCOTLAND.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY rose to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War if there was any immediate prospect of the restoration of cavalry to Scotland. The noble Earl said: My Lords, I promise not to add anything to the nightly catechism of my noble friend opposite, or to detain your Lordships for more than a minute. The question of cavalry in Scotland has become a topic of very widespread interest. We have had frequent assurances that the withdrawal was only temporary, and in one answer the limit of two years was given, I think, more than two years ago. I am sure my noble friend will thank me for enabling him to make a statement which I trust will reassure Scotland on this point.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord LUCAS): My Lords, the noble Earl will be glad to know that money was taken in this year's Estimates for the purchase of a site, and that we have been by no means inactive in regard to looking out for one, although, for obvious reasons in matters of this kind, it is impossible for me to disclose either the site or the actual date on which it is proposed to purchase it. I can assure the noble Earl that steps are being taken, and I hope to be able to give a more definite answer in a very short time.

DEPUTY-LIEUTENANCIES.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY rose to call attention to the War Office Circular of 20th November, 1907; and to move for Papers. The noble Earl said: My Lords, my second Question demands two minutes of explanation. It refers to a circular from the War Office with reference to the appointment of deputy-lieutenants. It is to this effect—

> "A commission as deputy-lieutenant should only be given to a person who possesses the qualification, in addition to such as are laid down in the Militia Act, of having either held a commission in one of His Majesty's forces for not less than ten years, or of having rendered eminent service in connection with the Association formed in his own county under the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, 1907."

The subject of deputy-lieutenancies has received a great deal of attention of late years from the War Office. I think the age was first raised, and then their number was limited. Those improvements—for I regard them as such—I heartily welcomed; but I must say that I think this new restriction imposes a very great limitation upon the selection of deputy-lieutenants, and may, in fact, if I do not misread it, put an end to the appointment of deputy-lieutenants for a very considerable time. The Militia Act of 1882, which I had occasion to look up in connection with this matter, imposes a very considerable number of limitations upon the appointment of deputy-lieutenants already, chiefly those relating to property; but if this new one is added, that persons to be appointed should have held His Majesty's Commission or should have rendered services in connection with the Territorial Force, it will be found difficult for some years to come to get any deputy-lieutenants at all. I wish to point out to my noble friend that the uses of deputy-lieutenants, which may be as vague to some candid minds as those of an archdeacon, are not entirely limited to military duties. It is quite true that they were utilised in connection with the Militia; but in the Militia Act itself it is stated that three deputy-lieutenants might act for the Lord-Lieutenant in his absence, which means, I suppose, that they may recommend to the magistracy and so forth—duties which do not obviously require military training. There is another point to which I desire to call attention. Deputy-lieutenancies have been purely honorary offices. They have been the only means by which a Lord-Lieutenant could reward public services rendered in a locality. I do not care to cite my own course in that matter; but I have always observed the strict rule not to give a deputy-lieutenancy to anyone who had not rendered such public service. As a result the number of my deputy-lieutenants has become extremely small, but under this War Office Circular they threaten to become extinct. I do not make these remarks in any hostile spirit, because I regard the circular as having been hastily issued as one of many means of promoting the interests of the Territorial Force. I only ask that the Secretary of State for War should give his attention further to this matter, and that the appointments should not be limited to purely military persons or persons who have rendered services to the County Associations, but that some scope should be given to a Lord-Lieutenant to give to persons who have rendered local service the only reward which a Lord-Lieutenant can give.

LORD LUCAS: My Lords, perhaps I may say a few words with regard to the original cause of this circular being issued, and the view of the Army Council on the matter. Originally, the chief function of deputy-lieutenants was to assist the Lord-Lieutenant of the county in raising the necessary number of men under the Militia ballot. They had, in fact, to raise what was then the Territorial Force of the country, and, allowing for the changes in the nature of the two forces, the functions of the present County Associations bear very close comparison to those originally intended to be performed by the deputy-lieutenants. It was, therefore, considered a suitable opportunity to revive the original conception of what was a deputy-lieutenant, and that was the reason for issuing the circular, in which it is clearly laid down that one of the qualifications of deputy-lieutenants is that they should have rendered useful service to the County Associations. It is not confined to that. That is the only new qualification; the other is having held a commission in one of His Majesty's forces for not less than ten years, thus reviving once more the conception that a deputy-lieutenant was intended to be a person who exercised certain definite functions very closely connected with the military forces of the Crown. I will, however, lay before the Secretary of State what the noble Earl has said.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I do not wish to detain the House, but I would point out to my noble friend that the original conception of what was a deputy-lieutenant has been overridden by the consistent practice of, at least, a century, and the effect of the Circular will certainly be to impose a hardship upon those who might otherwise expect a deputy-lieutenancy for civil services.

LORD ASHBOURNE: Up to the date of the issue of this circular a Lord-Lieutenant had a perfect discretion as to whom he might appoint. I should like to ask whether, in the event of a Lord-Lieutenant not being able to find deputy-lieutenants coming within the qualifications named in the Circular, it is intended that he should fall back upon the old practice?

LORD LUCAS: No case of that kind has arisen. If it did occur the point would certainly be considered.

———

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS DUTIES) BILL.

[SECOND READING.

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, this Bill and two others stand in my name on the Paper for Second Reading, and as they are all of a non-contentious character, I hope your Lordships will permit me to be very brief in view of the important debate that is to come on later. The Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill is an annual one, which is necessary to give validity to what is passed by the governing body in the Isle of Man. I believe it has always been treated as a formal matter in this House, and I, therefore, move the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

———

SEED POTATOES AND SEED OATS SUPPLY (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for Second Reading read.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, this is a similar Bill to one which it was my duty to introduce in this House some two years ago. Owing to the failure last summer and autumn of the potato crop in Ireland, the Treasury authorised certain grants to be made in order to supply seed potatoes and seed oats so as to avert what might have become a potato famine. It has always been the custom for the Treasury to sanction these loans, and then come to Parliament in order to obtain the necessary funds. They did it two years ago, and the Bill received the assent of this House. I hope that on the present occasion the same reasons will obtain. I beg to move.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

———

WHALE FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, a similar Bill was brought in last year for Scotland, and it was found also to be desirable that a Bill of this character should be brought in for Ireland. Two applications have lately been made for the erection of whaling stations off the Irish coast, and these applications have caused some alarm among the fishing populations in these districts. It is certainly necessary that the industry should be carried on under certain regulations. In this instance the regulations will be undertaken on behalf of Ireland by the Board of Agriculture. I beg to move.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE, on behalf of Lord Avebury, moved an Amendment providing "that the local authority, within the meaning of the same section, in the City of London shall be the mayor, aldermen, and commons of the city in Common Council assembled." He very much regretted the noble Lord's absence, as this was a matter which concerned the City of London, and Lord Avebury was infinitely more able to speak with authority upon this question than himself. Hitherto the justices had made arrangements in connection with the matters under consideration in this Bill, but in future the Bill ordained that the London County Council should make those arrangements. One of the objects of the Bill seemed to be to set up the London County Council to deal with these matters in order to avoid difficulties arising from over-lapping, and he did not desire in any way to quarrel with that object. But the Bill as now drafted would set up the London County Council as the authority to carry out in the city all the arrangements that were dealt with in the Bill, and he thought the result could only be one of very great inconvenience to all parties. Over-lapping had taken place and confusion had arisen in connection with various of the Parliamentary boroughs, but the position of the City was absolutely different, and none of the inconveniences feared could possibly arise in the case of the City. In the metropolitan boroughs the justices who had dealt with these matters had had no connection whatever with the municipal body in the district, but in the City the justices who had hitherto had these matters in hand had been the aldermen of the Common Council. There had, therefore, been complete harmony in the making of these arrangements between the justices and the Common Council. Though not quite accurate, it was almost accurate to say that these arrangements had been carried out in the City by the Common Council itself; at any rate, that work had been done by gentlemen who were members of the Common Council. Therefore, if the Bill passed in its present form, the aldermen of the City would lose a jurisdiction which they had exercised from time immemorial, and against which no complaint had ever been urged. The City was divided accurately and completely into two petty sessional districts, and overlapping was impossible, owing to the fact that the whole of the City formed the Parliamentary borough. He, therefore, submitted that there was no reason whatever for disturbing the *status quo.* On the other hand, great inconvenience might result from bringing the county council into the City to exercise the powers with which this Bill was concerned. There were between 130 and 140 parishes in the City of London, therefore, the closest consideration and the closest local knowledge were required in order to carry out such arrangements as these to the general convenience. He understood that the London County Council saw no objection whatever to the adoption of his Amendment, and for this reason he hoped the Committee would assent to it.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 13, after the word 'thereof' to insert the words, 'Provided that the local authority, within the meaning of the same section in the City of London, shall be the mayor, aldermen, and commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

VISCOUNT MIDLETON said that, so far as the London County Council were concerned, they had no objection whatever to the Amendment. On the contrary, the authority of the corporation in the City of London with regard to many county matters was already recognised.

The City exercised the powers of a county authority in respect of such matters as pauper lunatics, explosives, coroners, weights and measures, and other matters of that kind; and the County Council were not in the least apprehensive that any conflict of jurisdiction would arise in regard to the City, having regard to the very special position which the corporation occupied. He, therefore, hoped the Amendment would commend itself to the Government.

EARL BEAUCHAMP regretted that, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, he was unable to agree to the Amendment. It was quite true that at a later stage the London County Council in another place withdrew their opposition to the Amendment. But when it was brought before the Standing Committee it was there opposed by the representatives of the London County Council and withdrawn. It was after that—he thought on the Report stage—that the London County Council withdrew their opposition. He thought it only fair to remind their Lordships that this Bill would in no way take away a privilege from the Common Council, for, as the Earl had explained, this power rested with the aldermen, and not with the Common Council. After all, supposing the Bill were passed and the polling arrangements altered by the new authority, it was not unreasonable to say that it would be done in the interests of good administration, and he thought it was obviously desirable that the division of districts for Parliamentary and county council elections should be the same, and should be in the hands of the same authority for both purposes. The Bill in its present form had been before their Lordships four times, and had passed through the House as often as it had been introduced. Moreover, it passed in its present shape, and he thought that if the Bill proposed to give any very startling powers to the London County Council, an Amendment would have been suggested on one of the former occasions. In view of the fact that the present condition of affairs in another place made it unlikely that the Bill would receive favourable consideration if the Amendment were inserted, and also in view of the approval which their Lordships had given to the Bill as it stood four times, he hoped the Amendment would not be inserted.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said the present condition of business in another place was a matter with which none of their Lordships had anything to do, and he did not see why their Lordships House should suffer any disability in consequence of it. He was not acquainted with the reason why this Amendment had not been moved during the progress of the four previous Bills, but it might be that if those Bills were considered before the last County Council election, the City felt there was not much likelihood of securing that agreement which they had since secured. This was a much more important point than the noble Earl opposite seemed to think, and he did not at present feel that he would be justified in not taking the sense of their Lordships upon it.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to, and Bill reported without amendment.

Moved, "That the Standing Committee be negatived." — (*Viscount Midleton*).

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, if it is to be the ordinary course to move that the Standing Committee be negatived, I think the Standing Committee stage had better be repealed altogether. The Standing Committee has, since it has been established, done really useful business. Now, however, the ordinary course of things is to move to negative this stage, and it is negatived accordingly. It seems to me that, if this is to become the usual practice, the proper course is to abolish this stage altogether.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I understand that the noble Earl, Lord Camperdown, was about to propose the abandonment of the Standing Committee stage. If and when he does so, I think we ought to take carefully into consideration the *pros* and *cons* for maintaining or abolishing it. I do not propose to-day to enter into the various arguments on either side. Personally I quite concur with the noble and learned Lord who has just spoken that, in certain circumstances, the Standing Committee has been a very valuable stage in the past. I have seen excellent work done there, and I confess I am not in a position to state why it has now become the custom to move to negative this stage. I do not take any responsibility for it.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, I am, of course, entirely in the hands of the House. I am afraid I am hardly aware of the forms of your Lordships' House in this matter, and if I have erred it is because I was told that this was the proper Motion to move.

On Question, Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3:

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved two Amendments to modify the clause so as to refer to the Railway Commission for arbitration any difference between the Postmaster-General and the authority in which was vested any land dedicated to the recreation of the public with respect to the erection of telegraph wires.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 6 and 7, to leave out the words, 'in whom such land is vested or.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 8, after the word 'remains' to insert the words 'Provided that if such consent is withheld or any condition is attached thereto to which the Postmaster-General objects, a difference shall be deemed to have arisen between the Postmaster-General and that person, and sections three, four, and five of the Telegraph Act, 1878, shall apply accordingly as if it were a difference arising under that Act.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

VISCOUNT MIDLETON said the question raised by the Amendment was one upon which the Post Office and the London County Council had long been at variance. The position was this. Up to the present the Postmaster-General had not had the power of carrying telegraph wires over recreation grounds or public property without the consent of the individuals in whom that property was vested. When the Bill was considered in another place this very conclusive clause was proposed and supported by the Government, and was inserted in the Bill. Under it it would be impossible for the Postmaster-General to exercise the right of carrying telegraph wires over public parks and recreation grounds without the consent of the authority in whom they were vested. The noble Lord now proposed a modification of the clause which would take the whole question out of the hands of those authorities in whom the lands were vested, and leave it to be arbitrated upon the Railway Commissioners in case of a difference. The contention of the London County Council had always been the same. They were seized by Parliament with the responsibility for a considerable number of open spaces and parks, and considering the immense number of overhead wires already in London, they maintained that these operations should be carried on underground until the suburbs were reached. They felt that it was a very strong measure to take this matter out of their hands and allow the Railway Commissioners to be the judges of the public convenience. If the noble Earl desired to persist in this Amendment, which almost negatived the whole advantage of the clause accepted by the Government in another place, he (Lord Midleton) would move to amend the Amendment by excluding from its operation parks and recreation grounds vested in a public authority. He was, however, willing to substitute in his Amendment "London County Council" for "public authority," thereby restricting to London the power of a local authority to withstand the Postmaster-General.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To insert, after the words 'Provided that,' the words 'in cases where such land is not vested in the London County Council.'"—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD failed to see why the London County Council should have any special rights in this case. He could assure the noble Viscount that there was no intention of carrying wires across parks. The Bill only gave power in respect of land "being within twenty feet of any such street or road." The Amendment which he had moved was the outcome of a compromise in the other House.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I understand that the noble Earl relies upon the fact that these powers only apply to telegraph lines erected within twenty feet of a road. Would he say whether, in the case of a public park, a gravel walk traversing the park would be a road within the meaning of the Bill? The noble Earl will see that a good deal depends upon that.

THE EARL OF GRANARD suggested that the point should be held over for the Report Stage so that he might consider it.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON agreed to this course, and withdrew his Amendment to the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining Clauses agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee, and to be printed, as amended. [No. 186.]

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, this Bill was before a Joint Committee of the two Houses, and we unanimously agreed to certain Amendments for the purpose of making the Bill purely consolidation. Those are the Amendments that I ask your Lordships to allow to be taken *en bloc* at this stage. There are certain other Amendments which I will refer to later at another stage of the Bill, but which do not concern us at present.

Moved, "That the Amendments agreed to by the Joint Committee be inserted."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of the Amendments to be received on Wednesday next.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF STRADBROKE: My Lords, the object of this Bill is to make married women with separate estate equally liable with single women and widows for contribution, in repayment to boards of guardians for the support or relief of their parents. The Bill has been introduced in consequence of a Resolution passed at the last annual meeting of the Association of Poor Law Unions of England and Wales, and that Resolution arose out of a case taken to the Court of Appeal by the Pontypool Union, where a married woman in fairly good circumstances refused to contribute to the support of her father, although her brothers, who were not in such a good financial position, were contributing 1s. and 1s. 6d. a week respectively. The Bill has passed through the House of Commons without Amendment, and, I believe, with the approval of His Majesty's Government. I, therefore, trust your Lordships will give it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Stradbroke.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I would ask the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack whether, in his view, the Bill is necessary at all.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I should like an opportunity of ascertaining what the exact position is before we proceed with the Bill. Perhaps the noble Earl will allow it to stand over for a day.

THE EARL OF STRADBROKE: My only reason for pressing the matter was to get the Bill through your Lordships' House before the adjournment. As I have said, the Bill has passed through the House of Commons without any Amendment.

LORD ALLENDALE: My Lords, I have to say, on behalf of the Local Government Board, that they have no wish to offer any opposition to the Bill; in fact, they are prepared to give it their support.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I have no doubt the Bill is quite right, but, as a matter of fact, I have not seen it, and I should like to have an opportunity of ascertaining what the law is before we alter it.

LORD ASHBOURNE: Perhaps the Lord Chancellor, while he is applying his mind to the matter, will see whether Ireland cannot be dealt with in the same way.

THE EARL OF STRADBROKE: In view of what has been said, I shall be very pleased to move the adjournment of the debate.

Moved, "That the debate be adjourned."—(*The Earl of Stradbroke*).

On Question, Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned till To-morrow.

POLLING DISTRICTS AND REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD MARCHAMLEY: My Lords, in the absence of my noble friend, the Earl of Liverpool, who is detained, I believe, in camp, I have been asked to move the Second Reading of this Bill, the object of which is to confer upon county councils in Ireland the power to alter the polling districts and the method of compiling lists of voters. It is important that it should, if possible, pass through your Lordships' House before Parliament rises for the summer recess, because the Registration Courts in Ireland begin sitting in September. I think I may claim that it is a measure of an entirely non-contentious character, and that it has been supported by all parties in the other House. It has been supported by Mr. Walter Long and others, and by the whole of the Nationalist Party, and I understand it is approved by the Irish Local Government Board. For the purposes of local government in Ireland, counties are divided into electoral divisions, and the lists of voters are made up according to these electoral divisions; but for Parliamentary purposes the counties in Ireland are divided differently, and consequently a great deal of trouble and expense is involved in the printing and publishing of the Parliamentary lists of voters. In England the county councils have power to alter the polling districts, but in Ireland I understand that is not the case. Clause 3 provides that any county council in Ireland may, with the sanction of the Local Government Board for Ireland, arrange to have the register of voters, or any part of the register, prepared alphabetically in townlands or, as regards urban districts, in streets. The Bill is desired by all political parties in Ireland and by all county officials; and it is urgent because as I have explained, it is hoped it will be applied to proceedings in the Registration Courts in September.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Marchamley.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR was putting the Question, when——

LORD ASHBOURNE said: I assume the Government intend to tell us something about this Bill, which purports to make important and serious changes in polling arrangements in Ireland. I do not wish to offer any objection to the Bill, but I cannot conceive how it will be possible, even if the Bill becomes law this week, for the county councils to prepare the schemes in accordance with the provisions of the Bill and have them ready by September. If there was all this urgency the Bill ought to have been sent up to your Lordships' House earlier. I have, as I have said, no objection to the Second Reading, but I think we are entitled to an expression of opinion from the representative of the Government Department concerned.

Lord DENMAN: My Lords, I was hoping that, after the clear explanation given by the noble Lord behind me, it would have been unnecessary for me to have said anything with regard to this Bill. The Government are satisfied that this is a useful Bill. As my noble friend behind me said, it was backed in the House of Commons by Mr. Walter Long and other Unionists, and I should have thought that, in those circumstances, it would not have been opposed in your Lordships' House.

Lord ASHBOURNE: I am not opposing it. I merely asked for some explanation.

Lord DENMAN: The Bill, as my noble friend has explained, seeks to bring the electoral divisions for county councils and for Parliamentary——

Lord ASHBOURNE: I do not want to appear to be unduly critical of the Bill. If the noble Lord is in a position to tell me that the Local Government Board of Ireland have examined the Bill and think it workable and prudent, I shall be quite satisfied.

Lord DENMAN: I can assure the noble and learned Lord that the Local Government Board do approve of the Bill. The noble and learned Lord will see that it contains a provision that no scheme shall be of any force or validity unless and until it is confirmed by an Order of the Local Government Board.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for Second Reading read.

Viscount RIDLEY: My Lords, this is a Bill on which it is not necessary for me to say more than a few words, as it is entirely of a private character. It is chiefly concerned with certain internal changes in the constitution of the University of Durham, necessitated by its growth as an institution and by the development of its work in Newcastle. It has been a matter of arrangement between all the parties, and as a result it has passed the House of Commons without any difference of opinion. It seeks no new powers, and the various authorities concerned are entirely agreed upon it; but it is necessary to come to Parliament for powers because the constitution of the University was settled by Act of Parliament originally. The promoters proceed on the same method as was followed in the case of the London University Bill in 1898, by the appointment of Commissioners who are empowered to carry out changes according to the schedule of the Bill, but have no power to divert any property from the uses to which it is at present given. The Bill as it stands is approved by the Dean and Chapter of Durham and by all the educational authorities concerned. I hope that, in these circumstances, your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To morrow.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). An Amendment moved, and negatived; Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

TOBACCO GROWING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (MERCANTILE CORPORATIONS AND COMPANIES) BILL [H.L.].

COMMONS BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

PROVISIONAL ORDERS (PROCEDURE) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

WILD BIRDS BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

COSTS IN CRIMINAL CASES BILL.

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I rise to call the attention of the House to the history of this Bill, which I need not point out to your Lordships is a very important Bill. It was introduced into this House on Saturday last, two or three of your Lordships having to sacrifice your holiday, I suppose, in order to give it a First Reading. The Bill has not been circulated at all, and it was not even laid upon the Table of this House until a quarter past five this evening. Your Lordships are now asked to give the Bill a Second Reading, and, moreover, if report speaks truly, it is the intention of the Government to get through the remaining stages during the three Parliamentary days which remain of the present week. I want to know what is the special reason for hurry in connection with this Bill, because, unless very special reason can be given, I submit to your Lordships that it is treating the House with absolute disrespect. Unfortunately, we are getting used to this kind of thing. His Majesty's Government mentioned in the King's Speech a much greater number of subjects than there is any possibility of hoping to treat with anything like deliberation in the course of the session. They then used weapons of their own in another place, and, having done that, they come to your Lordships and thrust Bills down our throat one after another without our having any means of deliberating upon them. Noble Lords and their friends elsewhere are very much given to making attacks on this House and to pointing out how unfavourable this House is to the present Government. So far from that being true, this House has done more for this Government in the way of hasty, helter-skelter legislation than for any Government during the time I have sat in your Lordships' House. I moved for a Return two years ago which proved that in the years 1906 and 1907 your Lordships' House passed for the present Government a larger number of important Bills in less time and with less consideration than they had done in a long preceding series of years. I should like to ask whether the Government really propose to take the remaining stages of this Bill during the next three days. The noble Earl the Leader of the House spoke with grateful memory of the stage of Standing Committee. Not only will it not be possible to take the Standing Committee stage with regard to this Bill, but I do not know how your Lordships are going to pass it through all its stages this week without offending the Standing Orders of the House. I merely utter this as a protest. I am not forgetting that we have to come back on 12th October. In the first place, what shall we have to do when we come back, at any rate for some time? Why should we not be considering this Bill? But, quite apart from that, I have not forgotten, and I do not suppose any of your Lordships have, the proceedings prior to Christmas on the last occasion that we had an autumn session. I hope we are not going to have any renewal of the discreditable scenes—it was not legislation—to which this House was then forced to become a party. I hope your Lordships will insist that this sort of thing shall not be repeated in the closing weeks of next December. I venture to place this protest on record, and to ask the Government whether they propose to proceed with all the stages of this Bill during this week, and, if so, for what reason.

* THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I think your Lordships will all agree that, under the circumstances, the noble Earl is fully entitled to make the protest which he has just made. It is perfectly true that this Bill was brought up early on Saturday afternoon, and that it has only just been placed in your Lordships' hands. It is by no means the first time that something of this kind has happened. It has happened with other Governments in power. I have never quite understood why it is, when a Bill is brought up here on a Saturday afternoon, it should be found impossible to get anybody to print it. Overtime is not unknown, and I should have thought it would have been conceivable that important measures laid

before your Lordships' House would have found someone to print them; but, apparently, that difficulty has arisen, and I confess that when I found the Bill had not been circulated I would have been glad to have postponed the Second Reading, but that would necessarily have involved a prolongation of the session into next week.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Why?

* THE EARL OF CREWE: Because all the other days in the week are likely to be filled with other business.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Why not October?

* THE EARL OF CREWE: I will come to that in a moment. The noble Earl asks why we should not be content to put this measure off till October. I think the answer lies in the nature of the measure itself. It is a measure which has come up from another place with a very general amount of agreement arrived at among people of very divergent opinions. I do not think it is advisable to allow a measure of that kind to simmer too long. I think it is quite possible that, I do not say noble Lords opposite, but other politicians elsewhere, might, if the measure were postponed, develop some differences of opinion which so far have not occurred to them. In those circumstances I feel that it would be advantageous—I do not speak as a party man, for this is really not a party measure, but in the general interests of getting this very important question decided—if your Lordships would agree to pass it through all its stages before we adjourn for the holiday. The points at issue, as I think will appear when the Bill is debated, are not numerous. There are a number of great principles involved, but upon those agreement has been reached. The points upon which amendment is likely are, I hope and believe, exceedingly few. With regard to the general question, I should merely like to say this, that although I fully agree that it is desirable, both for the proper conduct of business and out of respect for your Lordships' House, that measures should be in the hands of Members for some time before a Bill is asked to be read a second time, yet I think one is bound, as far as possible, to avoid pedantry in the matter and to differentiate between different measures. What I am going to say to my noble friend holds equally good for both Houses, and it is this. When a measure has been very fully discussed in one House and has received but little amendment, I think it is reasonable to assume that those who are interested in the subject have followed those discussions and do not come to the matter in complete ignorance and with an entirely fresh mind; and though, of course, I am very far from saying that that absolves anybody from the necessity of placing the measure in your Lordships' hands, yet I think it is only fair to consider the particular character of the measure and the kind of opposition it has received. If this Bill had been amended in important respects at a late stage in another place, the noble Earl's case would have been a great deal stronger than it is at the moment, though I greatly regret that this should have occurred.

* THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I am glad that the noble Earl commenced his observations by frankly admitting that my noble friend was within his right in protesting against the manner in which this House has been treated in regard to this Bill. Even to us who are accustomed to treatment of the kind, it is rather a strong order that a Bill of this importance should be read a first time on Saturday and a second time on the following Monday, and that the Bill itself should not be on the Table of the House until within an hour of the time when the discussion will probably begin. The noble Earl gave us certain reasons against the rather obvious course which my noble friend suggested —I mean the course of allowing the Bill to stand over until after the summer adjournment. His reason was, if I may say so, a rather suggestive one. He said the measure was not one of a sort that ought to be allowed to simmer for too long. We are able, perhaps, to infer from that observation what must have been the temperature of this Irish stew which has been simmering during the last few months. We may even divine that members of His Majesty's Government may have already burnt their fingers, and do not particularly wish to burn them again. I rise merely

because I do not wish my noble friend behind me to stand alone in his protest. It is one which I have more than once made myself from this Table. With regard to the course which your Lordships should take, I am bound to say that the noble Earl is perhaps right in saying that this Bill comes to us under rather special circumstances. We are, of course, familiar with the general outline of the case, and I hope most of us have followed the discussions which have taken place elsewhere. But I should like to remind the noble Earl that amendments, and, I believe, amendments of some importance, were inserted in the Bill as lately as Friday last. I can only say with my noble friend behind me, that if we are to submit to treatment of this kind at the present period of the session, we hope that no attempt will be made to repeat the performance at the close of the winter session. I really do not think we are using idle words when we say that a moment will come when this House will not only resent, but will resist, the kind of treatment to which we are becoming too much accustomed.

* THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I do not desire to say anything in reply to the noble Marquess, but I will proceed, if I may be allowed to do so, to make a few observations on the measure, the Second Reading of which I shall shortly move. This question of University education in Ireland is one of the oldest and one of the most difficult that has been before Parliament. My right hon. friend has embarked upon a road which, like some of the caravan roads across the African desert, is strewn with the whitened bones which show the disasters of travellers who have passed that way before. This question, among other experiences, broke up the strongest Government which has probably ever existed in this country—I mean the Government which was formed by Mr. Gladstone in 1868.

Before I proceed to say anything about the measure, perhaps I may be allowed to make a brief historical retrospect with regard to University education in Ireland. For a long time University education in Ireland meant the University and College of Trinity, in Dublin. That college and University was founded in the year 1582 as a sort of younger sister to the famous foundation at Cambridge of the same name; and ever since those days it has been in its character a Protestant University. For at least 250 years it has been closely bound up with the Episcopal Church of Ireland. It was not until 1793, when Catholic relief generally was in the air, that Catholics were allowed to obtain degrees at Trinity, and in 1834 a fruitless attempt was made to allow Catholics to enjoy the scholarships and professorships of the University.

The next thing that happened to University education in Ireland was in 1845, when the Queen's University, as it was called, was formed, consisting of the three Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Cork, and Galway. Within five years from their inception these colleges were condemned by the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, and also formally condemned from Rome, and ever since then they have not been looked on with great favour by that Church. At this moment there are, I fancy, about 250 Roman Catholic students in the three colleges. In 1854, by private enterprise, what was known as the Catholic University was founded, chiefly remembered now by the famous man who was its first head and who afterwards became Cardinal Newman. That University, for reasons into which it is not necessary to enter, never succeeded as a University, and it now only exists, so far as it can be said to exist at all, as an association of Roman Catholic colleges, of which, of course, the most famous is Maynooth. In 1866 Lord Russell made an unsuccessful attempt to recognise that University, and two years later, in 1868, Mr. Disraeli attempted to take in hand the question of Irish University education. At that time Lord Mayo was Chief Secretary for Ireland, and it was announced that a Catholic University was about to be instituted in Ireland; but between the Government of the day and the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops and the supporters in this country and in Ireland of the right hon. Gentleman who was then Prime Minister the scheme fell to the ground, and the Government of that day, as it appears, were not sorry to find an excuse for withdrawing it.

Then in 1873 came the event to which I have already alluded, when Mr. Gladstone attempted to found a great national University in Ireland, which was to include all the colleges of the first rank, including Trinity and Maynooth. The fate of that measure, involving as it did that of the Government, is very well-known history, but it should also be remembered that, in that same year, 1873, Mr. Fawcett at last succeeded in doing what he had unavailingly tried to do before—that was, to abolish tests at Trinity College. Since then Trinity has been, at any rate in most respects, a testless University. In 1879 a further attempt was made, also by a Conservative Government. The Queen's University was abolished, although the colleges remained, and what is known as the Royal University was instituted. That was a purely examining body, and has remained so down to this time, and its existence, I think, has been almost an unmitigated misfortune for the highest type of education in Ireland.

One thing is worth noting with regard to this Royal University—that its system of professorships acted as an indirect endowment of the Catholic University in Dublin. That was owing to the arrangement under which the different professors of the new University were paid. That is to say, those of the Queen's Colleges only received a small sum in addition to their stipend, while those of St. Stephen's Green received the full payment of professors, and that obviously acted as an endowment towards those particular colleges. Last year, taking entrance examination and degrees together, about 3,600 students entered for the various examinations at the Royal University, of whom nearly 2,400 passed, of whom 486 were women.

That has been the condition of University education in Ireland, and the improvement of that system has been a subject of anxious care and study to many statesmen of both parties. I need not mention the prominent part which Mr. Balfour has taken, greatly to his honour, because it was sometimes, I think, in opposition to his party interests, in declaring in and out of season his determination to assist if he could in the settlemens of this question. But, as a matter of fact, among the public men of both parties who have held office either as Lord-Lieutenant or as Chief Secretary in Ireland, there has been, I think, scarcely one who has returned from Ireland without a conviction of the necessity of establishing in Ireland a University acceptable to Roman Catholics. I remember one singular instance of this. The late Mr. James Lowther was the least vacillating of politicians. Not long before his death he told me that he did not believe that he had modified in the slightest degree any opinion on any subject which he held when he entered the House of Commons in the year 1865, except on one, and that was this question. He was prepared to go almost to any length in assisting the foundation of a Roman Catholic University in Ireland.

The next thing that happened arising out of this general interest in the matter was the establishment in the year 1901 of a Commission over which the noble and learned Lord opposite, Lord Robertson. presided. He was assisted by various distinguished men. The late Lord Ridley, the present Archbishop of Tuam, and the Sir Richard Jebb were amongst them. That Commission reported in the year 1903, and the effect of its Report was to condemn, I think, without any qualification, the system of a purely examining University. It also condemned the indirect system of endowing particular professorships, and it as a whole recommended the institution of a new college in Dublin, although I think the noble and learned Lord opposite carefully guarded himself, if I remember right, from being supposed to recommend the establishment of a Roman Catholic University as such in the capital of Ireland.

LORD ROBERTSON: I stated in my separate Report that the ground of my objection was that I thought it was a political question for Parliament to decide, and not for the Commission.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am very glad to have that from the noble and learned Lord. Then in 1906 a further Commission was held. The Commission presided over by the noble and learned Lord had been appointed to inquire into the question of University education outside Trinity College. Trinity did not fall within its purview, but it did fall within the purview of the Commission of 1906. That Commission was also composed of unusually distinguished men. It was presided over by Sir Edward Fry. Chief Baron Palles, Sir Thomas Raleigh, Professor Henry Jackson of Cambridge, Mr. Butcher, whom we all know so well in another place, and who is also equally distinguished on the academic side, Sir Arthur Rücker, so well known as the Principal of London University, and Dr. Douglas Hyde were members of it. All but one of those Commissioners, and the one was not one of those distinguished men that I have mentioned, recommended the establishment of a college in Dublin, but on one point of the first importance their opinions were diametrically split, and that was the question whether Trinity should form part of the new University or not. Four of those gentlemen recommended that Trinity should be included. One, Professor Jackson, thought that the inclusion of Trinity was the best course that could be taken, but believed it to be practically impossible, and three were strongly opposed to the inclusion of Trinity.

In bringing in this measure the Government had to decide whether or not Trinity should be included. When we came to examine the matter at close quarters, it was quite evident that Trinity strongly objected to inclusion. About the position of Trinity College, Dublin, there can be no two opinions. It enjoys the possession of famous traditions of ripe scholarship, and of highly successful schools, both in classics and mathematics and in theology. It has enjoyed, also, a social reputation, for years and centuries, for literature and wit which no University surpasses. It may be said that among all the Universities, the kindly mothers of polite learning and of science, not one in any country has secured deeper devotion or more romantic allegiance from its sons than has Trinity. Under those circumstances it was no doubt a fascinating idea to ask Trinity to bring all its traditions to the service of the new University, and to act, as Trinity must have acted, as leader in the new combination. But Trinity did not see the matter in that light. Trinity was altogether unwilling to join. Whether, in doing so, she made one of those great refusals which are sometimes made by institutions no less than by individuals it is impossible to say; but it was obviously impossible, in view of her opposition, to press the point, and therefore we fell back on the scheme of the Bill.

The problem we had to meet was how to institute a University in Ireland which would be acceptable to the Catholics without endowing a Catholic University, which would be to do something which has never yet been done in the United Kingdom. It might be said, as it often has been said: There are no tests now at Trinity; why do not Catholics who desire the highest form of education attend Trinity College? The one main answer to that is that they will not. The reason, I think, is not altogether far to seek. It is not, of course, that Roman Catholic parents and Roman Catholic clergy believe that if their young men attend Trinity College they would be turned into Protestants, but they do think that they might return from there somewhat less good Catholics. The fact that they hold that opinion, although a certain number of Catholics do go to Trinity, makes a general attendance practically impossible.

In some ways the task of the Government was easier than that of any previous Government. The question of Belfast will settle itself more easily than it ever could have settled itself before. Great towns like Belfast have now not merely become reconciled to the idea of having a University, but a University has become almost an appanage of first-class towns. If Sheffield, with 400,000 inhabitants, can have an excellent University, there clearly is no reason why Belfast, with some 360,000, should not enjoy a similar advantage. It was found that when Lord Kelvin strongly recommended the institution of a University in Belfast, the idea was received there with infinitely greater favour than it had ever been in former years. Therefore, we leave Trinity alone. We propose to form two Universities, one with its seat in Belfast, and the other with its seat in Dublin, consisting of a new college in Dublin and the old Queen's College at Cork and the old Queen's College at Galway. As to Clause 1, I need only say that for the moment the question of the titles of these two Universities is postponed. It was felt that it would be better that they should, so to speak, christen themselves, rather than be christened by those who might not be in complete sympathy with them. But that is a small matter.

Clause 2 deals with the colleges. I need only draw the attention of the House to subsection 4 of that clause. It is one on which a considerable difference of opinion has existed, which was not altogether reconciled when the Bill was discussed in another place. Subsection 4 provides for the recognition—that is the word in the Act—or affiliation, of other colleges by the new University, and although that recognition is carefully guarded, yet it has met with a considerable degree of objection. We should all agree that if this matter could be considered in the abstract the objection would be fatal to the scheme. It is not, as a purely abstract question, a desirable thing that a University degree should be obtainable by anybody who has not shared in the corporate life of the University and has not, as a matter of fact, lived at the University itself. On the other hand we were confronted by the practical necessities of the case.

The two colleges principally concerned in this matter are Maynooth, which will naturally be recognised by Dublin, and Magee, which will naturally be recognised by Belfast. It is only fair to state that, although those colleges are spoken of as theological colleges, they are not purely theological, as anybody will know who has visited them, because there is a faculty of arts at both; and at Maynooth, of which I have the most personal knowledge, that is a side of education which it would be improper to speak of as being neglected. It was suggested in another place that although it might be proper to affiliate Maynooth, yet out of three years arts course—the whole course, I think, is seven years—two ought properly to be spent in the immediate neighbourhood of the University. If that is the ultimate outcome of this Act, nobody would be more glad than myself. One has no right to speak in any critical or advisory tone of the educational arrangement of a Church to which he does not belong; but it is common knowledge, I believe, that among Catholics there are a very considerable number, even in Maynooth itself, who would welcome the possibility of such a course as this. But it is not practicable at this moment.

In the first place we must remember the important point that we are not in a position to found a residential college, and it is not possible to provide in Dublin at this moment hostels for students who, in view of the fact that they are intended for the priesthood, would have to be kept under careful supervision whether they were at Maynooth or Dublin. Under those circumstances it is quite clear that to have insisted on this provision would be fatal to the reception of the Bill in Ireland by those who are responsible for that side of education. To begin by a controversy of that kind, whatever you may think of the merits of the case, would have been a poor start for the measure and would have undone a large part of the good we hope the Bill may do. It is important to bear this in mind, that the terms on which these colleges are to be recognised are susceptible of change from time to time, and therefore it would be open to the senate of either University, whenever it thinks that the time has come when such a provision of this kind ought to be enforced, to make it a condition for the continued recognition of either of the colleges.

Clause 3 deals with the important question of tests, and on that I may say, because it is a kindred though not an identical subject, that it was decided in another place, after some discussion, not to allow the erection of chapels in connection with these Universities. As regards the question of tests, subsection 2 provides for a custom that does not obtain greatly in England, though it is well known in Ireland, and that is the declaration by professors on taking office. No faculty of theology or divinity can be endowed by public money under the Act, though those who desire to found professorships in theology are, of course, at liberty to do so, but those who hold them will not be in all respects in the same position as the other officers of the University, and the religious belief of the students is carefully safeguarded by a conscience clause.

The next point is one over which a degree of controversy has arisen. It is with regard to the statutes of the Universities and the constituent colleges. That has been a matter of some discussion, because the Bill as it stands only provides for the regulation of these statutes by Parliament. The question has arisen whether the practice of the new Universities might not be assimilated to that of the Universities in this country. That is a question that is to some extent still under consideration, but I hope that my right hon. friend may find means of meeting the wishes of those who have raised this point in another place. Then temporary Commissioners are appointed. My right hon. friend has stated they are a distinguished body of men, both English and Irish. They are appointed for the transition stage, to draw up statutes and deal with the property and the obligations of the existing colleges and the Royal University.

As to the finance of the Bill, at present Queen's Colleges each receive £7,000 a year from the Consolidated Fund. This is brought up by votes and allowances to £13,000 in the case of Belfast, £11,250 in that of Cork, and £10,600 in that of Galway. The Royal University gets £20,000 a year from the Irish Church surplus, making a total endowment of £55,456. The new proposal is that the £20,000 of the Irish Church surplus is to be divided between the two Universities, Belfast getting £10,000 and Dublin £10,000. In addition to that, Belfast gets £18,000 a year, Dublin £32,000, Cork £20,000, and Galway £12,000, making altogether a total of £102,000, which is £46,544 more than they have hitherto been receiving. As regards buildings, Dublin University and College receive a building grant of £150,000, Belfast one of £60,000, Cork £14,000, and Galway £6,000. Then to Dublin the site and buildings of the Royal University, which cost £77,000, are handed over, and the Queen's Colleges which form part of the new University and cost originally and with additions altogether £186,000, making a grand total of £493,000. That, I think, cannot be said to be illiberal finance. No building grant, as far as I know, has ever been given to an English University. To Wales very little has been given, for Wales is the good child in these matters, and the amount raised there by private subscriptions has been considerable, and the Principality has not got much from the Treasury. Scotland, on the other hand, is an astute country, and has had at one time or another £380,000 in the shape of building grants.

This is not to be a residential University. It is to be regretted, I think, in any case, and all the more in view of the fact that Trinity is a residential University, and, therefore, comparison between the two is certain to be instituted, although in many respects the new University cannot hope to rival the ancient traditions of Trinity. We hope that some benefactors will come forward from time to time and part with some of their superfluous money by way of gift or legacy for the purpose of instituting a residential University in Dublin. I will give only one other set of figures—that of the numbers of students at the Queen's Colleges. They show to my mind more than anything else the necessity of instituting this new foundation. They have come down progressively since 1802. Belfast has fallen from 502 in that year to 390 in 1906, Cork from 348 to 261, Galway from 144 to 111. I think it is clear that that is due to the setting up of the Royal University. It cannot, I think, be otherwise explained. If people could get the same degree purely by examination and by living where they pleased, they were less likely than otherwise they would be to attend colleges. Therefore I think we may fairly expect, if the Bill is passed, a very considerable and steady increase in the numbers in these colleges.

I pass rapidly over a great many other provisions in the Bill. Clause 10 provides for the institution of scholarships by the Intermediate Education Board of Ireland and by county and borough councils. Clauses 11 and 12 deal with various points connected with professional education. Clause 13 deals with the interests of existing graduates and students, and saves the interests of those who are at present students of the Royal University, because it would be obviously unfair for them if, having entered a University course to pass a certain examination, they were confronted in the middle of it with something quite different. Then follow long and rather complicated clauses upon which I do not think controversy has arisen.

The first schedule gives the constitution of the governing bodies of the Universities, and, in addition, draft charters of both the Universities and colleges have been circulated. The draft charters in the case of the colleges provide a scheme for the governing bodies which is not placed in the Bill, and, therefore, the charter can be altered without the necessity of coming to Parliament. The composition of the proposed governing bodies of those colleges is one of the points which has formed the subject of some discussion. We have been told they are not sufficiently academic in character, that the outside element is somewhat too large. That, of course is a matter for discussion, and one upon which any man is entitled to hold his own opinion. If I may take Dublin as an instance, of the governing body of thirty-four members, sixteen may be taken as being directly academic, ten appointed by the City and county councils, four appointed by the Crown, and four co-opted. That gives a large majority to the academic side. Whether it is large enough may be argued, if an Amendment is moved on the subject. I think it must be borne in mind that it is very important to excite the interest of the locality and all those who represent it. It is our belief that that is best attained by allowing important local authorities to send representatives to the governing bodies.

Such is the character of the measure which I ask your Lordships to read a second time; and, I think, it is pretty clear from the history that I gave earlier that it is a kind of measure which any Government might well be tempted to leave alone. My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary, however, has shown great energy in promoting it, and has earned many handsome and generous compliments, not only from his own side, but from those generally opposed to him in politics. I hope, therefore, that the caravan, if I may use the simile again, is drawing in sight of home. Ireland has waited a long time for some measure of this kind; certainly she has waited for a full hundred years. Every year a new generation of young Roman Catholic students has arrived at manhood without in most cases obtaining the highest class of University education. That has a political side to it. The young student at the time does not always recognise his misfortune, for the average young man does not usually complain that he is being under-educated. But when he gets older and finds various avenues closed to him and various careers thwarted, he must blame somebody; he knows he need not blame himself, and, therefore, he blames the British Parliament, which has failed for so long to deal with this question, and I cannot help thinking that the existence of this real grievance has been one important contributory cause to the ill feeling which, as we know, has existed from time to time between the two countries. Our view is that we are very glad to believe that this measure offers a settlement.

We have been taunted—we may be taunted again—with being untrue to our principles by instituting something in the nature of endowments of denominational education. Those taunts, I confess, do not greatly affect me. I think they can only be made by those who are exceedingly prejudiced, or who take a very shallow view of the facts. The popular education of a country must be what the people of that country demand in view of their beliefs and opinions, whether social or religious. That is exactly the spirit in which we approached our attempted settlement of the question of elementary education in England. We approach this question in precisely the same spirit. What we desire to do is to give to every man, to every boy, freedom of opportunity so far as that is compatible with the establishment of a great national system. In the highest education in Ireland there has existed this great gap in the national system. That gap this measure is intended, if possible, to bridge.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

*Lord ASHBOURNE: My Lords, after the full and clear statement of the provisions of the Bill which has just been given by the noble Earl, I will venture to assume that there is no one in your Lordships' House who has not a very good idea of the proposals of this Bill. It would be impossible for any of us, after the discussions that have taken place in Parliament, after the proceedings of the two Royal Commissions, and after the frequent discussions of this matter in the Press, not to have a very ample knowledge of all that is meant by the words Irish University question. It is one of the most difficult and thorny of Irish problems. I think the noble Earl, if I may presume to say so, might have left out his closing sentence. Nothing that I know of has been said of a taunting character in reference to the Government in connection with this Bill. But really it is something of a challenge to ask us to recognise that this Bill is conceived on the same lines as the solution of the English primary education question that was presented to your Lordships. The noble Earl waved a gentle flag at the close of his speech, but this is not a time of the evening that lends itself to going out of the way to take up any extraneous topic.

I am obliged to the noble Earl for the way in which he has referred to the University of Dublin, of which I had the honour to be a representative in the House of Commons for many years. That great University, founded in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was the sole University in Ireland until the foundation of the Queen's Colleges. It has had a great history and a splendid career, and it is worthy of note that in the Report of the last of the Royal Commissions referred to by the noble Earl these gratifying words are to be found—

> "Trinity College as it stands to-day is a noble institution for the advancement of sound learning, not unworthy of its great traditions and of the affection and veneration with which it is regarded by its children."

Those are worthy and generous words, and they are founded upon absolute truth. The connection of the University of Dublin with this great question of Catholic education is a worthy one, too. Long before the great Universities of England thought of granting their degrees to Roman Catholics, in the year 1793 Trinity College threw open her degrees to the Roman Catholics of Ireland without stint or hesitation. In the history of this question it should never be forgotten that the first of the great Universities of the Empire that recognised the claims of Roman Catholics to University degrees was the great University of Dublin. Mr. Fawcett's Act, passed within our own memory, threw open every prize, honour, distinction, and office within its control to everybody, and the portals of Dublin University since the passing of Fawcett's Act have been open to all.

As an Irishman, and as a former Member for Dublin University, I would have preferred if my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen had been satisfied with the opportunities presented by that University, and I much regret that the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church set themselves against that solution of the question. Then came the founding of the Queen's Colleges. The Roman Catholic Bishops declined to accept that solution, and the colleges were put under the ban of being regarded as godless. As we all know, the demand for a Roman Catholic University has grown immensely within the last ten years. It is not for us in this House, or for the other House of Parliament, to say whether we approve or do not approve of the demand of the Roman Catholics. It is not for us to sit in judgment on the opinions and desires of other men. Every one has a right to his own view as to what he desires, and it is not for us to say whether the Roman Catholics are right or wrong in the demand that they have made. They are within their constitutional rights, and we are bound to pay attention to the way in which they have presented their case. Mr. Gladstone, a man of genius and a great University man, thought that he could solve the question. Well, he tried his hand and failed; and he was wise enough never to try it again. Two Royal Commissions have sat, presided over by men of high eminence and composed of men of great distinction, and they have given their views. I will not discuss the proceedings of those Royal Commissions. Then came Mr. Bryce's scheme, and that was the only omission in the speech of the noble Earl. The noble Earl never mentioned the name of Mr. Bryce. That scheme pleased nobody. It touched every point of the greatest resistence, and it is not unnaturally passed by in the solution found in the present Bill.

The noble Earl has told us the way in which the Government approached this question. They appear to have applied their minds to it with an anxious desire to reach a solution that would as far as possible, be acceptable to Roman Catholics and would not hurt the feelings of other people — a very difficult combination to work out. The Chief Secretary is entitled to, and has got, full credit for the ability and the skill with which he framed this measure. He is entitled also to the fullest measure of credit for the diplomacy and the adroitness with which he carried the Bill through the House of Commons. It was passed there by great majorities; some important criticisms were made, but the

Chief Secretary always met them most genially and eloquently, and his view was supported by large numbers in the division lobby. All must admit, I think, that the Bill was fairly dealt with on both sides in the House of Commons, and that it was met frankly and not unkindly. It is obvious to anyone who has studied those debates that there was a desire, as far as possible, to reach a settlement of this long fought out question, and, if possible, to find that settlement in the Bill of the Government. The speech of Mr. Balfour on Saturday last was a fine speech, full of generous and cordial sentiment towards the Bill, and of ungrudging praise of the statesman who had carried it.

I myself have no desire to suggest any doubt as to my action in reference to the Bill. I am prepared to support the Second Reading, and to do what I can to assist the progress of the Bill through your Lordships' House, of course, reserving to myself the right, at the next stage, of offering such reasonable and fair criticisms as may be right and just. The noble Earl, naturally enough, hardly mentioned the portion of the Bill that has reference to Belfast. I can quite understand that, because there is little or no question about it. Belfast Queen's College has had a great and successful career, and no one can doubt that, under new conditions as a University, it will grow in fame, utility, and distinction. The real *crux* of the Bill is to be found in the legislation with reference to the new University in Dublin. The matters that require examination and explanation, the obvious and serious difficulties, are all in connection with the Dublin University. Mr. Birrell was in an enormous difficulty—the noble Earl has skated over it very delicately—in having constantly to meet the charge that this is a denominational measure, and, bearing in mind the composition of the House of Commons, one can well understand that he did not like that charge being made so often. There is, however, no reason for having any hesitation in putting the matter perfectly plainly.

The Bill, so far as the drafting of it goes, is framed on undenominational lines. Anyone who reads the clauses, and particularly those to which the noble Earl has referred, will see that the structure of the Bill is technically undenominational. But when one turns to the charters which are to work out the Bill, when one sees the mechanism to be applied by the charters, and the constitution of the governing bodies to be called into existence by the charters, it is obvious that it is a denominational measure, and intended to be a denominational measure. No one with any desire to be as frank as the circumstances would permit would dream of nesitating to admit, in the most candid way, that the charters must work out a system of education that will be denominational. If they do not do that, the Bill will not satisfy the wishes, the desires, and the ambitions of those at whose demand it has been produced; and it cannot but be a failure if it does not satisfy those demands. That is really the position of the case at the present moment. Take the Senate of Dublin University. There are no end of loopholes by which the atmosphere can come in in a fine, vigorous, and robust way at every second of its existence. It is better to recognise that as an intelligible and obvious result.

Anyone who regards this Bill as an undenominational settlement of the University question in Ireland must indeed be willing to be deceived; but then, there are none so blind as those who will not see. When the senate is in working order there can be no manner of doubt as to the atmosphere which will control its operations. The senate is given great authority as to those whom it will recognise. The Bill says that there should be a power given to recognise students in the colleges; the charter says there is to be power given to recognise the colleges. That shows what advance was made when the promoters applied themselves to the preparation of the charters, and what is the matter that is intended. Power is given to confer privileges and to swell the roll of graduates in a manner which may have considerable result ultimately on the management of the Universities. It may be that as time develops and the matter is further considered the power will be used in a more moderate way, and that efforts will be made to avail themselves of the power to confer some of the advantages of residence on all pupils of the colleges. But at present the whole decision in this matter is given to the senate. Why? The noble Earl said that the Commissioners appointed were distinguished men. I agree. Then why are they not given the power to recognise and affiliate? Why should not the Commissioners have this power while their tenure lasts, and when it ends it could devolve upon the Senate. The Robertson Commission unanimously recommended that the Royal College of Science in Dublin should be affiliated. Why not give the Commissioners power to affiliate that college which has the advantage of now being fully equipped? I do not know why the power of affiliation or recognition is not given by statute. That is a suggestion I venture to throw out.

Then there is the very large civic element in the Senates. That is a matter which has been acutely discussed elsewhere. I will not refer to it now; but the noble Earl must not be surprised if it is mentioned in future discussions in your Lordships' House. To call into existence a civic element out of all proportion is a very serious thing, and may have considerable effect. It is impossible to make any real contract here with the new English Universities. Then there is the question of chapels. It is impossible not to sympathise with Mr. Birrell in his difficulties in trying to meet the Nonconformist conscience. In Grand Committee on the Bill, Mr. Butcher, a man of great ability whom everyone likes to praise, moved an Amendment that a chapel might be erected by private benefaction within or without the precincts of the University or college in Dublin. Mr. Birrell saw the sense of the Amendment and accepted it. But the working of the human conscience is sometimes strange; and it was intimated to him that the Nonconformist conscience was restive under this proposition, and, accordingly on Friday last the erection of a chapel, even by private benefaction, had to be given up. I quite understand it, but it is one of those things that it is difficult to explain. I should not be in the least surprised, however, if at the Committee stage some of my noble friends presented that question for re-examination. From my knowledge of Dublin I am quite aware that next to the Catholic University College there is a very handsome and fashionable Catholic Church, which will, no doubt, be available while they are waiting for the building of a chapel, but its locality may not be convenient.

We have to consider this question apart from our own wishes, apart from our own University ideas, and apart from our own opinions of scholastic requirements. We have to look at it as practical men. What are we to do with this solution of the Government? The Bill has passed the House of Commons by large majorities and with a great deal of approval; it has commended itself, as far as we can see, to the general approval of the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. As practical men we must recognise that a settlement is desirable, and that we are nearer a settlement now than at any previous time in the history of this extremely thorny question. I am in favour, as I have said, of granting the Bill a Second Reading, and, subject to fair discussion, placing no obstacle in its progress. Yet it is impossible to look to the future with regard to some important points of the Bill without serious misgivings. But I know that Irishmen are clever, that they love learning and thirst for education. I place reliance upon the general desire of the Roman Catholic body in Ireland to make the new scheme a success; and, therefore, I trust that it will realise the hopes of its authors and in time become a potent agency to assist the spread of learning throughout the land.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE: My Lords, it has been the fate of those of your Lordships who have been connected with Ireland during the last forty years to find yourselves on nearly every occasion in active opposition to the wishes of the majority of the people of that country as expressed by their representatives in another place. I think the reason of that is very easy to explain. It is because the subjects which have been dealt with have been nearly always concerning either property or the Government of the country. I think it is universally acknowledged that land legislation, whether good or bad, has seriously reduced the value of the land, not of the whole of the land of Ireland, but of that part of it which belonged to the landlord in contradistinction to that part which belonged to the tenant So far as the measures which have been introduced have related to the Government of Ireland, your Lordships will agree that the opposition which was offered to those measures was actuated by the sincere belief and conviction that those measures would have resulted in a loosening, if not a snapping, of the links which bind the two countries together. But the Bill which is before us to-night is of a very different nature. No one can say that it affects the stability of the Empire, and the only way in which it affects property is so far as the tenth clause is concerned. That clause certainly gives very large powers to county councils to raise funds in aid of this University if they obtain the consent of the Local Government Board, although without that consent they are confined to a sum not exceeding 1d. in the £. I think, therefore, the people of Ireland will look with much interest to see what attitude your Lordships will take with regard to this measure, and it seems to me that it ought to be regarded by us only from two points of view. In the first place, we have to consider whether another University is needed, and in the second place, if such a University is necessary, whether such a one as it is proposed to establish will satisfy the wishes and the requirements of the Roman Catholics of that country. I do not propose to discuss at all the question of the University of Belfast. So far as I can make out that University is not desired and it is not required, and it is only inserted in this Bill for the purpose of satisfying that extremely valuable, but at the same time, exceedingly liquid asset of the Radical Party, the Nonconformist conscience.

I propose, with your permission, to consider very briefly in detail what are the chief objections which are urged against this Bill. The first is a very old one; it is that Maynooth was originally intended for the education of ecclesiastics and also of the Roman Catholic laity, and that until the Roman Catholic clergy agree to restore it to its original use, no steps should be taken with regard to the higher education of Ireland. As an argument that sounds very well, but as practical men we know that the Roman Catholic clergy will never allow it to be restored to its original use, and consequently those who advocate that higher education should be put off until that is done, really wish to postpone the establishment of a Roman Catholic University until the time of the Greek Kalends. The second objection which is urged is that Trinity College, Dublin, amply satisfies the requirements of the people of Ireland; she has opened her doors wide, as we have heard, to students of all denominations, and she is proud to reckon amongst her most distinguished alumni members of the Roman Catholic Church. I will not give a list of them to your Lordships, but there is one who will be well remembered by you—the late Lord Morris. I think this objection is a serious one, and deserves to be considered. I, for one, wish that on this occasion the Chief Secretary had not chosen the path of least resistance; that, instead of arranging for three watertight compartments, in order that Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Nonconformists might be bottled up for three or four years and then launched on the world filled to the brim with the *odium theologicum*, he had tried to found a really national University, where Irishmen of all religions, at the age when friendships are made, might have met and foregathered; where the religious convictions of all would have been respected; where they would have learned that good fellows were to be found in every denomination, and where, above all, they would have been taught that lesson which, more than any other, I think my fellow countrymen need to learn, the lesson of mutual toleration. But in fairness to the Chief Secretary, I think it must be acknowledged that there were lions in the path which he would have to fight and conquer, had he chosen what I believe would have been the better and the braver course. I honestly admit that if I were a devout Roman Catholic I should hesitate about sending my son, at a most susceptible age, to a University whose atmosphere is distinctly Anglican, and if I were, what I fear many of my Roman Catholic fellow countrymen are, disloyal, I should certainly not have sent him to a University whose proudest boast is that it is loyal to the core. I do not think the whole blame lies on the side of the Roman Catholics, because although Trinity College was perfectly willing to make certain concessions I cannot help believing that a deep sigh of relief was heaved when she found she was allowed to pursue her way along the old paths on which she had been so successful, unhampered by a new and unknown element which might have swamped her.

There is another objection which is urged by many educated Roman Catholics—that the University is absolutely unnecessary. A well-known Irish gentleman, a member of the Roman Catholic Church, said to me the other day, "Why do you give us this University? We do not want it. There is nobody to go to it. There is virtually no middle class in Ireland, and we do not want a University for ploughboys." I said: "If that is your view, and that is what educated Roman Catholics in Ireland think, why do you not express it in public?" He replied: "We cannot do that, it would not do for us to go against the priests; it would make us too unpopular." I for one am not willing to help those who are not willing to help themselves. I say that the case goes by default, and I do not believe any of your Lordships would be willing to take up the cudgels on behalf of those who had not the courage to take them up for themselves. The last objection which is urged against this University is that it will be priest-ridden; in other words, that it will be governed by clerical influence. Of course it will, and if it were not, I do not believe that in the present state of feeling in Ireland it would satisfy the wishes of the Roman Catholics in that country. I know the Chief Secretary thinks it will be an undenominational University, but I am told that the Chief Secretary believes his administration of Ireland has been successful, and a man who believes that will believe anything. I wish myself that it were not necessary for political reasons to continue this farce of calling it an undenominational University. I wish it could be a purely Roman Catholic University, with the Pope as patron, Cardinal Logne as Chancellor, and with the whole bench of Roman Catholc bishops as its governing body, for I do not believe, unless the University is governed by the bishops or by their nominees, that Roman Catholics will attend it, and I would like to throw upon them the responsibility of showing that they are able to manage a University so as to satisfy modern requirements.

We live in democratic times, and this is a democratic Bill. We no longer affect to give the people what we believe to be good for them; we give them what they want, and my opinion is that what they want nowadays is generally what is very bad for them. But I believe, at any rate, that if we were to take a *plebiscite* of Roman Catholics in Ireland at the present time, we should find a large majority in favour of a University to be governed by the clergy. I should like to say a word about the Roman Catholic clergy. I used just now the word, "priest-ridden," and I should not like it to be thought that I said anything inimical or unfriendly towards the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland. I have lived amongst them all my life, and amongst their number I can count old and valued friends. It used to be said in old days that the Roman Catholic priest was the centre of every form of political intrigue. I believe that much of that is changed nowadays, and when you find a Roman Catholic priest at the head of a political organisation, it is nearly always more for the purpose of governing and controlling that institution than for the object of urging it politically. I can say that in my part of the world, the West of Ireland, priests are generally occupied in looking after the spiritual and temporal welfare of their flocks, and I must acknowledge that when they look after their temporal welfare, they sometimes wander into political fields where I find myself in acute antagonism to them; but except in those matters and on certain questions of discipline, where they take what I hope they will forgive my calling a rather narrow view of a particular case, I am sure that their object is to live on terms of friendliness with their neighbours be they Roman Catholic or Protestant. Of course, they wish to retain control of education, but I have still to discover the church whose clergy do not wish to do the same, and I have no hesitation in saying that I would far rather that my countrymen were brought up even under the strictest form of ultramontanism than that Ireland should follow the example of those nominally Roman Catholic countries where the attendance of a man at Mass is sufficient to bar him from promotion in the Army, Navy, or the Civil Service.

I should like to say one word about an Amendment which was proposed on the Report stage in another place and alluded to by the noble Earl the Leader of the House, by which it was proposed that no one should be able to take his degree without being resident two years at the University. I am very sorry that Amendment was not adopted with qualifications, because, as I am in favour of a national University where Irishmen of all religions might mingle, so, in this Roman Catholic University, I am in favour of the establishment of a hostel where those who are destined to be priests will reside, segregated to a certain extent, but yet not cut off altogether from the laity who are there. It is said that the Roman Catholic hierarchy strongly objected to this, but it is whispered that some younger bishops are not so unfriendly to the idea, and I cannot help thinking that if this Amendment had been adopted, with perhaps a proviso that it was not to take effect for ten years, it would not have been so unfavourably regarded in Episcopal circles as the Chief Secretary seems to have imagined. But what ever chance there may have been of having a hostel for the education of priests in Dublin, it was absolutely done away with by the only Amendment of importance which was accepted by the right hon. Gentleman. I mean the Amendment which forbade the establishment of a Roman Catholic chapel in or without a college. I was extremely sorry to see that Amendment accepted, because I am sure that there are many Roman Catholics who would gladly have contributed towards a chapel which might have vied with Trinity College, Dublin, and I feel perfectly certain that there is no chance of a hostel for Maynooth students if there is not a place where those students may perform their religious duties in common. I hope that when the Committee stage arrives your Lordships will reconsider that point.

One word in a lighter vein. Various questions have been asked as to what shall be the name of this University, and no satisfactory answer has been given. There is one name which would appeal to Irishmen as a suitable name for the University, that of the University of St. Patrick, but I am told that that is impossible because that name has already been taken possession of by St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, which will become no doubt an affiliated college. Therefore I should like to suggest another name, a name which will recall the great Roman bishop who brought Christianity to this island, and will at the same time, commemorate the right hon. Gentleman who is giving an undenominational University to Ireland; I need hardly tell your Lordships that the name I suggest is The University of St. Augustine. I shall vote for the Second Reading of this Bill, not because I believe it is the best possible University that could have been devised, but because I should like to show Roman Catholics that where the stability of the Empire is not in danger, and where justice is done between man and man, the minority in Ireland are only too anxious, too willing, to do whatever lies in their power to further the wishes and to benefit the majority of their fellow-countrymen.

*LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, I cannot profess complete satisfaction at the Bill now before us, establishing as it does a new University, nominally undenominational but having a strong denominational character. I should much prefer to see the youth of Ireland of all denominations educated together, and I believe this might be done without danger to their religious faith. In the course of a tolerably long life I have been fortunate enough to count a considerable number of Roman Catholics among my personal, and some among my intimate, friends, many of them earnest and devout men deeply attached to the doctrines of their Church, and I have never known one jarring note struck which might disturb the harmony of our intercourse or friendship or prevent us joining cordially together when opportunity offered for any public object. It may be said that this is the experience of maturer years when a man's convictions are grounded and settled and when his mind is no longer so receptive of new ideas or strange influences. That is no doubt the case to a certain extent, but I believe the same conditions might obtain in earlier days. I have been assured by friends who have gone through Trinity College that not only was there no attempt at interference with their religion, but that they did not find themselves in any way debarred from associating in every manner with the rest of the undergraduates of other denominations. I need hardly point out the great advantage it would be in the future if young men as they grew up would no longer stand arrayed against each other in opposite camps, but would be actuated by feelings of friendship towards those around them, and be able to combine together for any object of public advantage.

I would even go further and say, as my noble friend has done, that I should like to see those who are destined to take holy orders educated together with other undergraduates. I firmly believe, and my old University recollections, although dating from a great many years back, confirm it, that it is a great advantage for a society of somewhat thoughtless young men to be leavened by the inclusion among them of those of a more serious character. I also believe it to be a great advantage to those who intend to take holy orders; that they thereby acquire greater knowledge of the world and a keener insight into the various phases of the thoughts, feelings, and aspirations of those whose course in life will be different than they possibly could do if they only associated with students of their own character. I believe all this might be done without any danger to the faith of those who would participate in such education. Indeed, if I thought that it was fraught with danger to any young man, that he would be shaken in the faith in which he has been brought up, I should not advocate united education. But unfortunately this feeling of security is not shared in by the great mass of Roman Catholics in Ireland, or rather perhaps I should say, of those to whom they naturally look for guidance. They refuse to accept University education under those terms and I do not think it is right to force upon people an education of which they conscientiously disapprove, or, what comes to the same thing, to force upon them the alternative of accepting this system of education or going without a University education altogether.

Therefore, my Lords, I certainly am not disposed to oppose the Second Reading of this Bill. There are many points that have been raised in discussion in the other House which I trust will be considered in Committee when it comes again before your Lordships' House. There is one great merit, in my idea, in the Bill—that it leaves Trinity College absolutely intact. I think anyone who dispassionately considers the great work that has been done by that venerable institution during three hundred years, the distinguished men who have been educated within its walls, and the high standard it has ever maintained, would think it nothing short of a public calamity if any change were introduced that might impair its efficiency or reduce the value in which its degrees are deservedly held throughout the civilised world. In this respect, therefore, I consider this Bill to be a marked improvement on other schemes that have been brought forward. I can only hope that the educational advantages which it offers will be largely availed of in Ireland, and that they will have the result which must be the result of any system of higher education, of widening the ideas of those who profit by them, of softening asperities of feeling, and of rendering them more ready to combine with others in anything that may advance the interests of their common country.

*LORD MACDONNELL OF SWINFORD: My Lords, with your permission I shall offer a few remarks upon the Bill which it is proposed to read for the second time. I have taken a deep interest in the question of University education in Ireland, and I have paid special attention to the subject whilst still connected with Irish Government. I am not willing, therefore, to give a silent vote or to abstain from defining my position in regard to this Bill, and expressing my views upon the general question. Happily, it is no longer necessary to state the reason or to demonstrate the necessity for the provision of greater facilities for University education in Ireland. All political parties are in practical agreement on that point, and if in recent years any divergence of opinion has existed upon it, that divergence has been composed by the labours of the two Royal Commissions which have recently considered the subject. We in Ireland have been looking forward with hope to the result of that agreement. Whatever may be the particular measure to be adopted for giving it effect it cannot fail to promote intellectual progress in Ireland and the material prosperity of the country. The Bill before your Lordships proposes to carry that general agreement into effect by a multiplication of Universities in Ireland. It establishes two Universities in addition to the University of Dublin, and I think I am correct in saying that by a natural process of evolution a fourth or even a fifth University may eventually come into existence. This, it is argued, proceeds on the analogy of recent academical developments in England and derives support from the actual state of things which prevailed in the Scottish academical world. This method of dealing with the University question in Ireland was very clearly before the minds of those who considered the question before the present Chief Secretary ever addressed himself to the subject. I can only speak for myself, but I may perhaps be permitted to say that in considering the subject there was complete unanimity of view and absolute identity of purpose between the distinguished men who considered the subject and myself. Speaking, therefore, for myself, I confess that I entertained very serious doubt as to whether those Scottish and English models were suitable for the existing state of things in Ireland. In my humble opinion the success of the Scottish University system depended not so much upon the number of Universities as upon the excellent system of primary and secondary education which exists in Scotland, and upon the co-ordination of that system with the higher teaching of the University. But Ireland is lamentably behindhand both in regard to primary and secondary education, whilst no serious attempt has yet been made to co-ordinate the work of the two classes of school. Even if we were sanguine enough to hope that this most necessary co-ordination of primary and secondary education in Ireland would be taken in hand at once, many years must elapse before the new Universities would be able to derive from the schools the assistance which they would want, before they could themselves bring to bear upon the schools the influence necessary to stimulate them to activity. Passing to the English developments, my opinion was that the analogy between the great commercial centres in England which are the seats of the Universities and the state of things in Ireland is extremely remote. The demand for higher and better technical education in England was, I think, the chief factor which led to the establishment of the newer Universities, but that demand can hardly be said to exist at all in Ireland at the present time. Moreover, the population of the districts served by those new Universities is far in excess of the population of the whole of Ireland, and if regard be had to the resources of the two localities the comparison would be still more adverse. These were some of the material considerations which induced myself and others with whom I worked to think that a scheme of multiple Universities was unsuitable for Ireland, and our conclusions upon that point were confirmed by considerations of academical efficiency and political expediency upon which I should like to touch.

It is known to your Lordships that one of the greatest difficulties we experience in the administration of Ireland is due to the religious dissensions which distract the energies of our population and divide it into hostile camps. We may have been over-sanguine, but we believed that that difficulty was not insuperable. The promise of events in recents years had led to some assuagement of those hereditary animosities, and my own experience as a student in Queen's College convinced me that the association, under proper safeguards, of young men of all religious beliefs would powerfully contribute to advance mutual toleration and comprehension, objects which should be dear to the heart of every patriotic Irishman. We thought that by bringing Irish University colleges within the University of Dublin in accordance with what the Charter of the University and extant legislation show to have been the intentions of its founders and supporters, we should be giving a powerful impetus to the cause of religious and political toleration in Ireland. Still more, we believed that the bringing of the new colleges into association with the older University, with its great teaching and its high traditions, offered the best guarantee for the maintenance of a high standard of academical efficiency of a lay, though reverent spirit in University and collegiate administration and of general repute. I have never heard of any objection from an academical point of view to this plan which did not on examination prove either invalid or susceptible of easy removal. The plan was approved by a majority of the last Commission as the best which could have been adopted. It was received with acquiescence and favour by the entire Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, and by the Roman Catholic laity, by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, by distinguished representatives of the Episcopal Church of Ireland, lay and the clerical, and by some of the prominent supporters of Nonconformity in England. I myself will never cease to regret that the plan, which was not only a measure for the advancement of education in Ireland, but for the mutual reconciliation of contending parties, did not commend itself to the authorities of Trinity College. In my opinion the authorities of Trinity College made the great refusal when they declined to place themselves at the head of this great movement, which was a movement not only for the renaissance of learning in Roman Catholic Ireland, but also a movement which would have lead to the reconciliation of contending parties and to the promotion of prosperity throughout the country.

I have heard it urged as an objection to the Bill before your Lordships, that the new Universities will undersell the University of Dublin and starve it to death. If this be the result the responsibility will rest on the authorities of Trinity College, who have, I believe, sacrificed the best interests of their country and University to what I regard as an outworn prejudice. Should this event come to pass I can only hope that the wise aspirations of the senior Member for the University of Dublin will be borne in mind, and that the opportunity of fusion which was rejected in 1907 may be turned to good account at some future time.

Failing the plan of a national University, I should have been glad to have seen another plan adopted in the place of this Bill. I should have liked to have seen a new college situated in Dublin included in the Dublin University in accordance with existing legislation on the point, and the colleges united into a revived University with charters and constitutions somewhat similar to those in the Bill. But as the Government deemed the support of Trinity College necessary to any Bill which could pass through Parliament, and as Trinity College would only give its support on condition of "Hands off Trinity," I admit that the Bill now before your Lordships is as good as any that could be accepted from that unholy alliance.

I am, therefore, not disposed to subject this Bill to any meticulous criticism. I accept it as a whole, but with one reservation. Wherever and whenever in Ireland in recent times the cry of University reform has been raised, that cry always contemplated the creation of not merely teaching but also residential colleges. It is, therefore, to me and to all Irishmen a source of extreme regret to find that the colleges which are now presented to us are to be mere collections of classrooms and laboratories. It has been said in the course of these discussions that the modern idea of a University excludes all that association of students and all those amenities of college life upon which every University man's memory loves to linger. If that be the case, I must only regard this modern idea of a University as a Bœotian; I think I heard from the noble Earl on the front bench that it comes from Sheffield. At all events, I wish to quote to you, in comparison with that idea, the following passage from a great and revered master, the late Cardinal Newman—

"If I had to choose between a so-called University which dispensed with residence and tutorial superintendence, giving its degrees to any person who passed an examination in a wide range of subjects, and a University which had no professors or examinations at all but merely brought a number of young men together

> for three or four years, if I must determine which of the two courses was the more successful in training, moulding, enlarging the mind, which sent out men the more fitted for their secular duties, which produced better public men of the world, men whose names would descend to posterity, I have no hesitation in giving the preference to a University which did nothing."

My Lords, I commend that extract to your consideration. The subject is not one of detail. It is one of principle, and I think that the Government will not launch this great undertaking in a manner suitable and in accordance with the wishes of the Irish people unless some further grant is made for the purpose of establishing residential colleges. I would also suggest that by this means, by establishing residential colleges, you will bring about that result which so many speakers have desired, the bringing of young students from Maynooth to attend lectures at the University. If it be impossible to obtain a further grant from the Treasury, I would submit to you that there is one place in Dublin which could be utilised for the purpose of the Dublin College. It is a place and a site around which many memories, inspiring memories, of Irish life linger. In ancient Celtic tradition it was a place of learning and of saintliness; in mediæval times, of Norman prowess, of the doings of the Knights Templars and Knights Hospitalers, and later on down the centuries from Tudor times to present days the name of the hospital at Kilmainham frequently occurs in Irish annals. If the Treasury are unable to find the money, let them make over that Institution to the new college, and in that way throw some lustre upon, and attach some dignity to, this new creation.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, we have listened with the greatest interest to Lord MacDonnell's speech, but there is one remark I wish to make arising out of it. The noble Lord said that the scheme which we in Ireland know as Mr. Bryce's scheme would have brought about the mutual conciliation of contending parties and that practically the contending party was Trinity College. To that statement of the noble Lord I agree. Then he went on to say that as it was a case of "Hands off Trinity," we had to accept the present Bill. I agree, and what I want to say to your Lordships to-night is that I, for my part, accept the Bill, because Trinity College is not in any way to be interfered with. Then as to the remarks from the noble Earl who introduced the Bill into this House. The noble Earl said that there was haste in the matter and that it was bad to allow the matter to simmer too long. That was followed by a remark from the noble Marquess who leads us on this side of the House to the effect that it might be an Irish stew that was simmering. Then the noble Earl, in dealing with the Bill, went on to say that it was like a caravan that was marching through the desert with the dry bones of the different preceding schemes lying on each side. Well, I only hope that the dry bones will not prove to be the dry bones of the Irish stew. I assure your Lordships that we are not going to allow this matter to become dry bones; we have the Bill and we are going to work together to try and make it a success. I think it is right that we should congratulate the Chief Secretary that at last he has succeeded in bringing in, and passing, a measure of education, and that that education is to apply to Ireland. But there can be no doubt, no matter what has been said about it, that this is a denominational measure, because the charters and their working must result in there being a denominational University with a college in Dublin. I do not quite understand how the Nonconformist conscience has been got over in this matter. The other day I was speaking to a Nonconformist minister and he said to me—

> "Well, in this matter we consider Ireland to be quite outside the range of our thoughts; in regard to education we have put aside the question of Ireland altogether."

It comes, therefore, to this, that in this matter Nonconformists consider Ireland to be absolutely a separate entity.

No doubt the Bill will pass the Second Reading to-night and we shall follow the Leader of the House of Commons in this matter. At this point I must unhesitatingly congratulate the Chief Secretary on having got all parties and all creeds in Ireland to agree on this measure and I am sure the Bill, within its limitations, will be a success. As to its defects, there is first and foremost the fact that this University of Dublin is not residential. That, to the minds of those of us in the south of Ireland, is one of the most important things. The Royal University is swept away, and I noticed that the Chief Secretary, in dealing with this matter on Saturday last, mentioned that Lord Castletown, the present Chancellor of the Royal University, helped him in every way to annihilate himself and to annihilate the University! The University was solely an examining body, and another had been put in its place with the difference that the new University in Dublin is to teach as well as to examine.

As regards the non-residential factor in this Bill, it is a question whether parents will be willing to send their sons to lodgings in Dublin. It will also have this effect, that there will be no kind of discipline. There is a college but no college life, and there are no college friendships formed—friendships of long endurance. Then as to the buildings, which buildings I know very well, and which were the old Exhibition buildings of 1868, I have no hesitation in saying that there is plenty of room in the grounds that exist there for the building of, at all events, a small residential college. A small one would be a commencement. I do not think there is any great hurry in this matter, and small beginnings make great ends, whilst I am sure that there are many who would be willing to help materially out of their own pockets to build a residential college and to meet the Government in the matter. Maynooth would, no doubt be affiliated, and in regard to that I should like to draw attention to a most remarkable passage in the evidence given before the Robertson Commission by Dr. O'Dyer, the Bishop of Limerick, who strongly advocated a residential University. Remembering the criticism that has been poured on this measure by Dr. O'Dyer, it is interesting to note what he said. His words were—

> "We are, in Dublin, within very easy distance of Maynooth, which is our great ecclesiastical college, so that if we had a central institution in Dublin we might hope in a very short time to have in it a very large number of students. I should not be at all surprised if our numbers were well over 1,000, or, perhaps, 2,000 students in a very short time, and then we should have really an immense institution in the country. Then, again, we think it ought to be a residential institution. Trinity College is residential and, while we do not think that residence or attending University lectures ought to be an absolute condition of getting University degrees, yet we think that there ought to be an opportunity for an adequate number of our students getting the education of a residential University, because we believe that residence, by itself, and the mixing of students with one another, and with the fellows and their teachers, has a great educational effect upon them. It is particularly desirable therefore that we should get a residential institution in Dublin, and we consider that it would be rather unfair and unequal treatment to have Trinity College here, in Dublin, for the Episcopal Protestants who can reside there, and to have our Catholic young men without any home knocking about in the lodging-houses of the town."

I think that is a very remarkable statement, and one with which many of your Lordships will agree. It would be of incalculable benefit to young men who will be our future priests, and who will take care of the Roman Catholics throughout Ireland, to go up to Dublin for a short time and live in a college away from Maynooth, mixing with the other collegians in their work and in their games.

The noble Earl who leads the House knows Maynooth very well, and I should like, I hope without hurting the feelings of any Roman Catholic, to mention a little incident which occurred. We had a meeting of the Archæological Society of my county at Maynooth and were addressed by Dr. Brown, now a bishop in the South of Ireland, on the antiquities in the neighbourhood, and then we were shown over the place; going into the library I asked the assistant librarian: "How do you teach history, and have you got a History of England in the library?" He replied: "No; history is taught by the lecturer." That shows, therefore, that history is taught not from the books that one would find in any ordinary library but by the lecturer whose ideas about history are communicated to the young men who have charge more or less of the population of Ireland. Then with regard to the finances of this Bill: there were some figures dealt with by the noble Earl about which I was not quite clear—the mention of a sum of £46,555 out of the present endowment. I do not quite understand what that means.

*The Earl of CREWE: That is the sum total of the additional grant, as compared with the present grants paid to the various Queen's Colleges. It is the difference which comes from the Treasury.

*The Earl of MAYO: That is satisfactory. Then there is the £20,000 per annum. That is a fairly generous gift, and I should have thought there would have been enough money to build a residential college. It must be remembered that that £20,000 is part of the monies acquired by the disestablishment of the Irish Church and it is to be divided between Dublin and Belfast. That is all very well, but it is Irish money. In Dublin there is to be a Roman Catholic atmosphere and in the other a Presbyterian atmosphere. The Chief Secretary said on the First Reading of the Bill in another place—

> "Where Ireland would be, or where should I be, without this Church fund, I dare not think; it is indeed a horn of plenty."

I am a member of the Irish Church, and I like to have it recalled to my mind that the horn of plenty is being used for a Roman Catholic University in Dublin, and a Presbyterian one in Belfast. It is an interesting fact that has now become almost a historical fact. I make these remarks not in any carping spirit whatsoever. I welcome the measure in every possible way, and say that this Bill has every reason for passing both Houses. We shall all, I think, try to make it a success, and I, with many others, will watch with the greatest interest the progress made by our latest University, and I feel it will depend almost entirely, talking of Dublin, on the way the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Roman Catholic laity work together for the good of this great—I think it will be a great—University. We may criticise details, but one great principle remains: the Roman Catholic population have as much right to a college with an atmosphere of Roman Catholicism as we have to help to hold Trinity College.

*Lord KILLANIN: My noble friend Lord Macdonnell is, as far as I know, the only Catholic Member of the House who has as yet spoken, and I think, therefore, that possibly it is only right that some Member from this side of the House who is a Catholic should, however inadequately, endeavour to put before your Lordships some of the views which many of us Catholics hold in connection with this question. I can say myself, honestly, that in so far as I have taken any part in political life either in Ireland or in this country in another place, this question of Irish University education for the Catholic people of Ireland has always deeply interested me, and it has for many years seemed to me to be far and away the most important question in connection with Irish matters. Also, my Lords, the reality of the grievance under that heading, and the urgent and ever-growing necessity for dealing with that grievance, has always received, whether in public or in private, whether in sympathetic or in unsympathetic company, my unwavering support. And in later years, inasmuch as I am a Senator of the Royal University, which University is to be dissolved under this Bill, and inasmuch as I am also a Commissioner of National Education in Ireland, it has also more or less been my duty to give some attention to the state of affairs in connection with this matter, and to the consequences arising therefrom. Accordingly, I should like, with your kind indulgence, to endeavour this evening to give expression to some of the views which I hold on this question, and some of the considerations which influence me in connection with this matter, and also I should like, on this important occasion in the history of Ireland, to give expression, for my part, to the great pleasure and the great hopefulness with which I see at last this question apparently about to reach a satisfactory solution. In the first place, and I think it only right, I should like to add my humble tribute of sincere admiration for the courage and perseverance, the tact and patience, to say nothing of course of his well-known abilities and eloquence, which the Chief Secretary for Ireland has shown in tackling this most difficult problem, which had baulked so many great men before him. For my part, I warmly admire the bold, and even chivalrous, determination with which the Chief Secretary for Ireland has insisted upon finding a solution to this problem, and with which he has insisted furthermore in carrying that solution to a successful issue, and that in spite of great difficulties and great and threatening dangers and risks, both to himself personally and to the Party to which he belongs. When I have said that, I think that even he, the triumphant hero in this matter, will generously agree with me that, although nothing can deprive him of the credit of having settled this question, or of the victory, the rough and difficult way which I admit he has trodden to the goal had been, to a large extent, smoothed and paved by the earnest and the powerful advocacy which Mr. Balfour has now for twenty years given to the furtherance of this question. When I recall to mind the many speeches which Mr. Balfour delivered on this question in another place, specially the famous speech delivered nineteen years ago, at Partick in Glasgow, when I recall further a passionate speech of his in response to a hostile deputation of his own constituents that waited on him in Manchester, I cannot but feel that, although Mr. Balfour was denied the satisfaction of adding the settlement of this question to the many other remedial measures which he passed for the benefit of Ireland, the eventual settlement of that question owes a great deal to, and was largely facilitated by, his powerful advocacy and loyalty on this subject. But, my Lords, when I think of that advocacy, when I recall to mind the many eloquent speeches which he delivered on this question, when I recall to mind what I might almost call his pathetic appeals to his own Party to let him, their leader, and above all, their chosen leader in Irish matters, deal with this question, it is painful to me to think of how he was obstructed and successfully prevented from dealing with this question by the intolerance and the selfishness of a small section of his own Party. Many of us in Ireland felt that very much, because we considered that this was one of those Irish grievances that stood out from others as a just complaint of the Irish people which this Parliament, as long as it is responsible for Irish affairs, was bound to listen to and bound to remedy. We considered furthermore that the duty of settling that question devolved especially on that Party in the State whose principal maxim and pledge was, in reference to Irish affairs, that the Imperial Parliament was willing and capable of dealing with any real Irish grievance, which is to my mind the only possible position for any feasible Unionist policy in Ireland. It is, if we come to think of it, but a continuance of that policy known as justice to Ireland which even O'Connell advocated many years ago as an alternative policy to repeal of the Union, and certainly, as far as I am concerned, it is the only Unionist policy that I have ever supported, and the only Unionist policy that I can ever imagine myself supporting. Accordingly, my Lords, it was with dismay, amounting almost to despair, that many of us in Ireland in the later days of Unionist administration saw the weakening of that policy, and saw a great and just complaint of the Irish people such as this shelved and put on one side and actually contemned, and Mr. Balfour beaten in his own Party and in his own Cabinet, on this puestion. Many of us in Ireland winced under what we felt was a true indictment, namely, that the treatment of this question by the official Unionist Party had furnished an unanswerable argument in favour of Home Rule, and had struck a heavier blow at the Union than it had ever received before. However, fortunately sometimes, even in this world, things turn out better than anyone expects, and now, the carrying of this great measure of justice for the people of Ireland, carried in the Imperial Parliament, in a Protestant Parliament, in what I might call, to make use of a much abused word, a denominational Parliament, with the assistance and co-operation of both the great Parties in the State, is to my mind a redemption and an eloquent exemplification of what I have said must be a fundamental and essential pledge and maxim of any possible Unionist policy in Ireland, namely, that Irishmen can look to the Imperial Parliament for the removal of any real Irish grievance.

The question then arises : Is this a real Irish grievance and has the settlement of this question been urgent? I do not want, to go into the whole history of this question, especially at this late hour of the night, but I think, in order to understand somewhat the genesis and the growth of the demand of the Catholic people in connection with this matter, it is necessary to take a brief glance at Irish history. It is necessary, however shortly, to look to past times in Ireland, when the Catholic people, who were the majority of the people, had all their property confiscated, their churches and their schools destroyed or taken from them, when education was a crime, and their whole social and political position was ruined and destroyed, and when the people lived as serfs or banished from their own country. We see them then living on for generations, and for centuries, without churches, without schools, without property, without education, but still true to and steadfastly holding by the faith of their fathers, in spite of every worldly temptation and inducement to do otherwise. I do not wish to dwell on that part of Anglo-Irish history. I am only too glad to turn my back upon that dark passage of history, but if I do so, I do so on one condition, and that is that we remember that we have left the Catholic Irish people very poor and very uneducated and without any opportunity of being in any other position. But when we turn from that period, and come down to pleasanter times in the history of Ireland, we see down through the decades of the last century the Catholics being gradually emancipated, gradually given means of education, gradually being enfranchised and allowed to take some part in the government of their own country. And as we come to the last decades of the last century what is the position? We then find that, so to speak, a new class has grown up in Ireland, a new generation. They are the same people, but they hold a different position. There is a great body of Catholic people whom this House and Parliament emancipated, whom this House enfranchised, into whose hands Parliament has given all local and political power in Ireland, and in whose hands rests, for good or for bad, absolutely, the future destinies of Ireland, When that is the position, when you have that class in Ireland holding that great position, that great power, and those great responsibilities, it has always passed my comprehension how anyone could hesitate to give them every possible facility for education and refuse to give the democracy, which is going to rule in Ireland as elsewhere, every opportunity of taking an enlightened and broad-minded view of its own powers and responsibilities. My Lords, it is for the purpose of meeting the needs of that new class, of that new generation who are so powerful in Ireland, that a Bill like this has been brought into Parliament. It is for the purpose of meeting the needs of those classes that for the last forty years the Catholics of Ireland have been asking Parliament to assist them in making arrangements for the higher education of the Catholic people of Ireland, and it is on account of that situation that almost every statesman, as the noble Earl the Leader of the House has pointed out, during the last forty years, who has had any connection whatever with the Government of Ireland, has borne testimony to the necessity of settling this question. Those gentlemen have for the most part, my Lords, been Englishmen. They have been Protestants, and their natural prejudices would not have inclined them to take this view. There are such well-known instances as the noble Viscount who sits on the Front Opposition Bench, Lord St. Aldwyn, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, who was for so many years Chief Secretary for Ireland; Viscount Morley, also Chief Secretary; and such statesmen and well-known politicians in connection with Ireland as Mr. Lecky, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Cadogan, and Mr. Wyndham. Also, as has been pointed out, two Royal Commissions composed of the greatest educational experts that could be discovered in these islands, Scotsmen and Englishmen, for the most part Protestants, have also borne testimony to the necessity of settling this question, and the tragedy of the situation is that we should be only now settling it when it is almost too late. I say it is almost too late because, although it is impossible to exaggerate the injury that has already been done in Ireland by the neglect of this question, the whole of the higher and nobler life of three-quarters of the population of Ireland has been thwarted and stunted during that period.

A bitterness has been created in the Catholic class in Ireland that did not exist and need not have existed. All the influences of higher education and culture, which do so much for the general good of the community in innumerable ways, have been almost entirely absent during all this period as far as the great body of the Irish people are concerned, and it is because this state of affairs, even though late, is going, I believe, to be remedied, that I have no hesitation in welcoming this Bill.

I believe that under this Bill will be founded a great national popular University, reflecting public opinion and therefore able to guide public opinion, reflecting popular aspirations and therefore able to guide popular aspirations, reflecting the popular opinions and tastes of the Irish people, and therefore able to guide them. It is for these reasons that I, although like other Members of this House, I do not consider this in all respects an ideal measure. I welcome it. I welcome it as, to my mind, the best under all the circumstances. I welcome it as a practical solution of a practical question, and I say that it should not be judged on rigid principles or on abstract theories or ideals. The case of Ireland is always a concrete, practical one, and to my mind many of the mistakes that are made in the government of Ireland arise from the fact that questions are treated on theoretical lines. Ireland fits in with no theory or ideal or principle that was ever heard of. Its people are too varied, its history has been too checkered, and its Governments are too fickle, and therefore in this matter, as in every other Irish matter, all we should ask for and all we should look for is the best under all the extremely contrary Hibernian circumstances. Although, I welcome this Bill as a practical solution of a practical question, there are, of course, in it some blemishes which I regret to see. I think it is a thousand pities that the Chief Secretary has not been able to make some provision for residential quarters. That fact will disappoint the people of Ireland. They are unanimous on that subject. It will temper, I fear, the enthusiasm and gratitude that this Bill is going to arouse in Ireland, and it will create jealousies of other Universities, and to my mind it will prevent this measure having finality. When I think of how far the Chief Secretary for Ireland has gone, of how successful he has been in carrying this measure so far, I think it is a pity that he should not even now meet the wishes of the Irish people on this subject.

I shall not detain you any farther at this hour of the night by going into many other points, which I could easily do, that have been raised, such as whether the University is denominational or not. To my mind it is not denominational in any proper sense of the word. There are no tests, there are no barriers, there are no means of excluding anyone, it will not be denominational and only Catholic; because the people of Ireland are Catholic, and if all the people of Ireland went to bed to-night Catholics but woke up to-morrow morning Mahomedans, with turbans on their heads, this Bill could be sent over to Ireland without a single change in its constitution, and it would suit the Mahomedans of Ireland just as well.

I shall not detain your Lordships further, but conclude by again expressing my sincere pleasure and my great hopefulness in connection with the settlement of this question. I consider that the settlement is in the first place a noble work in the cause of the education of the people of a country. I do not see how you could do a greater work. When, furthermore, I consider the difficulties of the situation, I think it is an act of the highest statesmanship. I also look upon it as a great measure of justice, of conciliation, and of reparation to the people of Ireland. This Bill removes the last disability from which the Catholic people of Ireland suffered and which through so many centuries and generations handicapped them so hopelessly in the struggle of life, and late as this measure of relief and justice has come to Ireland, I, nevertheless, think now that it has come that there should be recognised and seen in this settlement of this question a generosity of spirit, a toleration, a liberality of thought, and a friendliness of disposition on the part of the people of England and of Scotland which deserve and ought to receive the grateful appreciation of the people of

Ireland. For my part, my Lords, I earnestly trust and pray that this crowning act of conciliation to the Catholic subjects of His Majesty in Ireland may do much to increase that peace, that mutual confidence, and that mutual good-will which we should all desire to see existing and growing between the people of these two islands that God and nature have put so close together.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: In view of the late hour of the evening, I am unwilling to detain your Lordships for long, but I am also unwilling to give an entirely silent vote in supporting the Bill which is now before us. I am sure it will be admitted by the noble Lord opposite, who, I believe, is to wind up the debate on the part of the Government that whatever criticisms have been made from this side of the House have been friendly criticisms. They have not been criticisms attacking the Bill with the object of destroying it, but have been rather criticisms expressing dissatisfaction that the scheme which is at present before us is not complete enough in certain respects. I do not think that can be said of the criticisms in the speech of the noble Lord opposite, the late Under-Secretary for Ireland. His criticisms I do not think I describe unfairly when I say that they attacked the structure set up by the measure now before your Lordships far more than did the criticisms levelled from this side of the House, and I confess that if I had been blindfolded and had heard the speech without knowing who was delivering it, I should not have been very surprised to hear it finish with a Motion for the rejection of the Bill. I think it will be interesting for the future historian—it is not our business to do so to-night in view of our ignorance of all the facts of the case—to puzzle out how it is, in view of the contrary views which the noble Lord holds, that the Bill is in its present shape. And here, my Lords, I want to disagree a little with the speech of the noble Lord and the noble Lord who introduced the Bill as to some of the history that has been put before your Lordships. The noble Earl, the Leader of the House, gave us a most complete *resume* of the efforts to supply a University education which would be satisfactory to the wants of our Roman Catholic fellow citizens in Ireland, but I noticed he passed by very lightly what is known familiarly as Mr. Bryce's scheme, whereas on the other hand, the noble Lord opposite devoted the most part of his remarks to pointing out its excellencies. The noble Lord assured us that practically that scheme was received in Ireland with open arms. I did not quite catch, but I think he suggested, that it was so received by the Anglican Church of Ireland.

LORD MACDONNELL OF SWINFORD: Distinguished members of the Church of Ireland.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I am much obliged to the noble Lord for his explanation. My Lords, I am a loyal member of the Church of Ireland, and I desire to remain at all times loyal to its most distinguished men, but I think I can promise the noble Lord that if it had ever been suggested in our synod that we should have approved of Mr. Bryce's scheme, some of my friends in Ireland could have given the proposer of that measure a very lively time. The scheme was undoubtedly received by some people at first acquaintance, with favour, because we were all disposed to receive any attempt to deal with this long delayed question with favour, but on examination I do not think there were many people in Ireland in favour of the scheme, and I am certain there is nobody in favour of it now outside the immediate circle of its authors. It was very soon after its creation damned with extremely faint praise, and surely a justification and a final proof of that fact lies in the fact that it forms no part of the present scheme. I want, if I may—I think I can do it accurately—to amplify a little some of the history which has been put before us this evening. The noble Lord opposite had a great deal to talk about, and, therefore, I am sure it was only an accidental omission on his part, but I think he showed a tendency to attribute the failure of adoption of Mr. Bryce's proposals solely to the attitude of Trinity College. I do not think that is a fair reflection to put upon Trinity College. I do not think it is fair to argue that this scheme is only brought forward because the opposition of Trinity College made Mr. Bryce's scheme impossible.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I certainly did not mean to say that, although I may have seemed to imply that that was the only cause, but it undoubtedly was a ruling consideration.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I am much obliged to the noble Lord. I quite agree that the opposition of Trinity College was a cause, and an important cause, but it was not the sole cause, and I do not think it was even the most important cause, which, I think, lies in the fact that the scheme would have been absolutely unworkable in practice, in view of the invariable practice of the Roman Catholic Church in dealing with educational matters, because, word it as you like, the Bryce scheme would have set up a system of mixed education, a system of education which Protestants and Roman Catholics were to be asked to share together, a system of education that we Protestants, many of us, approve of, but a system that hardly any Roman Catholic can be found to advocate. I take that from the action of the Roman Catholic bishops. They in times past could have had systems of mixed education on several occasions. Trinity College did their best, by offering them the provision of a divinity school, to bring the Roman Catholics into Trinity College on absolutely equal terms with their Anglican fellow-subjects. The Roman Catholic bishops did not like the proposal. I do not blame them for that. It was a subject on which they, and they alone, were qualified to judge as to whether they would accept it or not. Whether you look at the system of elementary education in Ireland or in England, whether you look at the treatment of the negotiations of Trinity College on this matter, it has been made perfectly clear that the Roman Catholic hierarchy will not countenance any system of mixed education, whether it be, as I say, elementary education or higher education. I do not grumble at this, because they are the proper people to make up their minds on that subject. But I believe that that state of things, which exists to-day just as strongly as ever, would have made the working, although it would not have prevented the passing, of any scheme founded on Mr. Bryce's proposals absolutely impossible. That, my Lords, is all I desire to say beyond this. I have ventured to say several times before that I live in Ireland every day when I am not in London for Parliamentary purposes, and I realise to the full, that, whereas I have had the advantage of a University education, I am surrounded by neighbours in many walks of life who tell me, not in a spirit of complaint, but in a spirit of regret, that they have never had the advantage of a University education, and have never had the opportunity of receiving a University training, the advantages of which they all recognise. My noble friend who has just sat down spoke of the Chief Secretary for Ireland obtaining a victory in bringing the Bill as far as he has brought it. But I think my noble friend was a little sanguine. I do not deny the great work which the Chief Secretary has done, and I do not as an Irishman deny him the fullest gratitude that we find the present Bill to-day placed upon our table, but victory, my Lords, is not yet. Victory is only in sight. It is in the working out of the proposals and in the administration which is made possible by the Bill before us this evening, that we can hope, and that we must hope, to attain to victory, if victory is to be attained, and I as an Irishman cannot be any less sincere than any who have spoken in saying that I sincerely hope that victory may come to us, and that victory may come to us rapidly, as the result of the passing of this Bill.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I think the Government are to be congratulated on the reception which has been accorded to this Bill in your Lordships' House. There has been criticism, but it has been criticism of the fairest and most temperate description; and I do not think I misinterpret the feelings of noble Lords who sit behind me when I say that it is their desire that this Bill should pass into law, and that without too much delay. We are led to this predisposition in favour of the Bill by various causes. In the first place, I think I am right in saying that in the minds of most of us there is a feeling of great weariness in connection with this subject of University education in Ireland; and that were it only for somewhat ignoble motives of that kind, we should be glad to see the question disposed of.

But apart from motives of that kind, there is a higher motive which points in the same direction. I think most of us feel that it is little short of a calamity not only to the people of Ireland, but to the whole United Kingdom—I will go further and say the whole British Empire—that the Roman Catholics of Ireland, who number a large majority of the people of that country, should during all these years have found themselves unable to avail themselves, at any rate to anything like a sufficient extent, of any of the opportunities which we have been able to afford them for the purpose of acquiring what we usually speak of as higher education. Therefore, most of us are, I think, ready to welcome a settlement of this difficult question without inquiring too scrupulously into the conditions attaching to it. The spirit in which this problem is now approached is much more tolerant than that which prevailed within the recollection of many of us, and there is a general inclination to adapt our theories to the convictions of other people rather than to force the convictions of other people to fit themselves to our theories.

Speaking for myself, I may say frankly that I am deeply convinced, in the first place, that it is highly desirable that this question should be settled; and that, in the next place, it is no manner of use to offer to the people of Ireland a settlement which they are not willing themselves freely and readily to accept. That leads me to two conclusions. In the first place, in regard to Trinity College, Dublin, that we should be extremely careful not to impose upon that distinguished and illustrious body any combination which it is not prepared to accept. When we come to the question of the manner in which we ought to deal with the Roman Catholics of Ireland, then I say do not let us be so foolish as to assume to ourselves credit for generosity when we offer to the Roman Catholics conditions which we know perfectly well the Roman Catholics will not accept or will not be allowed by their advisers to accept.

Holding these views, I share the feeling of my noble friend, Lord Clonbrock, when I find that, in the first place, the Bill leaves Trinity College, Dublin, severely alone. Next I come to the terms which the Bill offers to the Roman Catholics. What are those terms? We offer them a University which is to be something more than a mere examining University. It is a University which, we hope, will have some—I wish I could say all—of the attributes of what we in this country associate with a teaching University. But, at any rate, we hope it will offer the students who resort to it some of those opportunities for contact with their fellow-students and for association in the life and studies of the University, which play so large a part in the Universities of other parts of the United Kingdom. We hope that this new University will have a local colour and produce something which can be described as "local patriotism." I was struck by a statement of the Chief Secretary in the course of the debates which we have followed with so much attention lately, in which he said that, in his view, it was essential that Dublin men or Belfast men should really be Dublin men or Belfast men. I hope that is an object of which we shall not lose sight.

Now what are the conditions under which we are going to offer this University to the Roman Catholics in Ireland? There has been a great deal of playing upon words in connection with this subject. Is it, or is it not, going to be a denominational University? Is it going to be a Roman Catholic University or a University for Roman Catholics? I confess I am not very much moved by these verbal distinctions. What seems to be important is that we are going to establish a University which, from the force of circumstances, must inevitably be a Roman Catholic University. I do not see why we should for an instant be ashamed or reluctant to face that fact.

If this scheme stands any chance of being accepted by the Roman Catholics of Ireland it is for the very reason that the scheme in its operation will give the Roman Catholics that kind of University which they desire—a University with a strong Roman Catholic atmosphere, guided, and in fact dominated by the Roman Catholic Church. That fact—and I believe it to be a fact, weighs with me much more than the fact that in the Bill upon the Table tests are specifically excluded. We have learnt, at any rate, this much from these discussions, that the absence of tests is perfectly compatible with the presence of a distinct denominational atmosphere, and that is a point which, I daresay, many of us will bear in mind when we come to consider other educational controversies which are not yet concluded. In this case the whole machinery of the the new University is so constituted that it cannot fail to have eventually a distinctly denominational complexion, and the Roman Catholic hierarchy make no secret of the fact that it is on this account that the scheme finds favour in their eyes. We may say that all this is very retrograde, that other Universities are emancipating themselves from these influences; we may say that these things are injurious to the highest interests of education, but I confess I look upon the matter in this light and in this light only—are these conditions or are they not the only conditions upon which you can obtain a settlement which will be acceptable to our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens in Ireland? I take it that that is a matter which is beyond dispute, and His Majesty's Government have left us in no doubt that that is a *conditio sine qua non* in the understanding which has been arrived at between them and the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland.

But, my Lords, I am afraid I must go on to say that the desire of His Majesty's Government to render this scheme acceptable to the Roman Catholic hierarchy has led them at one or two points to make a somewhat serious departure from what I conceive to be the principles which they had in view, when the scheme of this Bill was first formulated. I desire, in the first place, to refer to those provisions of the Bill which have reference to the recognition of other colleges—that recognition which the noble Earl who leads the House frankly told us was simply another expression for what we commonly describe as affiliation. If your Lordships will look at the fourth section you will find no doubt that it bristles with safeguards as to the manner in which this right of affiliation is to be exercised. The noble Earl told us that the right was carefully safeguarded, and it is quite true that we are told that affiliation can only take place when the Senate are satisfied that students are pursuing a course of a University type—a course approved by the governing body of the University, conducted under teachers recognised by the governing body for the purpose, and subject to conditions or limitations contained in the Charter.

All these safeguards are, I venture to say, safeguards of the very thinnest description. What I think will take place under this clause—and I do not think there can be the slightest doubt about it—is that Maynooth will come in, will be recognised, will be affiliated, and it is perfectly well understood that this is to be the case. If that takes place, then at once the condition of residence in the new University disappears entirely, because we know that the authorities of Maynooth are not content to accept any conditions necessitating residence on the part of their students. What it will come to will be this, that the Dublin degree will become not a Dublin degree, but a Maynooth degree, and that the Dublin man will turn out to be a Dublin man in name, but in fact a student of Maynooth. That seems to me to be a very serious departure from the principles upon which this Bill professes to be founded.

The result, cannot fail to be this, that the influence of Maynooth will swamp the new University and that, to use a very apt expression which fell from a friend of mine who was describing this clause the other day—

> "The centre of academic gravity will tend to shift from Dublin to Maynooth."

What I confess somewhat puzzles me is this. Why was it, when you screwed up your courage to the point of contemplating the admission of Maynooth, that you could not screw up your courage a little further and allow the Roman Catholic students of the new University to have a chapel of their own? I understand that a chapel might have been provided at the expense of munificent donors, who were ready to come forward. The proposal providing such a chapel was accepted by the Chief Secretary, and then at the last moment, owing to influences which I need not particularise, the clause was dropped out. I confess that seems to me to have been a very deplorable exhibition of weakness on the part of His Majesty's Government, and I hope attention will be called to the matter when we come to the Committee stage. I am inclined myself to go further still and to say that, if you have made up your minds that there is to be in Dublin a University which is to be a University for Roman Catholics, you might just as well have provided them, not only with opportunities for divine worship in a suitable chapel, but with some kind of opportunities for residence in buildings, call them hostels or what you please, which would have prevented these young men from being scattered over the city of Dublin without that protection of which youths of that age stand so much in need when they are pursuing their University studies. I therefore say that I regard these proposals of affiliation with the utmost suspicion.

On the merits I should have been disposed to support a proposal for diminishing the facilities for such affiliations, but I noted the words of the noble Earl opposite when he told us that in his opinion any attempt to diminish these facilities would have been fatal to the reception of the Bill in Ireland. That is a very serious statement. I take it as meaning nothing less than that if this House were to insert in the Bill clauses which would prevent an operation of this kind from taking place, the Bill, which the Roman Catholic hierarchy are now prepared to accept as a settlement of the question, would not be accepted by them as such a settlement. If that is so—and I do not think that I misunderstood what the noble Earl said—much as I dislike the possibilities which this clause unfolds, I will not take the responsibility of suggesting that it should be materially modified in Committee.

But, although that is my feeling, I cannot help thinking that the clause at other points stands in need of further examination. I cannot, for example, see why this process of affiliation should be rendered as easy as it is under this Bill. I cannot see why it should be in the power of the Senate of the University by simply a resolution to effect a great operation of this kind. I should have thought that the proper machinery to set in motion would be that of statute, and that such statutes should be laid on the Table of the Houses of Parliament, and that there should be an appeal to the Privy Council for any persons who took exception to the terms proposed.

There is one other point at which the provisions of the Bill seem to me to be open to considerable criticism. I refer to the composition of the governing bodies, and particularly the governing bodies of the constituent colleges. These governing bodies contain a very liberal representation of what has been spoken of as the civic element. Now, my Lords, the civic element apparently means the representation of the Irish county councils, and I confess that I have the gravest doubt, knowing what we do of the manner in which these local Irish bodies approach their duties, whether it is desirable that they should have so important a part in managing the affairs of these new Universities. We who have some knowledge of Ireland know perfectly well that these local bodies are conducted on extreme political and partisan lines, and we know that in the case of the most ordinary appointments which fall within the patronage of these bodies regard is had not so much to the fitness of the individual competitors as to their political connection and antecedents; and to my mind it seems altogether wrong that people actuated by feelings of this kind should be given an opportunity of using an influence which may be in some cases a preponderating one in the conduct of the affairs of the Universities, and in the appointment of professors and other officials who will be responsible for their management.

I will not detain your Lordships longer. I am deeply convinced that whatever this Bill may be in theory, the fruit of it will be, so far as Dublin is concerned, a University which will be for all practical purposes a denominational University, and I believe it is because that is to be the result that the Bill has been accepted as it has been by those concerned. I am under the impression that His Majesty's Government were in this position—that they had to agree to a Bill of this kind or else leave matters untouched, and I frankly confess, if that was the choice put before them, I can quite understand that they should have preferred to propose the Bill which lies upon the Table of your Lordships' House. I trust that it may do much good in Ireland, that it will bring some, at all events, of the advantages of higher education within the reach of a large section of the population to whom those advantages have hitherto been denied, and I also trust, therein sharing the feelings of some noble Lords who have spoken from this side of the House, that in a future which may, perhaps, be distant, but to which we nevertheless may look forward, this Bill may lay the foundation for a more liberally conceived arrangement, which may bring within the reach of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland University life and the opportunities of higher education in a manner more closely analogous to what we understand by those words in this country and in Scotland. At any rate, if I criticise this Bill, I do so in no unfriendly spirit, but with a sincere hope that the most favourable anticipations which have been indulged in with regard to it by noble Lords opposite may eventually be realised

* THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, the Government certainly have no right to complain of the manner in which their effort to deal with the long standing question of Irish University Education has been received by the House. Least of all have we to complain of anything which fell from the noble and learned Lord, Lord Ashbourne, earlier in the evening in his able and interesting speech, or from my noble friend who has just summed up the debate for those who sit behind him. Indeed, the only real criticism of the principle which underlies this Bill has come from our own side of the House in the interesting speech, to which we all listened with the deep attention it deserved, of my noble friend who sits behind me (Lord Macdonnell). In the few observations which I shall address to your Lordships I may have a few words to say with regard to that speech.

Dealing for the moment with the speeches of noble Lords opposite, I observe, in the first place, that a very large portion of the speech of the noble and learned Lord, Lord Ashbourne, was taken up, quite legitimately, with matters no doubt of importance but nevertheless matters more properly discussed in Committee. Some of these points were dwelt on a few moments ago by my noble friend. First of all there is the question whether the affiliation of these new colleges, to which it is proposed to give a certain position in the University in regard to their students, had better be done, as is proposed in the Bill, by resolution of the Senate, or whether it would be better to do it by a statute. There is a kindred point as to whether, so long as the University Commission is in being, the recognition of the student courses in such colleges, and, indirectly, of the colleges themselves, might not, as the noble Lord seemed himself to prefer, be entrusted to the University Commission. And there is, lastly, the point, upon which both my noble friend who spoke a a moment ago, and the noble and learned Lord, Lord Ashbourne, dwelt, as to whether or not the civic element, as it has come to be called, should be accorded so large a representation as is accorded to it in the government of the new University and of the constituent colleges. I do not understand that it is disputed that it would be desirable to give some representation to the civic element, but what is disputed is whether we may not have gone too far. I venture to say that all those points, important as they are, are points which are more properly raised in Committee.

I think the answer with regard to the question of affiliation, as a matter of principle and not of detail, was given by my noble friend when he introduced the

Bill. I am not going to conceal—it would be idle to do so, because these facts are publicly known—that the concession which the Government have made to the views of the Roman Catholic body upon the question of affiliation has gone far to strain the allegiance of some of our most sterling supporters in both Houses of Parliament. On the other hand, it is the undoubted fact that we were desirous to lay broad and deep the foundations of an edifice to which time, no doubt, might make some additions, but which in principle would not be altered, and the desirability of which would not be called in question; and we came to the conclusion that unless we made this concession to our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen we should have laboured in vain.

I cannot help saying, in connection with this matter—it was not in the speeches either of Lord Ashbourne or of my noble friend, but in some of the more pronounced speeches elsewhere — that bitter, and, as I think, unjust, taunts have been levelled at the Nonconformist Members of the Liberal Party on account of what has been, as I think, cruelly and unjustly called their hypocrisy, because while they had accepted this concession with regard to the affiliation of Maynooth, for that is what the clause in practice will mean, they at the same time objected to the provision of a University chapel. Both of these are matters which, with perfect consistency, in England, Scotland and Ireland, the Nonconformist body has opposed; and it seems to me to be a curious and unjust thing that when the great body of Nonconformists have accepted the larger concession which was asked of them with regard to the Roman Catholic position, they should be charged with political hypocrisy because they did not make the other concession—that is to say, that when they have made the major concession in regard to the affiliation of the colleges, they should be charged with hypocrisy because they did not make the minor. That is absurd, unjust, and illogical, and even although some appearance of contradictory conduct may be alleged, the world is not governed in these matters by the strict application of logic, and what I believe will be recognised—and recognised outside Nonconformist and Liberal circles — is this, that at a critical moment in the history of University education in Ireland the great majority of Nonconformists did come forward and did accept a position most distasteful to them in order to satisfy their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. If anyone likes to amuse himself by charging Nonconformists and the Nonconformist conscience, at which it is so easy to sneer, with hypocrisy in this matter, I make him with pleasure a present of their merriment. But I venture to say that in this matter the Nonconformists have shown, not only generosity, but the highest statesmanship. If anybody desires to see the Nonconformist position in this matter stated with great clearness, moderation, good feeling, and ability, let him read the letter in the *Westminster Gazette* of to-night by one of their most trusted leaders, Mr. John Massie, who is so honourably known in the life of the University of Oxford.

We have heard a good deal about the poverty of this Bill in that it does not provide a residential college in the University of Dublin. Far be it from me to say that a residential college in that University might not be a very desirable thing in many ways, but, after all, there must be some limit, especially at starting, in regard to matters of expenditure, and I unhesitatingly say that to set up a residential college in a proper and substantial manner—and it would have been no use to do so unless we did it in a proper and substantial manner—would have added something like £100,000 to the cost of the Bill. Therefore, I say that upon grounds of economy alone we were not in a position to make that great addition to the schedule of expenses. I think the evils caused by the absence of a residential college have been a little exaggerated. It is quite possible to have collegiate life and to have social and athletic clubs and associations in a college which is not a residential college. I was, until the other day, for many years a member of the Council of University College, London—that great building in Gower Street, with the existence of which I find many people in London are not at all acquainted; and I can only say that in that college, which was not, and, I believe, never will be, a residential college, there is most active social life amongst the students, and they have all the athletic, scientific, and artistic clubs and associations which are to be found in any college at Oxford or Cambridge. Therefore, while I think it would have been a desirable thing, if our means had permitted it, to have had a residential college, I do not at all despair of there growing up in the new University at Dublin, nearly all those movements which are so desirable in the encouragement of good feeling amongst the students themselves.

The noble Lord opposite, Lord Killanin, to whom we listened with great interest and attention, dwelt upon the early history of this question. He showed the House, with unanswerable force, that this is an ancient question, and I have no intention, especially at this late hour of the evening, of following him over the ground, interesting as it is, which he attempted to open up. I took part many years ago in the great debates on the University Bill on which Mr. Gladstone's first Government fell. Those debates, if referred to now, will be found to be mines of information as to the historical origin of this question. Nobody—not even those, and I was one of them, who disagreed with my own party and opposed the Government Bill—would deny for a moment that the speech which Mr. Gladstone made on that occasion, not only in its great eloquence, but also in its historic learning on this great question, was one of the most remarkable monuments of his genius. We are undoubtedly in this matter the inheritors of the difficulties of a remote past. The University question began really as soon as the occupation of Ireland in the reign of Henry II.; but, if we are the inheritors of the difficulties of a remote past, I think it would be ungracious of us if we did not recognise that we are also in recent years the inheritors of the goodwill and of the previous labours of our immediate predecessors.

I agree with my noble friend to whom I have just alluded, that it would be ungracious if we did not recognise that in some of the provisions of this Bill we were anticipated by Mr. Balfour. I make that acknowledgment with perfect sincerity. Those very parts of the Bill upon which we had to make the strongest demand upon the loyalty of our Radical and Nonconformist friends are precisely those parts of the question upon which Mr. Balfour laboured for many years to convert the public. I do not deny that some portions of this Bill, which I support, may not be consistent with some of my own speeches, but, as Emerson says—

> "Too great a belief in consistency is the virtue of weak minds."

There are moments when you have to accept unwelcome facts. You have to bear in mind that compromise is the very elixir of political life, and, therefore, it is that, though I am willing to grant that I very largely share on this question, as I always have shared, the views of my Nonconformist friends, I am not ashamed to say that, for the sake of peace, in order that this long chapter may be closed, I am willing to stand and defend things which are not absolutely consistent with what would be my own personal and individual views in the matter. If a man is not prepared to do that upon given occasions, I think he is not fit to take any part in public life at all.

But this much I do venture to say, that there is one essential difference between this Bill, even with its undoubted concessions to denominationalism, covered as these concessions are by the abolition of tests and the prohibition of rules, and other demands in regard to religious belief, and the Bill in regard to which it was the misfortune of very many active Liberals—Professor Fawcett, Dr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. Harcourt, and many others whom I could name, who since those days held high office in Liberal Governments—to differ from Mr. Gladstone in 1873. There were two great objections to Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which were urged in the House of Commons and which destroyed that Bill. The first was one which, perhaps, was in importance rather exaggerated but it seized hold of the public mind and struck the public imagination. There was a prohibition in the Bill against the University teaching either history or mental or moral philosophy. Nor was the prospect improved when somebody discovered that this prohibition was borrowed from a clause in a charter to a Spanish University in the darkest days of Jesuit supremacy in Spain in the early eighteenth century. That however was, comparatively speaking, a matter of detail perhaps, though it caused a great amount of excitement; but the other and really vital point was this, that Mr. Gladstone'

Bill would have made one University in Ireland just as in Napoleonic times there was one University only in France. We objected to that, in the first place because we thought it would be bad for University life on educational grounds that there should only be one central University, as in France was still the case at that time, in 1873. I may remind the House that since the days of those debates the whole University system of France has been entirely altered, the great central University having been largely broken up and the old provincial Universities restored.

But there was another reason. Religious and political passion at that time, as my noble friend observed just now, were running higher than at the present day. I never recollect a time when the air throbbed with religious and political passion more strongly than in that great debate which caused the fall of Mr. Gladstone's first Government. It was argued, with almost unanswerable force, that the affiliation clauses relating to new colleges in Mr. Gladstone's Bill within a time easily calculable would so have packed the senate of the only University in Ireland with delegates of small Roman Catholic colleges that the whole control of University education would have passed into the hands of the archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, and a document had been published which told the Prime Minister of 1866, Lord Russell, that the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland demanded, and would be contented with nothing less than, the absolute control of all the professors, of all the books, and of all the students, and we accordingly feared even risking to give them under such circumstances an absolute monopoly of power in a not distant future

There was, in the speech of Lord Donoughmore, almost a challenge as to whether we had any reason to suppose that this Bill would be received in the spirit in which it was intended. That is a perfectly reasonable question to ask. I am quite aware that that criticism has been made, though it has been made, oddly enough, more abroad than here. Naturally, in the position which I hold in connection with foreign affairs, I have to be a student of foreign newspapers, and I have observed this criticism. It has also been made in one or two quarters in England. The Liberal Government are told that they are making this experiment, which depends so largely upon the goodwill and support of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, at a singularly unfortunate moment, because the authorities of the Church of Rome have selected this moment to plunge into a great controversy which has embittered University life all over Europe, known as the Modernist controversy. I am not alarmed by that. I think that we may not unreasonably hope from what we see that, so far from the Roman Catholic hierarchy being dragged at the heels of an unprogressive element of their communion on the Continent, it may work out the other way, and that when the Roman Catholic Church sees the desire of this Protestant nation to do justice and to march with the times, the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church generally in Europe may be influenced thereby, and become in the whole assimilated to what I know is her position in America to University education, where practically none of these difficulties about the class of books which students are to read exist at all.

I may be over-hopeful, but there are signs in Ireland that the old passions are dying down with regard to education. There is, I think, a real and genuine wish for conciliation. It is realised that this question must be settled; that, as my noble friend said just now, it has gone on too long; and that the credit of Parliament is involved in a settlement. In the great debate to which I just now alluded, when political passion ran so high, there was one speech which caused an immense effect, and it did so because it struck a rather different note from all the others. It was a speech made by one who afterwards became a distinguished statesman and held high office, by a man who was one of the greatest living scientists in England, and a distinguished University professor, and himself at that time a representative of a Scottish University—I allude to Dr. Lyon Playfair. In a speech which can be perused even to-day with advantage, he asked the House not to look at this question simply and solely as, a political and religious question, but to think of nothing except the educational needs of Ireland. He said—

"I have endeavoured to look upon Ireland as part of this Kingdom not split into sections by religious differences, but inhabited by our fellow-countrymen, who have a right to all the advantages which the State can give them in regard to higher education. I have remembered the circumstances of the country, which render it more important that Ireland should enjoy these advantages without stint or hindrance than either England or Scotland. Ireland has had many obstacles to progress, some political, others material. She possesses hardly any of those great raw materials of industry, which give such advantage to other divisions of our country. She has to import the chief part of her coal from England and Scotland, and that is the mainspring of all industries. With small natural resources, except those for agriculture, it is above all things essential that the intellectual resources of Ireland should supplement her deficiency in natural resources. As civilisation progresses science and knowledge, applied to production, become more important factors than the mere possession of raw materials.

"Not only then as regards industrial development but also to increase the fund of intelligence among the youth of Ireland, so as to give them outlets for employment which the restricted industry of their country does not afford . . . a case is made out for a juster development of the new system."

My Lords, it is for that reason that the Government have brought forward this Bill, in the earnest hope that by it they may abolish and clear away the gloomy distrust bred of the fanatical intolerance in past days of Catholics and Protestants, and as has been well said by a modern author "may restore to Ireland the consoling vision of widening education and disappearing hates."

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

House adjourned at five minutes before Twelve o'clock, till to-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 27th July, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz:—Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

SALMON, TROUT, AND RIVER TWEED FISHERIES BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 23rd day of July, That, in the case of the following Bill, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have not been complied with, viz.:—Salmon, Trout, and River Tweed Fisheries Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

South-West Suburban Water Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Keighley Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill [Lords] .— As amended, considered; Amendments made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Thames River Steamboat Service Act (1904) Amendment Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; a Clause added; Bill to be read the third time.

Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

River Wandle Protection Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 82, 211, 236, and 237 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed To-morrow.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Blackburn Corporation Bill (by Order).—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Standing Orders (Private Business).—Standing Order 26*a* was read, and amended, in line 2, by leaving out the words "the Plans and Sections," and by inserting the words "so much of the Plans and Sections as relates to the portion of the work by which the banks, foreshore, or river-bed may be affected."

And in line 12, by leaving out the words "the river is subject to a Board of Conservators," and by inserting the words "there be a Board of Conservators constituted for the conservancy of the river."

Standing Order 82 was read, and amended, in line 5, by leaving out the words "and such Copies shall be," and by adding at the end of the Standing Order, the words "together with Copies of the estimates and statements deposited in accordance with Standing Order 36*a* (if any)."

Standing Order 172 was read, and amended, in line 11, by inserting after "36*a*," the words "or under General Order made in pursuance of the Private Legisation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899."

Standing Order 173*a* was read, and amended, in lines 30 and 31, by leaving out the words "and shall be circulated with the Votes."

175*a*. Ordered, That notice in writing of any Bill relating to England or Ireland, and containing provisions whereby any application of the property of any charity not authorised by the Lands Clauses Consolidation Acts, shall be directed, or the patronage or the constitution of any charity, or the right of any charity to any property, shall be affected, or setting up or taking power to set up or to take over or interfere in the management of any school or other educational foundation or institution, or to levy any rate or raise money for any such purpose, shall be given to the Attorney-General for England or Ireland, as the case may be, and no such Bill shall be taken into consideration by the Committee on the

Bill until the House has received a Report from the Attorney-General on such Bill, and such Report shall stand referred to the Committee on the Bill

Resolved, That this Order be a Standing Order of this House.

Standing Order 188a was read, and amended, in line 4, by leaving out the words "and circulated with the Votes."

Standing Order 220 was read, and amended, in lines 2 and 3, by leaving out the words "and circulated with the Votes."—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATAL.

Copy presented, of Despatch from the Governor of Natal forwarding a Bill to make Special Provision for the Trial of Natives accused of certain crimes [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Return of the number of Steam Trawlers registered at Ports in the States of Western Europe in the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.

Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1907–8, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1907–8 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

METEOROLOGICAL COMMITTEE.

Copy presented, of Third Report of the Meteorological Committee to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, for the year ending 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE.

Copy presented, of Fifty-fourth Report of the Postmater-General [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd June; *Mr. Ellis*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 258.]

CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd July; *Mr. Lamont*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 259.]

LAND REGISTRY.

Account presented, of Receipts and Payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 260.]

CLERGY (WEST INDIES).

Copy presented, of Return of the Amount payable on 5th January, 1908, out of the Consolidated Fund for Ecclesiastical Purposes in the West Indies [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Return for the year ended 31st March, 1908, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted, under Rule 2 of the Regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Act, to hold civil employment or profit under Public Departments [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 261.]

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Caledonian Canal.—Copy of One hundred-and-third Report of the Commissioners [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 262.]

Lunacy.—Copy of Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ending on 30th June, 1908 [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Provincial Engineers (P. O.) Staff.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that for some years past the established clerical staff in the provincial superintending engineers' offices has been insufficient to meet the work in that Department; that temporary assistance in the shape of sorting clerks and telegraphists, Second Division clerks, boy clerks, and the employment of casual clerks from outside the service, has failed to adequately fill the breach, and that the members of the permanent clerical staff are obliged to perform continuous overtime; and if he can say when the bringing up of the establishment to the required strength may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton*). I am aware and regret that for some time there has been heavy pressure of work on the established clerical staff in the provincial superintending engineers' offices and that there has been a considerable amount of overtime work; but proposals for a revision of the Engineering Department, including the clerical force, have been received, and I hope that before very long the establishment will be brought up to the required strength.

Trawlers Depredation on Lewis Fisheries.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland in view of the fact that, in reply to a memorial from the people of Ness representing a population of 4,000, a letter was sent from the Scottish Office, under date 4th June last, deprecating the view that the Lewis fisheries had been ruined by trawlers, and stating that the Lewis fisheries were better last year than they had been for some years, is he aware that the figures which he quoted for 1904–7 largely represent herrings caught by English and Scottish steam drifters, whereas statistics concerning the line-fishing industry, on which the fishermen of Lewis mainly depend, show that the weight of line-caught fish landed in the island fell from 126,024 cwts. in 1893 to 76,011 cwts. in 1904, and 69,833 cwts. in 1907; and, in view of this evidence in support of the contention of the memorialists, will he endeavour to meet their grievances.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair*). In the information referred to the herrings, whether caught by English or Scottish drifters, were taken in Lewis waters and landed in Lewis. Since 1898, the date from which full statistics are available, the average catch per boat actually engaged in line fishing has remained practically the same, while the value of such catch per boat has gone up from £38 in 1898 to £55 in 1907. Within the same period the number of boats actually engaged in line fishing in Lewis has decreased from 666 to 451. The latter fact much more than accounts for any apparent diminution in the catch.

Motor Cab Regulation.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, as he does not advise the prosecution of motor cab drivers who take more passengers than they are licensed to carry, except in cases of serious overcrowding, why the police rigidly carry out the regulation as to the number of passengers a tramcar is licensed to carry, and the reason why the tramcar is treated differently in this respect to motor cabs.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone*). If more than the authorised number of persons are admitted into a tramcar the passengers are inconvenienced, generally against their wishes. When a motor cab is hired no one is inconvenienced by any overcrowding except the hirer and his friends, and there is no object in prosecuting except where the overcrowding is such as to cause danger.

Motor Cab Capacities.

MR. COOPER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, as he is unable to advise the police to prosecute the drivers of motor cabs who carry more passengers than their cabs are licensed to carry, except in cases of serious overcrowding, he has issued any instruction to the police explaining what serious overcrowding means; and, if so, will he give the regulation, and, if no instruction has been issued, whether this question is left to the discretion of each constable.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) As regards the instructions to the police, I can only refer the hon. Member to the

Answers given to former Questions on 27th May and 22nd June. The need for intervening must necessarily depend on the circumstances of each case, and be left to a great extent to the discretion of the constable.

French Import Duties on Elastic Tissues.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the French Government propose to increase the import duties on elastic tissues; and, if so, what steps His Majesty's Government propose to take to protect British interests.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Grey*). My right hon. friend does not know whether the French Government propose to increase the import duties in question, as no official publication has yet been made of any of the proposals put forward by the Customs Commission of the French Chamber of Deputies, which is now engaged in studying the revision of the existing French Customs tariff.

Australian Commonwealth Arms.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if Lyon King-at-Arms was consulted in regard to the new design for the arms of the Commonwealth of Australia; and, if not, will he take steps to ensure that he will be consulted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. As I stated on Thursday last, the arms have already been approved by His Majesty.

London Police Holiday.

Mr. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, pending the Report of the Committee on the Weekly Day of Rest, he can see his way to grant the Metropolitan Police a full fortnight's holiday this year instead of the usual ten days, on account of the exceptionally heavy duties the force have been called upon to perform.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) No, Sir. I should not feel justified in making any alteration in the leave of absence of the Metropolitan Police, at any rate until after the Select Committee has reported. Even the comparatively small increase suggested could not be made without raising the police rate above its present limit.

London Railway Cab Service.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received any complaints respecting the shortage of cabs at the chief railway termini in London since the abolition of the privilege cab system under the Bill of last year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) No, Sir, I have received no complaints.

Home Work.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the administration of the home-work provisions of the Factory Act was discussed at a conference with medical officers of health at the Home Office last autumn, as promised in a reply to a Question in the House on 18th July, 1907; and, if so, what results were arrived at.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Yes, Sir, the conference was held as promised. A useful discussion took place on a number of administrative points, and certain alterations and improvements were subsequently made in the tables issued to the medical officers for the preparation of the statistics. It may be hoped, I think, that the conference will have its result generally in an improved administration of the home-work provisions of the Factory Act.

Outworkers Lists.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the second column in Table 6 of Part II. of the Supplement to the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for the year 1906, where the number of lists of outworkers sent in by employers who fulfil the legal obligation to send in two lists in the year are given separately from those who have sent in only one in the year; whether he has noticed that the numbers are, in many cases, odd and not even, in one case the number given being one; whether the same thing appears in Table 5, which gives the details of the returns according to industries; and whether he can give any explanation why these apparent mistakes have occurred.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am aware of the figures to which the hon. Member calls attention. The figures have been tabulated as received from the medical officers of health. As explained in the introduction to the Return issued in 1906, the Department is unable to clear up by correspondence minor points of doubt that arise in connection with these figures. The errors, which are not very important, are no doubt due to some misunderstanding on the part of the medical officers, and the question whether the instructions as to filling up the tables can be made clearer will be considered before they are again issued.

Infection in Out-workers' Premises.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in Glasgow no cases of out-work in infected premises are reported as having been found in the course of 3,072 inspections of out-workers' premises, although the cases of infectious disease throughout the city are reported as being at the rate of 24 per 1,000 of the population; and whether he has inquired if the places where home-work is done in Glasgow are really as immune from infectious disease as Column 20 in Table 6 of Cd. 3986 seems to show.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The figures in the Returns were supplied by the medical officer of health for Glasgow, a most efficient and careful official, and I have no reason for doubting their accuracy. The question, however, of the prevalence of infectious disease in this or any other class of premises is a matter of public health with which the Home Office is not directly concerned.

Animal Dealers—Dog Licences.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether there is any regular system of inspecting the shops of animal dealers with the view of finding out the number of dogs which they keep, and whether they pay licences for each of such dogs.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) No special regulations have been issued respecting these dogs, but it is a part of the officers' duty to see that licences are taken for all dogs which are liable to duty, and the Board have no reason to think that there is any evasion of duty on the part of dealers in dogs.

Book Imports.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the nature of the powers entrusted to Customs officers as regards the examination of foreign books in the luggage of passengers landing at British ports from the Continent and as regards the seizure of the same; and whether it lies in the individual discretion of such officers to pronounce a given book fit or unfit for importation, or whether any and what code of criticism is officially supplied to them for application to the problem.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) Under Section 42 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, books in regard to which notice has been given that a copyright therein subsists in the United Kingdom and indecent books are prohibited to be imported. Any books observed by Customs officers, in the course of the examination of passengers' baggage, which appear to fall within these two categories are detained and submitted to the Board of Customs for their directions.

Shorthand Writers' Fees.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that a second Court was unable to sit at Guildford last week in consequence of there being no shorthand writer; whether a second Court was unable to sit at Birmingham last week for the same reason; whether the learned Judge who was presiding invited gentlemen who were present to act as shorthand writers, and that they refused on account of the lowness of the remuneration; whether in many places shorthand writers have had to be engaged at a greater cost than the Treasury scale of remuneration; and whether he will reconsider his decision not to raise the scale.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) As I stated in reply to a Question on Thursday last, the appointment of official shorthand writers for the purposes of the Criminal Appeal Act rests with the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief Justice, with whom I am in communication on the subject.

Limavady and Dungiven Railway Company.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury why the grant of £19,601 was made to the Limavady and Dungiven Railway Company, in face of the fact that the company being under an obligation to pay the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company 70 per cent. of the receipts for working expenses was incapable of paying interest on the loan; and why, when the Treasury, after foreclosure, sold the line for £2,000 to the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company, they did not require that company at once to promote a Bill to confirm the proceedings and to settle at the same time the obligations of the purchasing company in the interests of the public.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) At the time (1883) when the advance to the Limavady and Dungiven Railway Company was made, it was anticipated that the net receipts of the line, after paying the proportion due for working expenses to the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company, would from the outset suffice to pay the interest and instalment of principal on the Board of Works loan. The Board of Works ultimately, with the consent of the Treasury, sold their interest in the line to the Midland Company subject to the necessary Parliamentary powers being obtained. The Midland Railway Act, 1907, to which the agreement for sale with the Board of Works is scheduled, conferred the necessary powers. The Limavady and Dungiven Railway Acts of 1878 and 1882 remain, however, in full force and apply to the transferred undertaking, and under the second schedule of the agreement, confirmed by and scheduled to the Act of 1907, the Midland Company are obliged at their own expense well and sufficiently to equip, work, manage, and maintain the railway in perpetuity and to afford proper facilities for the traffic of the district.

Windsor Motorists' Prosecution.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to recent prosecutions of motorists in Windsor for exceeding the speed limit; whether he has noticed that it was admitted in cross-examination that one car was capable of travelling at fifty miles an hour and another car at sixty miles an hour; and who is responsible for having licensed such vehicles to travel upon the public highway.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have seen a newspaper report of these prosecutions which contains statements to the effect referred to in the Question. An Excise licence has to be taken out in respect of a motor car as in respect of any other carriage, and it could not be withheld on the ground that the car could travel at any particular speed. No other licence is required.

Automatic Motor Speed Limits.

MR. HAROLD COX: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to any inventions for recording the speed of motor-cars and for automatically shutting off the engine and applying the brake at a given speed; and whether he will cause an examination to be made of any such apparatus submitted to him, with a view to determining whether it is likely to prove suitable for compulsory use.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My attention has not been called to inventions of the kind mentioned by my hon. friend. I should be ready to cause any such inventions to be examined if they were submitted to me.

Paupers' Clothing Contracts.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he authorised a certain firm in London to value samples of clothing submitted to the Poplar Board of Guardians by various firms, one of which was the Women's Committee of the Central Unemployed Body; whether the report submitted stated that the Board had paid to these workrooms 2s. 3d. for shirts which were valued at 1s. 9d., 2s. 11d. for flannelette vests valued at 1s. 8½d., £1 for men's suits valued at 9s. 11d. and 11s. 6d.; what steps he took to make sure that the samples submitted by the private firms were the same as those sent originally to the board of guardians but returned by them; and whether the expert responsible for the valuation indicated in each case how much he estimated as being a fair wages rate for making the various articles in question.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) As regards the first two points in the Question, the facts are substantially as stated. As regards the third point, I asked for the particular samples which had been submitted to the guardians by the firm referred to, and I have no reason to doubt that these were the samples furnished to me. They are still in my possession. As regards the concluding part of the Question, the expert compared the four sets of samples sent to him and assigned a value to the samples accepted. He did not indicate in his report what he estimated to be a fair wages rate for making the articles in question.

Vaccination.

MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that Mr. W. R. Hitchcock, the vaccination officer for Wandsworth, did not serve Form Q on Mr. Cooper, 16, Belfour Street, Nine Elms Lane, before his child was four months old, and that this omission on the part of the vaccination officer contributed to Mr. Cooper's neglect to make a declaration of conscientious objection to vaccination under the Act of 1907, Mr. Cooper not being aware of the four months limit until three days after the child attained that age; and whether, seeing that this Form Q was expressly inserted in the last Vaccination Order on purpose to make known to parents more clearly the provisions of the Law, he will ascertain whether there has been similar neglect on Mr. Hitchcock's part in any other cases.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have not received any complaint with regard to this matter, but I will make inquiries on the subject.

Turnchaple Admiralty Contracts.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): To ask the Frist Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that a firm by the name of Rolf and Son are doing work for the Admiralty at Turnchaple, in the Plymouth district, and are only paying the bricklayers' labourers 4d. and 4½ per hour, whereas the standard rate is 5d.; and whether he intends taking any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Admiralty are making inquiries and will take steps to prevent any breach of the Fair Wages Resolution.

Deptford Victualling Yard Coopers.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he is aware that, in consequence of the present staff of coopers employed at the Deptford Victualling Yard being insufficient to cope with the coopers' work required there, a quantity of work, such as the heading-up and securing of wood-bound casks and cylindricals, hitherto performed by coopers at piece-work rates, is now being done by labourers, who when employed upon such work receive an extra payment of 2d. per day; and whether he will consider the desirability of restoring this work to the coopers.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The work referred do does not require the services of a trained cooper, and the more economical arrangement which has been introduced brings the Admiralty into line with the ordinary trade practice.

Obsolete War Ships.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the original costs of the ships "Bellona," "Katoomba," "Mildura," "Pallas," "Pearl," "Phœbe," "Ringmaroona," "Salamander," and "Tauranga," which were constructed in 1891–2, and which, amongst others, were broken up during the financial year 1906–7, was £1,058,680 and the price realised was only £65,750; if so, can he explain for what reason did the Admiralty condemn these nine war vessels built fifteen years ago; and whether the Admiralty will take into account this loss of £993,000 on vessels which were constructed so recently when preparing their next programme of naval construction.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The hon. Member's figures are correct. Vessels are placed on the sale list when there is no longer any useful function which they can perform in the Royal Navy or when their usefulness is not commensurate with the expenditure required for maintenance. The precise period in a vessel's life when this occurs must evidently vary in each case. As regards the last part of the Question, the Admiralty take into account all relevant circumstances in determining the programme of new construction each year.

New Armoured Cruiser.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can state the tonnage of the new armoured cruiser to be laid down this financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The tonnage is not yet settled.

Rosyth.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the naval preparations on the other side of the North Sea, he will consider the need for expediting the contract for the works at Rosyth, so that these may be completed in the year 1912.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The contract time for the completion of the works at Rosyth having been determined recently after careful consideration, I am not aware of any such change in the circumstances as would justify me in reopening the question.

Admiralty and the Press.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty will he state who sees Press representatives at the Admiralty; who determines the nature and extent of the information given verbally to them; whether special information is verbally given to the representatives of some papers which is not imparted to those of others; and whether the First Sea Lord ever gives interviews to editors of newspapers, or other journalists, or to other persons taking part in public controversy respecting naval matters.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is, the private secretary to the permanent secretary. The Answer to the second part is, the permanent secretary. The Answer to the third part is in the negative. With regard to the fourth part of the Question, I do not know whom my colleagues on the Board may see unless they choose to tell me; but I have every confidence that no communication will be made respecting naval matters in the sense which I gather is intended to be conveyed in the Question.

Pembroke Dock Engine Fitters.

MR. HUDSON: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can now say what wages are paid by the firm of Messrs. Clark, Chapman, and Company to the engine fitters engaged on H.M.S. "Defence" at Pembroke Dock; and whether the Fair Wage Clause is being observed.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) A report has been received from the firm to the following effect:—There are three journeymen engine fitters engaged by the firm on board H.M.S "Defence" at Pembroke. Two of them receive 36s. per week plus 17s. 6d. allowance, and the others 41s. per week plus 17s. 6d. allowance. There are, besides, three young men who have not yet completed their full apprenticeship. Two of these have 24s. plus allowance, and the other, 30s. plus allowance. These young men are usually styled "improvers," the ordinary standard rate for which class averages from 18s. to 21s. per week. The usual allowance for battleships is 17s. 6d. for journeymen, and 14s. for apprentices. The Admiralty have no reason to suppose that the Fair Wages Clause is not being observed.

Wireless Telegraphy.

Lord EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if the Admiralty have created a skilled staff of wireless telegraphists; and, if so, how are they rated.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) A telegraphist branch has been instituted, and is in process of formation. They will be trained from boys, and be advanced to the various grades according to requirements when qualified by service and examination. To meet immediate requirements, a proportion of signal ratings who have been performing wireless duties have been accepted for transfer to the wireless branch, and also a certain number of volunteers from other ratings. The arrangements for their transfer and advancement are given in a circular letter to the Fleet, a copy of which I shall be glad to give to the noble Lord.

Rosyth.

Mr. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the population which will be located at Rosyth on the completion of the naval works there, sufficient area of land has been secured for laying out a town on garden city lines to the best advantage, for the health and wellbeing of the people, as befits the spirit of the age.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The naval works at Rosyth will not be completed for seven years after the contract is let, so that the question will not be a practicable one for a considerable time. In any case the Admiralty do not possess sufficient land to lay out a garden city themselves.

Sanitation in the Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that it is now upwards of three years since Dr. Dittmar, the medical inspector for the Local Government Board for Scotland, reported the sanitary condition of the townships in the Island of Lewis as dangerous to the public health, will he state whether he has yet obtained from the local authority information in regard to the houses contained in these townships; and has he yet succeeded in making arrangements with the Treasury such as will admit of assistance being given towards the construction of houses on new sites.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I learn on inquiry that steady progress is being made in the sanitary improvement of crofters' houses. This and other questions affecting administration in the Lews are constantly before me, but no arrangements in the direction referred to by my hon. friend have been made.

Vatersay.

Sir J. DEWAR (Inverness): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if an arrangement has been arrived at with Lady Gordon Cathcart in regard to the Island of Vatersay; and if he can state its terms.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Government have made additional proposals, on the lines generally of the procedure laid down in the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, which safeguard the proprietor from possible loss. These proposals, which have been accepted by Lady Cathcart, provide for compensation to the tenant for surrender of his lease and to the proprietor for loss directly attributable to the occupation of the farm by small holders. The Government will now proceed forthwith to ascertain definitely how far the farm of Vatersay may properly be occupied by small tenants, to prepare a scheme of settlement under the crofter tenure, and to carry it into effect with the co-operation of Lady Cathcart, who remains proprietor of the farm. This arrangement, I am glad to say, made it possible for the proprietor to apply to the Court of Session upon Saturday, the 18th instant, with the happy result that, by the order of that Court, the men who were committed to prison for contempt of Court were then liberated. I trust that those in whose immediate interest this scheme of settlement has been devised and agreed upon, especially those who are in occupation of parts of the farm, without whose active support the whole arrangement will fall to the ground, will now co-operate with the proprietor and the Government in facing and adjusting the difficulties of the situation, and will join in the endeavour to make the scheme a practical success.

Willesden Education Dispute.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he has now made inquiry into the action of the Willesden Education Committee in ordering the fortnightly prosecution of William Barnard of that place until he consents to inflict what he holds to be a permanent injury upon his son, aged fourteen, by forcing him to attend a certain school for mentally-deficient children in the district; whether the Education Committee is under any statutory obligation to order fortnightly prosecutions in this case; and, if not, whether, seeing that the father, whose wages are 25s. a week, has already been fined £4 since last May at the instance of this Committee, he can take any steps to recommend them to mitigate the severity of their action in this matter, and so protect this man from complete financial ruin.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am making inquiries of the local education authority, and when I receive a reply I will communicate with the hon. Member.

Teachers' Registration Council.

MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been directed to the hardship inflicted on the registrar, the chief clerk, and the lady assistant registrar of the Teachers' Registration Council, recently dissolved, who have either been dismissed or are under notice of dismissal from the Board of Education.

MR. BUTCHER: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether, seeing that the persons mentioned in the last Question were engaged in work which seemed to be permanent, the President will either secure that they shall receive compensation or find for them other employment in the public service, preferably by taking practical steps to reconstitute the Teachers' Registration Council under the Administrative Provisions Act of 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) In reply to this and the next Question, I have already stated that the officials referred to were the servants of the late Registration Council and were employed under agreements providing for the termination of their engagements at six and three months notice respectively. The Board cannot assume responsibility for finding employment or compensation for abolition of office for persons who are not in their service. I may add, however, that the Board have been able to give temporary employment during the last four months to the chief clerk, and I have recently appointed the lady assistant registrar a woman inspector under the Board. With regard to the formation of a new council, I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Parliamentary Paper which has recently been issued. It will rest with the new council when constituted to determine the *personnel* of their staff.

Agricultural Unrest at Cayo.

MR. LLEWELLYN WILLIAMS (Carmarthen District): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the state of unrest and agitation prevailing in the parish of Cayo, in the county of Carmarthen, owing to the collection of chief rent alleged to be due to the Crown; whether he has been informed that a large number of farmers in the parish have formed a committee with a view to oppose the payment of chief rent; whether they object to its payment on the ground of the disproportionate amounts levied respectively on small and large farms, and their ignorance as to its meaning and application; whether the deputy-steward and the Woods and Forests Department have, upon request being made to them, refused information on these points to the farmers; whether, in some instances, levies had to be abandoned on account of excessive distresses; whether distresses were levied this month on two farms, and the goods distrained upon taken away by the bailiff in the absence of the farmers to another parish; whether this was done because the deputy-steward was afraid to conduct the sales on the premises owing to the inflamed condition of public opinion in the district; whether, in the neighbouring parishes of Llangadock, Myddfai, Llanfair-ar-y-bryn, Llanddensant, and Llansadwrn chief rent has not been paid for the last fifteen years, and, if so, why; and whether, in view of the difficulty of collection, the inequality of the incidence, the irritation created, and the inadequacy of the result, the Government will take steps either to commute or terminate the payment of chief rent.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) I am informed by the Commissioner of Woods in charge of the Crown Land Revenues in Wales that he is aware that there is some unrest and agitation in the parish of Cayo on the subject of the chief rents payable to the Crown in the manor of that name, and he believes that a committee has been formed to oppose payment. No tangible reasons for the objection to payment have been given. The rents are very ancient ones of a manorial character, and have been collected for some hundreds of years. They form part of the Land Revenues of the Crown. No reasonable requests for information have been refused. The Commissioners paid a visit to the district and invited the chairman and secretary of the committee referred to to meet him, but they declined to come. In some instances levies have been abandoned owing to apprehended violence, and in one case in which it was alleged that an unneccessary quantity of hay had been seized the distress proceedings were abandoned with a view to recovery in another way. In a very recent case the article distrained was removed to a distance owing to apprehended violence if the sale were carried out on the premises. There do not appear to be any chief rents payable to the Crown in the neighbouring parishes mentioned in the Question, and the Commissioners of Woods are not concerned in any way with rents due to private landowners. It is intended to enforce payment of the rents really due to the Crown unless and until they are redeemed, but the Crown is perfectly willing to sell them on the usual terms as a whole or singly.

Scottish Probation of Offenders.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been directed to the interpretation placed upon the Probation of Offenders Act in parts of Scotland to the effect that offenders on probation can only be dealt with and sentenced by the individual magistrate who placed the accused on probation, and in addition that the probation officer's report cannot be placed before the Court; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take to prevent the provisions of the said Act becoming nugatory.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) My attention has not been called to this. I hardly think the points mentioned should cause any difficulty. On the first, all that seems to me to be necessary is that an offender on probation who has failed to observe the conditions of the probation order should be dealt with by the Court which pronounced the order, not by the individual magistrate or magistrates who did so. On the second, the probation officer's report I think can, and indeed ought, to be placed before the Court, and, if it is either sworn to or put on affidavit, it appears to me that it would form "information on oath," which is what the statute requires. A Court of Law may have, of course, to determine these questions; and I gather from my hon. friend that a present and practical difficulty has been felt in administration, and it is only for this reason that I have ventured to state my views.

Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): To ask the Lord-Advocate whether he will issue a memorandum with reference to the Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill, setting out those parts of the Bill which are amendments of the existing law in different type from those parts which are merely a consolidation of existing statutes.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) I should hardly have thought this necessary. I presume, however, that my hon. friend, while not desiring detailed explanations of all the changes that are proposed, is anxious to have in a convenient form a reference to the sources of the various clauses in the existing legislation with indications of new or amended provisions. I think this request is not unreasonable, and I shall be very glad to have a White Paper containing this information issued at once. I should value my hon. friend's active support of this controversial Bill, and this, I trust, he will now be able to give.

Irish Land Stock.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer how many applications for £250,000 each and upwards were received by the Bank in connection with the recent issue of Irish Land Stock.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The number of applications for £250,000 each and upwards was 184.

Old-Age Pensions.

MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the recepient of an old-age pension will, in case of necessity, be entitled to receive medical relief from a board of guardians.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Medical or surgical assistance supplied by or on the recommendation of a medical officer to the recipient of an old-age pension would not disqualify him from continuing to receive his pension.

Military Churches in India.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can give an undertaking that the Indian Government will not apply any public money to the repairing or maintenance of any garrison or other church in respect of the use of which any denomination claims an exclusive right.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) This course would not be possible. The churches in question, of which several are appropriated for Presbyterian and others for Roman Catholic worship, are Government buildings provided for the use of the troops, and they could obviously not be allowed to fall into disrepair and the object for which they have been built thus be defeated.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India at what military stations in India, where Government churches already exist, are places of worship for non-Anglican troops to be built, what is the estimated total cost, and out of what funds are they to be paid for.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The hon. Member will find in Appendix 9 to the Papers presented to Parliament in Cd. 4022 the names of the places where unconsecrated churches are being built. They are being built out of Government funds, but I am unable to give the exact figure without reference to India.

MR. LAIDLAW: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India how much was paid in the last financial year by the Government of India for the upkeep and repair of Government churches; and if the Government have contributed anything for the upkeep and repair of Hindoo temples and Mahomedan mosques in the same period.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) In 1906–7, the last year for which we have full accounts, the expenditure on repairs of churches amounted to £17,200; but this figure probably includes grants-in-aid for churches which are not the property of Government. As regards the second part of the Question, the grants made by former rulers for the upkeep of temples and mosques have been maintained and special grants have also been made in the case of buildings of archæological interest.

Births and Deaths in India.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the statistics of births and deaths in India have become more accurate and reliable year by year; and, if the answer be in the affirmative, whether the India Office accepts comparisons between the death rate of the present time and of past years as affording proof that the death rate has risen.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) According to the last Census Report the degree of error in the Indian Returns of births and deaths has, in some provinces at least, been greatly reduced. Comparisons of the kind suggested by the hon. Member should be made with all reserve.

Rathdowney Prisoners in Tullamore.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the seven Rathdowney prisoners at present in Tullamore goal are denied the use of tobacco; and, if so, seeing that they are bail prisoners, will he order that they are allowed to supply themselves with tobacco as they are with food.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell*): Bail prisoners are allowed to smoke tobacco if the visiting committee approve. I am informed that none of the prisoners referred to have made any application for permission to smoke. If they should do so, the governor will, as a matter of course, refer the application to the visiting committee for their decision.

Rathdowney Police Charge.

MR. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he say what officer was in charge of the police at Rathdowney, Queen's County, on 20th June last; and whether it was an officer of inferior rank who ordered the baton charge, and, if so, will he state his name and rank.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) District Inspector Thomas O'Brien was in charge of the police at Rathdowney during the earlier part of the day, and upon the arrival of District Inspector W. S. Irwin, the latter, as senior officer, took charge. Neither of the district inspectors was present at the place and time when the police were ordered to use their batons against the rioters. The baton charge was ordered by Head Constable James Spence, who was in immediate charge of the police at the moment. I refrain from making any statement as to the circumstances in which the baton charge was ordered, seeing that a charge of riot is pending against a number of men.

Eyrecourt Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a labourer named Hynes, who is married and has six children, applied for a cottage in the electoral division of Eyrecourt, union of Portumna; and whether he can give the reason why his application was refused.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It was proved at the inquiry that Hynes is a tailor and does not work as an agricultural labourer. He is, therefore, not qualified to receive a labourer's cottage.

Irish Primary Education Grant.

MR. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state how the supplementary grant for primary education is to be distributed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell*): I would ask the hon. Member to await the appearance of the revised Estimate which will be laid upon the Table in the course of a day or two.

Ballynahinch Orange Celebration.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that one officer and fourteen extra men of the Royal Irish Constabulary were drafted into Ballynahinch, County Down, in connection with the recent celebration of the memory of King William of Orange on 13th July last; whether he can state the reason, if any, for drafting extra police into that neighbourhood; and whether there was anything for them to do when they got there

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On 13th July an extra force, consisting of one officer and twelve policemen, was drafted into Ballinahinch for the preservation of the peace. The police authorities considered it necessary to send this force, which was somewhat larger than usual, because Orange drumming parties had recently indulged in provocative conduct by drumming for a considerable time outside the houses of certain persons of the opposite party. The proceedings of 13th July passed off without disturbance.

Crime in Galway.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the number of cases of manslaughter, threatening letters and notices, firing into dwelling-houses, killing and maiming cattle, incendiary fires, and boycotting in the County Galway since the last spring assizes held in Galway, of the number of persons with whom police protection has to be constant, and of cattle-driving; whether his attention has been drawn to the recent charge of Mr. Justice Madden to the grand jury, in which he stated that the condition of the county was deplorable, that recognition of the law was a thing of the past, and that it was lamentable to think of the perpetual dread of outrage, misery, and wretchedness that entered into the lives of the unfortunate people who had to pass their existence under such conditions; and will he state what steps, if any, the Government propose to take to restore law and order in that particular county.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am aware of the facts as regards crime in County Galway, and am informed by the responsible police authorities that, though the county is still in an unsatisfactory condition, there has been an appreciable improvement during the last two months. I am not aware that Mr. Justice Madden has made any comments on the state of the county, but I have seen a newspaper report of Mr. Justice Kenny's address to the grand jury at the opening of the recent assizes, in which remarks to the effect stated in the Question are attributed to the learned judge. The Government are taking all possible measures within the ordinary law for the preservation of the peace and the punishment of offenders in County Galway, and a force of 350 additional police has been appointed to the county under proclamation with that object.

Land Commission Report.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the usual time for the Land Commission to issue their Report has passed; and can he state when the Report will be issued, and explain the cause of delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Report of the Land Commission for the year ending 31st March last has now been received and will be laid upon the Table in a day or two. The Report is rather earlier this year than usual. It contains a large quantity of statistical information, which necessarily takes a considerable time to prepare.

Land Purchase Agreements.

MR. FFRENCH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that agreements for purchase up to £65,000,000 will be lodged before 1st November next; whether the bonus exhausted on that amount at 12 per cent. will be about £8,000,000; will the Government devote the remaining £4,000,000 for the re-instatement of the evicted tenants and the relief of the congested districts; and, if not, can he say what the Government proposes to do with it.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The agreements for purchase lodged up to the present in respect of direct sales and sales to the Land Commission represent about £64,000,000. The term of five years prescribed under the Act for the payment of the bonus at 12 per cent. will not expire until 1st November next. The Government are not at present prepared to make any statement as to the possible revision in the terms or percentage of the bonus after that date. A measure dealing with the subject of congestion is, as already announced, to be introduced during the coming autumn sitting.

Boxwell Estate, Wexford.

MR. FFRENCH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he is aware that the Estates Commissioners stated on 26th May last that their inspector's Report on the Boxwell estate, South Wexford, was being considered, and they were preparing the necessary documents to give a preliminary estimate of the price they would be prepared to offer to the vendor's solicitor; whether any offer has yet been made by the Estate Commissioners for the purchase of the Boxwell estate; and, if so, what were its terms, and what was the landlord's reply.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On the 23rd instant the Estate Commissioners furnished to the owner a preliminary estimate of the price which are they propared to offer for the estate in question, and are now awaiting his reply. It is not the practice of the Commissioners to give information as to the prices offered in such cases.

Service of Writs in County Cork.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to a statement contained in the evidence of Mr. H. R. Barry, solicitor, Kanturk, at the hearing on appeal of the malicious injury application of Lieutenant John MacCarthy O'Leary against the Cork County Council, to the effect that some writs were being served a very short time ago on some of the applicant's tenants, and that these writs were taken from the bailiff and revolver shots were fired over his head; whether he can state the time and place at which this outrage is alleged to have taken place; have the police any information of this occurrence; and, seeing that the tenants on the estate of Mr. MacCarthy O'Leary have purchased under the Land Act of 1903, can he explain the necessity for serving writs on behalf of a landlord whose interests in the property had ceased to exist.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have seen a newspaper report of the evidence referred to. The process server alleges that at about 8.30 on the morning of 15th July he was stopped on the road at Drominarigle, in the Kanturk district, by two disguised men who took two writs from his pocket and tore them up, and then fired two revolver shots and decamped. The process server passed a police station shortly afterwards, but did not report the matter to the police, who only heard of it casually on the following day. The police have made careful inquiries, but have been unable to obtain any corroboration of the process server's statement. I understand that the writs were against two tenants of Mr. O'Leary who have not purchased their holdings.

Irish Intermediate Board Rules.

MR. FFRENCH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the new rules formed by the Irish Intermediate Board have yet been published; whether the teachers have at all been consulted with reference to those rules; whether under the new rules only ten marks are given for arithmetic whilst ninety marks are given for algebra, and three languages made obligatory; is he aware that there is a growing feeling in Ireland that under the present intermediate system and its treatment of commercial subjects young men cannot be equipped with the knowledge necessary to render them efficient leaders of industry; and will he take steps to provide that the tendency of the intermediate schools is more in the direction of giving boys a sound practical education, and less in the direction of making them dreamers and book-worms.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Rules for 1909 were laid upon the Table on 23rd June, but will not be published by the Intermediate Education Board until the prescribed period of forty days has expired. I am informed that before the Rules were made, the Board received and duly considered several communications on the subject from teachers of intermediate schools. The percentage of marks allotted to arithmetic and algebra, respectively, are in the preparatory and junior grades 30 for arithmetic and 70 for algebra, and in the middle and senior grades 10 for arithmetic and 90 for algebra. In the preparatory grade one language other than English is prescribed, and in the three higher grades two languages are necessary. I am not aware that there is any dissatisfaction with the treatment of commercial subjects by the Intermediate Education Board.

War Office Engineers.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state whether he can recommend the payment of removal expenses to members of the staff of surveyors for engineer services, or to make an allowance in respect of such expenses, as is done in the case of the Army Accounts Branch and to public servants in the Admiralty, Office of Works, and Inland Revenue Departments.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question of removal expenses has not been finally settled. I may point out that, owing to recent changes, the circumstances of the War Department surveyors are not altogether comparable to those of surveyors in other offices.

Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the 166 cadetships announced in April last for award at the recent examination for admission to the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, will be sufficient to fill all the vanancies at the college as well as the company which is to be formed at Woolwich; and, if not, will he arrange for the publication, when the result of the examination is known, of an extended list of successful candidates so as to include approximately the number which will be actually required, or make some other alteration in the present system of publishing a list of successful candidates limited to the number of cadetships originally offered for competition, so as to mitigate the inconvenience caused to the parents of candidates, who in many cases, after having made other arrangements for their sons, are informed, some time after the list has been published, that cadetships will be offered to them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) 166 cadetships will not be sufficient to fill the vacancies referred to. When the announcement that 166 cadetships would be awarded was made it had not been definitely decided to form an infantry company at Woolwich. When this decision was reached at the end of May a notice to this effect, and that 60 additional infantry cadetships would be awarded, was given to each candidate attending the recent Army competitive examination. An extended list of successful candidates will, therefore, be published when the result of the examination is known.

Railways in British East Africa.

MR. REES: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government proposes to give any financial assistance towards the construction of railways in British East Africa; and, if so, whether any allotment is proposed for the current year.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) I regret that I am not in a position to add anything to the reply which was given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a similar Question on the 9th instant

Crown Servants in Ceylon.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the director of public works in Ceylon has issued instructions to the consulting engineers to the Crown Agents for the Colony not to recommend Ceylonese applicants for appointments in the Colony; and, if so, whether any action has been taken by the Government in regard to this matter.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) The director of public works is not in a position to give instructions to the consulting engineers, and I am not aware that he has attempted to do so.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Ceylon Government recently advertised for eleven posts of land settlement officers with a salary of Rs.9,000 per annum; whether there were about 200 applicants, mostly Ceylonese, many of whom were highly qualified for the office in virtue of their knowledge of the native languages and of law; and whether all the appointments have been filled up by the selection of European candidates who were less qualified in these respects.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) I am not aware of it, but inquiry will be made.

Native Education in South Africa.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when Parts I. and II. of the Report on Native Education in South Africa will be published, and also the Special Reports on Bechuanaland and Basutoland.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) It is not proposed to lay these further Papers which are not as suitable for publication, as they are either no longer quite up to date or deal with matters of less general interest than the last part which has been published.

Dinizulu.

MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the dearth of information as to the intentions of the Natal Government with regard to the imprisonment and trial of Dinizulu, he will telegraph for an explicit statement for the information of the House before it rises next week.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) The Papers distributed to Members to-day give the latest information in the possession of the Secretary of State, excepting that the governor has now informed the Secretary of State that the Attorney-General anticipates that, so far as the prosecution is concerned, the preliminary examination will be completed almost immediately.

Shetland Cable.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the Postmaster-General if he can state the cause of the breakdown in the Shetland cable recently; and whether it was in any way owing to the operations of trawlers in these waters.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The cause of the breakdown cannot be stated. The cable, at a depth of fifty fathoms, was simply flattened for a short length. There is nothing to show that trawlers were responsible. I regret to say that the cable is again faulty.

Wakefield Post Office.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has considered what loss of light and air the proposed new postal buildings will cause to the Market Street, Wakefield, United Methodist Church, necessitating as it will also the use of the building only by artificial light; and whether he is under treaty with the trustees of the said Church to pay them compensation for damage that has been, or may be, sustained.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The matter has received my careful consideration. I have learned with regret that a satisfactory enlargement of the post office cannot be effected without interference in some degree with the light and air of the adjoining Church; but the enlargement of the office has been designed so as to cause as little interference as possible. I am not under treaty with the trustees of the Church to make any payment to them by way of compensation.

Bristol Post Office.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Mr. W. E. Blake, the contractor for the erection of a new post office at Bristol, has posted notices on the job to the effect that any workmen inquiring whether a fellow workman is or is not a member of a trade union will be instantly dismissed; whether he is aware that this is likely to lead to a dispute; and whether, with the object of preventing any action being taken which may retard the progress of the work, he will take steps to secure the removal of this notice.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I have seen the actual notice, and as it seems to be designed to secure equal rights to all workmen I do not see that I can interfere in the matter.

Telegraph Messengers.

MR. W. T. WILSON: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that when outsiders are employed to deliver telegraph messages on which porterage has to be paid the full amount charged by the Department for such porterage is not paid to them, but that a deduction of 25 per cent. is made by sub-postmasters in some cases; and whether the whole of the porterage should be paid to the messengers.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am not aware of the practice in question; but, if the hon. Member will be good enough to furnish me with particulars of the case or cases to which he refers, I shall be glad to make inquiry in the matter.

Phœnix Park Powder Magazine.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the cost of the removal of the old railings and the supply of new ones around the powder magazine in the Phœnix Park has been done at the expense of the War Office, or is to be a charge on the Vote for the Irish Board of Works; what is the cost of the work; what was the necessity for the expense; at whose request was the expense incurred; is it the fact that the only use to which the estate lately added to the Phœnix Park has been put is for War Office manœuvres; and when will the general public be allowed to participate in the enjoyment of the area added to the park.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) As regards the railings the work has been done at the expense of the War Office, and the cost is estimated to reach the sum of £560. The old wooden fence was worn out and required replacement by a better and unclimbable fence. As regards the new estate, I am informed that only three acres of a total 200 acres have been let by the Board of Works to the War Office to facilitate bridging practice by the troops. The rest of the land, with some insignificant exception, is let on grazing tenancies or under agreements existing at the time of purchase. One of the tenants allows the War Office to use his land for signalling and a little horse training. The property was acquired to prevent its being built over and to preserve the amenities of the Phœnix Park. There is no intention at present to throw it open to the public, and a large expenditure would be necessary before doing so.

Irish Ordnance Survey Staff.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will state how many of the forty-eight field superintendents serving in the Ordnance Survey, Ireland, are effective soldiers, how many are ex-soldiers of the Royal Engineers, and how many are civilians who have never served in the Army; and if he will state the service of each of the superintendents, showing the service of the surveyors and labourers working under their orders.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) Thirty-three of the field superintendents are effective soldiers, four ex-soldiers, and eleven civilians. The service of these men ranges from seven to thirty-eight years, and that of the men under them from one month to thirty-six years. The information for which my hon. friend asks in the latter part of his Question would entail a reference to the records of nearly 500 men, and the Board regret that they do not see their way to supply it.

Duleek Survey Staff.

MR. FIELD: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can state what weekly charge is made for conveyance by the field superintendent, Ordnance Survey, at Duleek, for paying and visiting a detached party at Naul, County Dublin; can he say why a surveyor named Carter was allowed to compel his labourer to work on the bank holiday, 26th June last, and what action has been taken regarding this action on the part of the surveyor; and if it has been reported to the Division Office at Dublin.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The weekly charge for the conveyance to which my hon. friend refers is 6s. 6d. Mr. Carter and the labourer mentioned worked on 26th June, as the former was not notified that that day was a public holiday. A day's leave in lieu thereof was given to both men on 29th June.

Poultry Farms.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether land used either in large or small farms or in allotments for poultry and egg production is agricultural land as contemplated under the provisions of the Agricultural Rates Act, and entitled to the relief provided by that Act.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. The point referred to in it is one which I have no authority to determine, but the needful guidance to a solution of the question may possibly be obtained by the application of the principle recognised by the House of Lords in the case of Smith *v.* Richmond (A.C. 1899, 448). Accordingly, it may be said that if a farm used in part for poultry and egg production comprises land used as arable, meadow, or pasture ground only, the land so used will be agricultural land, notwithstanding its association with the other industry. Allotments used for poultry and egg production would also appear to be agricultural land within the meaning of the Act.

Rating of Chapels and Schools.

MR. HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware of recent decisions of Courts of Law which seriously affect the religious and social work carried on in association with chapels, churches, and Sunday schools; whether he proposes to take any steps to remove the present uncertainty; and whether he will issue a Circular of instructions to local authorities for their guidance, or whether he will undertake to introduce legislation to remove present difficulties.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I presume that my hon. friend refers to questions as to the rating of chapels and schools not exclusively appropriated to public religious worship or not used exclusively as Sunday schools. I have no reason to suppose that local authorities generally are unaware of the law on the subject, and I do not think I could give any undertaking to introduce legislation on the subject. I will, however, consider the suggestion as to a Circular.

Edenbridge Small Holdings Application.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the case of David Nicholls, a labourer occupying a cottage, at 5s. a week, near Edenbridge, in Kent, who, after making an application for land under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, is about to be evicted from his cottage; whether he is aware that the farmer applying for the eviction admitted in cross-examination that David Nicholls had paid his rent regularly and was a decent and respectable man; that no satisfactory reason was given by the farmer for the course which he is taking, and that his action is generally believed to be entirely due to the application made by Nicholls for land under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, whether he is aware that in the neighbourhood in which the man lives many of the existing cottages are already overcrowded and insanitary, and there are no other cottages available at a rent which labourers can pay, so that eviction is greatly dreaded; and whether the Government proposes to take any action in the Housing Bill, or otherwise, to deal with cases of this kind.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My attention has not been called to this particular case, but as regards the last part of the Question I may say that I hope and believe that the result of the Bill will be that cottages will be provided by local authorities where they are required, and that, consequently, in any such case as that mentioned the tenant will be able to obtain another suitable dwelling.

Hired Men at West India Dock Stores.

MR. W. T. WILSON: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that three hired men employed in the Naval Stores, Officers' Department, West India Docks, who are continuously engaged on carpenters' and joiners' work, are paid at the rate of 27s. per week, whilst the London district rate for this class of work is 42s. per week; and whether, in view of the undertaking given by the Government on 1st March, 1906, to pay the standard rate of wages to their employees, he will take steps to raise the wages of these men to the standard rate of the district.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The men are not engaged on joiners' work but on rough carpentry, such as the erection and alteration of racks in the storehouses, and the repair of packing cases, etc. Only one man is continuously employed on this class of work, and he is paid 33s. per week.

Royal Dockyard Joiners.

MR. W. T. WILSON: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that a very large percentage of the joiners employed in the Director of Works Department at the royal dockyards are paid from 1s. to 2s. 6d. per week less wage than is paid by the builders in the towns where the royal dockyards are situated; and whether he will take steps to raise the wages of those men to at least the same rate as that paid by the builders.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The general question of the pay of workmen in the Works Department is now being considered by the Admiralty, and a decision on this and various other grades of labour will shortly be promulgated.

Londonderry Quay Larceny Case.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to a case heard on 16th July at Derry Petty Sessions, in which three men were charged with the larceny of a bottle of porter, value 3d., and returned for trial at the Assizes on bail; whether he could state what has been the cost of this prosecution up to the present; and whether, in view of the trivial nature of the case, he will advise that some other method be adopted for dealing with similar cases in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The three men referred to were charged with stealing porter, of the estimated value of 3d., from a barrel which was stored in a shed on the quays in Londonderry. The accused did not plead guilty or consent to be dealt with summarily, and therefore the magistrates had no power to deal with the case summarily. The prosecution was at the suit of the Derry Harbour Commissioners, and therefore no expenditure from public funds has been incurred. Persons accused of petty larceny have the right to be tried by a jury if they so elect.

Richmond Royal Houses.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the First Commissioner of Works who are the tenants of Pembroke Lodge, Thatched House Lodge, and East Sheen Cottage, Richmond Park, on which £1,990 will be expended in the year ending 31st March, 1909; and of White Lodge, Richmond Park, on which £410 will be spent in the same time; what rents are paid by these tenants; if no rents are paid, who has the nomination of the occupants; are any rates paid to any of the neighbouring boroughs or to the county; and will he in future offer these houses to the highest bidder of the public, so that the outlay on them may be reimbursed to the nation.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The houses mentioned in the Question are "grace and favour" residences in the possession and in the gift of the King. The Office of Works have no concern in the matter except as regards structural repairs, as in the case of other palaces.

Coal Carriage Wastage Allowance.

MR. HEDGES (Kent, Tonbridge): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can now say what conclusion has been arrived at with regard to the withdrawal by the railway companies of free carriage of a wastage allowance on coal freights.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Board of Trade have endeavoured to effect an amicable settlement of this question, but I regret to say that this has not been found possible. The Board have therefore issued the necessary certificate under Section 1 of The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1894, to enable the complainants to take the case before the Railway and Canal Commission.

Census of Production.

Mr. GRETTON (Rutland): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state at what date are the Returns to be made in connection with the contemplated census of production; if all the forms to be filled in by traders and producers have been issued; and, if not, at what date will the remaining forms be ready for issue.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) As provided in the Census of Production Act, persons receiving schedules are given a period of three months after the issue of each schedule within which to make returns. The schedules are being issued as rapidly as possible. The schedules for coal mines and the majority of those for factories, builders, and contractors have already been issued and the remainder will be issued very shortly. The issue of the schedules appropriate to workshops, which will be in a somewhat simpler form, will then be proceeded with at once.

Royalties in Patents.

Mr. HAROLD COX: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the income derived from royalties on patents is treated for purposes of income-tax as earned or unearned income; and whether any distinction is made between such income and income derived from copyrights.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is that such income is treated as unearned. No distinction is made between income derived from royalties on patents and income derived from copyrights, save when the latter is received by the author himself whilst he is still exercising the vocation of an author, in which case it is treated as earned income.

National Revenues.

Mr. WATT: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what were the contributions to the revenue per head of the population of England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, for the year 1907–1908.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The amounts contributed to the revenue in the financial year 1907–1908 per head of population were—

	£	s.	d.
England and Wales -	3	12	9
Scotland - - -	3	7	8
Ireland - - -	2	3	11

Hotel Licences.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether steps will be taken in the compilation of licensing statistics in future to show the number of hotel licences granted in each year in Scotland upon a justice's or magistrate's certificate for six days.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am considering whether it is possible to keep a record for future reference of the information desired by the hon. Member.

Hindu Temples and Mahomedan Mosques.

Mr. REES: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India inherited from its predecessors in title large endowments for the upkeep and repair of Hindu temples and Mahomedan mosques, which they were compelled by the Government at home to make over to the management of committees, appointed *ad hoc*, after resorting to the necessary legislation; and whether, since this action gave dissatisfaction in India which exists to the present day, there is any prospect that the Government will reconsider the present unsatisfactory position in this behalf.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) Under the old Regulations of the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Codes, Government officers were charged with the duty of supervising the proper application of the endowments granted by former rulers for the support of mosques, Hindoo temples, and other religious purposes. In 1863 an Act was passed, No. XX., for the transfer of these duties to trustees, themselves professing the religions for the maintenance of whose services the endowments were granted. The Secretary of State does not accept the statement in the Question that the Government of India are compelled by the Government at home to "carry through this legislation." The principle of non-interference with the religious observances of the people is one of the settled principles of Indian administration. Various proposals, chiefly in Madras, have since been made for giving the public interested in these endowments greater facilities for enforcing the due application by the trustees of funds which should be devoted to religious purposes, but the projects laid before the Government have generally proved open to objections which have been fatal to them. There is, however, a Bill now before the legislative council of the Governor-General, introduced by the hon. Dr. Rashbehary Ghose on 20th March last, for giving greater facilities to the public for calling for and inspecting the accounts of public charities, including trusts of a religious nature. My hon. friend will find the Bill and the debate which attended its introduction printed in the *Gazette* of India for March last, which is in the Library of the House.

Drumkeerin Evicted Tenants.

MR F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners had taken any action with a view of reinstating Peter D. Kelly, an evicted tenant on the West estate, Drumkeerin, County Leitrim; and, if not, whether they will soon do so.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners received Peter Kelly's application for reinstatement on the 15th instant only, and, having regard to the large number of prior applications which have to be considered, they cannot say when they will be able to inquire into the case.

Belcoo Loan Fund Company.

MR. F. MEEHAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a number of poor people in the district of Glenferne, County Leitrim, have been decreed for money borrowed from the Loan Fund Company, Belcoo and Enniskillen, County Fermanagh, notwithstanding the fact that in many instances the money had been repaid and receipts produced; whether the police in the district are in possession of warrants to execute decrees in connection with the same; and, if so, whether he would direct an inquiry to be made into the matter before the police proceed to collect the amounts of the said decrees.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police have received sixty-four warrants for execution upon decrees obtained at the suit of the receiver of the Belcoo and Enniskillen loan fund societies against borrowers and their sureties, many of whom allege that they have paid portions of the debts. The police have been instructed that, in every case in which such allegation is made, they should communicate with the receiver before executing the warrant, and should then proceed as directed by the receiver, who is responsible for any action that may be taken for enforcement of the warrants.

Maghery Sports.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a party of Catholic excursionists on their way from Armagh to the scene of some sports at Maghery, on Sunday, 5th July, instant, were groaned at and insulted by a crowd of Orangemen, who waved Orange emblems and shouted that they would attack the excursionists on their way back, that the route back of the excursionists was arranged between the police inspector and one of the former, and that the route was strewn with broken glass and many of the excursionists' cycles injured thereby; whether he is aware that at Canary Orange Hall 100 or so of the Orangemen assembled, armed with pitchforks, spades, and crowbars; whether, when half the excursionists had passed the Hall, shots were fired at them, several pellets striking the horses and the brakes, to the great alarm of the women and children, and that on the same day an attack was made on a car conveying one of the excursionists for medical treatment; whether any arrests have been made in connection with these occurrences, or whether the police have made any report concerning them; and what action will be taken to prevent a recurrence of such scenes.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police authorities inform me that on Sunday, 5th July, a party of Catholic excursionists proceeded from Armagh to Maghery, but were not interfered with by Orangemen on the way, although some contingents passed through exclusively Orange localities. At one of these places a crowd had assembled at the Orange Hall, but the police arranged with the excursionists that there should be no drumming while passing through this locality, with the result that there was no disturbance. When the excursionists reached Canary on the return journey, a crowd of Orangemen, some of whom had pitchforks, opposed their passage. The police and the leaders on both sides arranged that there should be no band playing by the excursionists, who then passed unmolested. After the party had passed and were out of range several shots were fired by the Orange party, out of bravado, but the shots could not have reached the horses and brakes. The police have no knowledge of any attack made upon a car. It is the fact that broken glass was strewn on the roads in a few places. The police authorities state that this was the first occasion on which a Nationalist procession had passed by this route. The attitude of the opposing party at Canary was menacing, but nothing took place which would warrant a prosecution. The police did everything that was possible to preserve the peace and protect the excursionists, and they appear to have done so with success, seeing that no injury has been reported.

Mountmellick Labourers' Cottage.

Mr. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the site selected by the committee of the Mountmellick Rural District Council for a cottage and plot for Michael Delany, Ballina, Ardderin electoral division, has been fixed on demesne lands; and whether, seeing that the cabin at present occupied by Delany has been condemned by the medical officer as unfit for human habitation, the Local Government Board will take the necessary steps to secure a cottage for this labourer.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The scheme of the rural district council has not yet been received by the Local Government Board. Assuming that the case of Michael Delany is included in the scheme, it will be fully considered by the inspector who will hold the necessary inquiry.

National Education Board Secretaries.

Mr. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that fully one-half of the time of the two secretaries of the National Education Board is spent in writing purely formal and oftentimes useless letters to managers, teachers, and others, and that an ordinary minute or memorandum form would frequently answer the purpose much better; and, seeing that if the latter course were more generally adopted the curtailment of secretarial work thereby effected would allow of the abolition of the position of one or other of these officers, and the consequent saving of his salary of £800 a year, whether he will consider the advisability of having this course adopted.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have referred this Question to the Commissioners of National Education, who inform me that they have nothing to add to the very full information given in my reply to the hon. Member's Question on this subject on 13th July.

Leslie Estate, Ballbay.

Mr. McKEAN (Monaghan, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why, under the sale and purchase of the Leslie estate, at Ballybay, in the county of Monaghan, the agreements for which have been duly signed, it is not proposed to reinstate David M'Clean, of Derryvalley, a tenant who was evicted ten years ago from his holding because he refused to pay an increase of rent.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the lands in which David M'Clean claims reinstatement consist of a town park, and therefore do not come within the provisions of Section 2 (1) (*d*) of the Act of 1903. Moreover, the applicant himself was not the evicted tenant, but his brother, George M'Clean, who is now in America. The Commissioners have decided that in any event the case is not one in which they can take action.

Belfast Lough Foreshore.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state by whose authority some sixteen men who have been earning their living by lifting sand on the Whiteabbey foreshore of Belfast Lough have been forbidden to do so in future; whether he is aware that the consequence of this prohibition is that these men and their wives and families have been reduced to a condition of starvation; and whether he will consider the advisability of taking action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) As the foreshore referred to is under the management partly of the Board of Trade and partly of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests my right hon. friend has requested me to answer this Question. Complaints were made to the Board of Trade that injury to the adjacent land was being caused by the removal of materials from the foreshore under their management, and they have accordingly given instructions to their local officer to warn those found removing such materials that no removal should take place without the permission of the Board. I have no information as regards the particular cases referred to by the hon. Member, but if any application for permission to remove materials is made to the Board of Trade they will consider whether it can be granted, and, if so, under what conditions.

Milford Estate, Ballinrobe.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Milford estate, parish of Kilmaine, Ballinrobe Union, has been offered to the Estates Commissioners or the Congested Districts Board for sale; and, if so, how many years purchase has been asked by the landlord, how many offered, and when is the bargain likely to be closed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Milford estate, which belongs to Mr. C. C. Ormsby, was offered for sale to the Congested Districts Board in May, 1905, but the Board decided not to purchase it, seeing that it is situated in a non-congested district. The owner has since instituted proceedings for the sale of the property to the Estates Commissioners under Section 6 of the Act of 1903. The Commissioners will have the estate inspected as soon as the case reaches its turn to be dealt with, and in the meantime no statement as to price can be made.

Tanderagee Labourers' Cottages.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of applications for labourers' cottages lodged with the clerk of the Tanderagee Rural District Council, before 7th February, 1907; whether he is aware that the council passed fifteen of the applications and formulated a scheme; that, on inquiry by Mr. Dickinson, the Local Government Board inspector, the number was reduced to five, and will he say what was the reason assigned for this reduction; whether he is aware that disease, and particularly tuberculosis, is prevalent in the district, and was attributed by the medical officer and the inspector, in their evidence, to the bad and insufficient housing accommodation of the labourers; whether the inspector had any knowledge of the district before he held the inquiry; and whether he will make an inquiry into the whole matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The number of applications lodged was twenty-nine, and of these the council passed fifteen. The reasons given by the inspector for disallowing ten of the proposed cottages were communicated to the council on 6th March, as follows: In five of the cases the applicants were already living in good houses; in three others the sites selected were unsuitable; in one case the proposed site was on a small holding of five acres; and in the remaining case the applicant was not an agricultural labourer. Evidence to the effect stated in the

Question was given by the medical officer, but it does not appear that the inspector expressed any opinion on the subject. So far as the Local Government Board are aware, the district council have not taken exception to the inspector's decision. The question of making a new scheme to provide dwellings for labourers who may be living in insanitary houses is one for the consideration of the council in the first instance.

Hop Report.

MR. ESSEX: To ask the Prime Minister whether he proposes, upon the recommendation of the Report of the Select Committee upon the Hop Industry, to bring in a Bill prohibiting the use of hop substitutes in the brewing of beer in this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Yes, Sir, it is in contemplation to prohibit by law the use of hop substitutes in the brewing of beer in the United Kingdom. A Bill for the purpose will be introduced at an early date provided general assent is secured to put it through during the autumn session.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Wireless Telegraphy.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what powers, if any, he possesses to prevent the erection of Marconi apparatus on private premises that might be used for the purpose of conveying information.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The Secretary of State for War possesses no such powers. The control of wireless telegraphy is in peace vested in the Postmaster-General, who issues licences, and in war with the Lords of the Admiralty.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: Is it not desirable the War Office should have some control over this matter?

MR. HALDANE: It seems to me more important for the Admiralty.

Territorial Force and the Civil Power.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the terms of enlistment under the Territorial Army Act would enable the Territorial Forces to be used in the aid of the civil power.

MR. HALDANE: The terms of enlistment do not enable the Territorial Force to be specially called out in aid of the civil power. The nature of their liability when under military law was fully explained by me in debate on Army Estimates of 5th March.

6th Batt. Royal Highlanders.

MR. W. THORNE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that under the Territorial Army Forces Act, the 6th Battalion Royal Highlanders, formerly the 4th Volunteer Battalion Royal Highlanders, Perth, under the scheme should be 1,000 strong and only about 400 men have joined, and this only for one year; if he is aware that Lieutenant Colonel Campbell, in the absence of Sir R. D. Moncrieffe, Baronet, at camp on Wednesday, 15th July, paraded the men and, in the course of an address, asked them to support the new Army scheme, and at the close called upon those willing to serve for four years to step forward, and out of 179 men on parade only 10 signified their intention of serving the four years term, and that number consisted entirely of non-commissioned officers; and whether, in view of the provisions of the Territorial Army Act, he intends taking any action to prevent such methods of attempting to get men to join for a long term.

MR. HALDANE: I am not aware of the incident mentioned, but on the facts as stated in the Question I do not consider that the action of Lieutenant-Colonel Campbell was in any way open to reproach. On the contrary I think that such action on the part of the Commanding Officer, whether fruitful or not, is much to be commended. In other cases similar appeals have led many men to come forward.

Fife Imperial Yeomanry—Case of Private Rennie.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the number of occasions on which Private Rennie, of the Fife and Forfar Imperial Yeomanry, was put on fatigue duty during the training period at Annsmuir this year; whether two days after his arrest for alleged disobedience he was taken to the orderly room, when Captain Jury, the Adjutant, and Sergeant-Major Vine, the regimental sergeant, took the evidence of Lieutenant Hutchinson and Sergeant Storrer against Rennie; whether, on Rennie asking for time to prepare his defence and lead evidence on his own behalf, he was informed by Captain Jury that he would be allowed to do so all in good time; whether, despite this promise, he was on the following evening, without having had an opportunity of saying a word or leading evidence on his own behalf, drummed out of the camp; whether he was thus sent away without receiving allowance for his horse or his own pay, and had in consequence to borrow money to pay his train fare home to Methil; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made into Rennie's allegation that Sergeant Storrer had a violent dislike to him, and kept him almost continually on fatigue duty during the whole training, and thus provoked him into the alleged act of disobedience for which he was dismissed.

MR. HALDANE: Private Rennie was put on no extra fatigues beyond those in which all members of the corps took part. After Private Rennie had been remanded by his commanding officer for trial by court martial, the summary of evidence was taken down in the orderly room by the Adjutant. The Sergeant-Major would probably have been present, but was not concerned in the taking of the evidence of Lieutenant Hutchinson and Sergeant Storrer. Private Rennie did not ask for time to prepare his defence, or to lead evidence on his own behalf. He had the opportunity of questioning the witnesses against him, and took advantage of it in the case of Lieutenant Hutchinson. After the summary of evidence had been taken Private Rennie was, as is customary, informed by the Adjutant that when before the court martial he would have an opportunity of saying anything he wished in his defence. The application for trial was forwarded to the General Officer commanding, who considered that the case should be dealt with summarily by the Commanding Officer. The Commanding Officer decided to dismiss Private Rennie from the corps publicly, and as Private Rennie did not deny the charge, and as the evidence was quite decisive, that officer did not consider it necessary again to ask the accused if he had anything to urge in his defence. Private Rennie's horse allowance has been paid to the owner of the horse by the Squadron Commander, who holds a receipt for the same. Private Rennie's pay has been remitted to him, and his Squadron Officer gave him the money for his fare (10s.). The money was not lent to Private Rennie. The Commanding Officer has inquired into the alleged animosity on the part of Sergeant Storrer against Private Rennie, both amongst the officers and non-commissioned officers, and can find nothing to justify the allegation.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: May I ask why Private Rennie had no opportunity of laying his side of the case before the War Office?

MR. HALDANE: His case has been laid before the War Office by the hon. Member.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: But cannot Private Rennie himself be allowed to state his case?

MR. HALDANE: No; the whole matter has been carefully considered.

Officers' Quarters on Foreign Service.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War on what basis the amount of rent charged by the Government to officers on foreign service is fixed, and whether it bears any and what relation to the original cost of the houses in which the officers are quartered; whether in fixing or in maintaining rents which have been fixed in years gone by regard is had to the depreciation in value of such houses resulting from the lowering of the cost of labour or materials, or by wear and tear, or by other causes; whether regard is also had to the fact that officers with their families have frequently no alternative when serving abroad but to accept Government houses at whatever price may be asked for them; whether the rent charged to officers is on such a scale as to involve a substantial profit on the transaction; and, if so, whether the War Office will submit a statement to Parliament showing the profits made out of rents charged to officers; and whether they will affirm their approval of such a system.

Mr. HALDANE: Houses are provided to a limited extent in certain exceptional cases abroad for those officers who, not being entitled to free quarters, find a difficulty in obtaining private accommodation on reasonable terms. There is no compulsion on officers to occupy these Government lettings. The rent charged for these houses is based on the scheme being self-supporting; the South Africa rents being, for instance, arrived at on the basis of interest at 3 per cent. and the repayment of the principal within forty years (the estimated life of the bungalows) plus the cost of insurances and maintenance. In addition, there are charges for water and sanitary services. There is no profit to public funds arising out of the transactions; the Department stands to lose if the lettings are not taken up. The total charges are, however, under revision.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): Can the right hon. Gentleman give us any detailed information as to how much has been paid for the rent of these houses since our troops have been permanently settled in South Africa? Will he bear in mind the officers have no opportunity of getting any other houses?

Mr. HALDANE: I am afraid that would involve a long inquiry which I should be reluctant to have made in view of the labour involved.

Soldiers and Jury Service.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether officers and men of the Territorial Force are exempt from serving on any jury, and whether this exemption extends to officers and men of special and extra special battalions of the late Militia; and, if not, can he say why this privilege has not been extended to them; and whether he is aware that considerable doubt exists on the matter at present, and causes confusion among those in authority.

Mr. HALDANE: Officers and men of the Territorial Force are exempt from serving on any jury. Officers of the Special Reserve are exempt from jury service when on full pay. Non-commissioned officers and men of the Special Reserve are exempt from jury service when subject to military law. The Special Reserve are treated exactly as the Militia, and I am not aware of any doubt or confusion on the subject.

Captain CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in several instances lately men while out on training were called on for jury service and informed that they were not exempted? Will the right hon. Gentleman have this answer circulated for the information of all commanding officers?

Mr. HALDANE said he thought the mention of the matter in that House would suffice.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to place the senior service on an equality in this matter with the junior service?

Mr. HALDANE: We are simply carrying out old traditions.

Captain CRAIG: Is it not the fact that in one case the men are exempt all the year round and in the other only while on service?

Mr. HALDANE was understood to reply that the Territorial Officer was doing duty all the year round, while the Special Reserve was only on service at certain periods.

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman see that all members of His Majesty's Forces have the same privileges in this respect?

Mr. HALDANE: It must be borne in mind that the more numerous the exemptions the greater is the burden on the rest of the community.

British Garrisons Abroad.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, apart from the reduction of the South African garrison, any further withdrawal of troops from foreign or colonial stations is contemplated.

Mr. HALDANE: No, Sir.

Recruits' Pay.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War why a boy in the Regular Army under eighteen years of age who enlists from the Special Reserve is to receive man's pay, whereas a boy of the same age entering the Army in the ordinary way only receives boy's pay.

MR. HALDANE: These boys enlisted from the Special Reserve have done five months training including a course of musketry, and are on an entirely different footing from boys enlisting into the Army direct.

MR. ASHLEY: Does the right hon. Gentleman think that six months in the Special Reserve makes a boy a man?

MR. HALDANE: It goes a very long way towards doing so.

MR. ASHLEY: But is the boy then converted into a man fit for active service?

MR. HALDANE'S reply was inaudible.

Officers Training Corps Camp, etc.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what will be the duration of the annual camp training of the Officers Training Corps; what form the training will take; and what will be the strength of the unit or units which will be trained by one of the officers from the Regular Forces appointed to act as adjutant.

MR. HALDANE: The duration of the annual camp training will be eight to fifteen days for University contingents, and eight days for school contingents. Officers commanding University contingents make their own arrangements with General Officers Commanding-in-Chief, and if possible with officers commanding other University contingents. School contingents will join camps formed for the purpose at convenient centres. Regular officers may be appointed under the Officers Training Corps Regulations to command camps, or such units as may be formed for the purpose of training in camp. The training given will be entirely connected with duties in the field. At present adjutants have been, or are about to be, appointed to the contingents of Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh Universities, the approximate strength of these contingents being respectively 520, 530, and 390. Adjutants will be appointed to other Universities or groups of Universities, as may be necessary, having regard to the strength of their contingents, their proximity to one another, and the number of public schools in the neighbourhood, in the training of whose contingents adjutants will be called on to assist.

MR. ASHLEY: Will any considerable expense be placed on the members of this Officers Training Corps?

MR. HALDANE: No. We have provided all that is necessary, and there will be the same allowance as to the Regulars.

Royal Engineer Special Reserve.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War why, in view of his decision that men over thirty-six years of age are not suitable for active service abroad, a man is permitted to re-enlist into the Special Reserve of the Royal Engineers, under Army Order 186 of 1908, up to thirty-five years of age for a period of four years.

MR. HALDANE: Good tradesmen were always allowed to enlist in the Militia Royal Engineers up to thirty-five years of age. This regulation has been extended to the Royal Engineers Special Reserve as it is essential that there should be a proportion of good and experienced tradesmen in these units. I may add that these Engineers have not the same war strain on them that Cavalry, Artillery, and Infantry have to endure.

*MR. ASHLEY: Surely there is more strain on the man building a bridge under fire than on the man who crosses it?

[No Answer was returned.]

Territorial Regiment—Instructors' Pay.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the result of the new regulations for the payments from Association funds to instructors on the permanent staff of Territorial regiments will be to reduce emoluments of the instructors employed by two Ayrshire battalions from £22 per annum to £6 10s.; and, seeing that such reduction will be regarded by the instructors as a breach of contract, whether he will arrange to continue the present scale until the termination of existing contracts.

Mr. HALDANE: No rate has yet been approved pending the receipt of revised proposals from the Association. It is not proposed to continue rates paid by Volunteer corps unless they are justified by the conditions of the Territorial Force Corps. The permanent staff are not serving on any definite contract—they are liable at any time to be reverted to their regular unit. The hon. Member is referring only to the allowances from Association funds, and has not mentioned the regular pay and allowances which, if all are taken in cash, amount to about 43s. weekly.

Mr. COCHRANE: Will there be any reduction?

Mr. HALDANE: I hope it will be just the contrary. Many bad systems have grown up, and the matter is now being properly regulated.

Mr. ASHLEY: Will there be an appeal to the County Association or to the War Office?

Mr. HALDANE: They can always revert to the conditions on which they came into the Line.

Mr. ASHLEY: But will there be any appeal?

Mr. HALDANE: Practically, no. We shall leave the matter to the Association.

Inns of Court Volunteers.

Viscount VALENTIA (Oxford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War why the 27th Battalion County of London Regiment (Inns of Court) has not received official recognition as a unit of the Territorial Force, having enlisted more than 30 per cent. of its establishment; and whether it is intended to convert this battalion into an officers' training corps.

Mr. HALDANE: It has been decided that this unit shall be forthwith recognised as a Territorial Force unit as contemplated by the Territorial Force establishments. Regulations will subsequently be issued for the organisation of the unit as an officer's training unit for the Territorial Force.

Viscount VALENTIA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, though the Inns of Court Regiment is not a recognised unit of the Territorial Force, the officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the battalion will be entitled to pay and allowances as such during their forthcoming camp at West Down, Salisbury; and whether those composing the mounted detachment will be granted horse allowance for hire and forage as heretofore.

Mr. HALDANE: This unit will camp as a Territorial Force unit, the officers and men receiving pay and allowances as Infantry. The Territorial Force establishments do not provide for a mounted detachment. In accordance however with the request of the unit the men who composed the Mounted Infantry detachment in the Volunteers will be allowed this year to train as mounted men and to furnish horses, forage, etc., without expense to the public, pending a settlement of the future organisation of the unit.

Woolwich Common.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the fact that under 43 Geo. 3, c. 35, by which the Ordnance authorities acquired certain lands in Woolwich, all common of pasture and turbary and other common rights and privileges thereon were reserved, he will now abandon the proposal to fence in any part of Woolwich Common.

Mr. HALDANE: My hon. friend has been misinformed. The Act in question contains no such reservation.

Mr. CROOKS quoted the words from the Act in regard to common pasture and turbary and asked should this be the subject of reference to the Attorney-General.

MR. HALDANE replied that it was quite unnecessary to refer the matter to the Attorney-General. The words to which his hon. friend had called attention referred to common rights which were bought and paid for long ago.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) asked whether, in view of the fact that within fifteen months there had been three attempts to take land from the common, the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider this matter.

MR. HALDANE said he could not do that. It was absolutely necessary to take ground for training a company. To encroach on the rights of the public would be the last thing in the world that he would wish, but he was bound to do what he could to secure the efficiency of these officers. The War Office had bought and paid for all the rights.

MR. CROOKS asked whether these lands were not the waste lands of the manor of Eltham.

MR. HALDANE repeated that all the rights were bought long ago.

The Union Jack.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the King's Regulations provide that the Union Jack shall be flown at certain military stations on anniversaries and other occasions, he will direct that Empire Day shall be observed as an anniversary both at home and abroad.

MR. HALDANE: I have nothing to add to the replies which have been given to the House on previous occasions in reference to flying flags on Empire Day.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked what was the object of the Government in smothering up the Empire Day movement.

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): What is Empire Day? I do not know the date of it, and I do not care.

British Officers at Foreign Manœuvres.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War on what principle the selection of officers to attend foreign manœuvres is based; whether any grant is made to defray expenses, and whether extra leave beyond the ordinary is granted for this purpose.

MR. HALDANE: As a rule a very limited number of permissions to attend foreign manœuvres are available and a selection has to be made from the very large number of applicants who wish to be present. In selecting officers to attend preference is given to those who have special linguistic or professional qualifications. Grants in aid of travelling expenses are occasionally made and attendance is regarded as a duty and not as leave.

MR. ASHLEY: Do they get ordinary leave in addition to extra leave?

MR. HALDANE: Oh yes.

Grantham Barracks.

LORD J. JOICEY-CECIL (Lincolnshire, Stamford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is proposed to use the barracks of the late 4th Battalion Lincolnshire Regiment (Militia) at Grantham, Lincolnshire, as headquarters for the Special Reserve recruits of the 4th Notts and Derby Regiment.

MR. HALDANE: This matter is at present under consideration.

Territorial Cyclists.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many of the cyclist battalions of the Territorial Force have been raised and recognised; and what is their present strength.

MR. HALDANE: Eight cyclist battalions have been recognised up to the present, and their total strength on the 1st July was seventy-one officers and 2,241 non-commissioned officers and men.

Cyclist Companies.

MR. CARLILE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of the fact that the absence of cyclist companies from the infantry battalions of the Territorial Force will much impair the value of the tactical training it is possible to give to the infantry, whether he will consider the advisability of making provision for the addition of cyclist companies to these battalions.

MR. HALDANE: The Army Council has decided to sanction the formation in each battalion of Infantry, at the discretion of the Association, of a cyclist section, composed of one officer, 2 non-commissioned officers and twelve men. This section will be within the establishment of the battalion, and will receive the same rates of pay as the rest of the battalion.

MR. CARLILE asked if the decision come to was not contrary to the opinion held by nearly all commanding officers.

MR. HALDANE said that it was a matter which must be decided by the General Staff.

British Force at Natal.

MR. G. GOOCH (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the number of Imperial troops at the present time in Natal; and what is their annual cost to the British taxpayer.

MR. HALDANE: There are at the present time rather less than 900 Imperial troops in Natal, and their cost is approximately £70,000 a year.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): May I ask whether the presence of these troops does not operate to support the Natal Government in maintaining martial law?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion.

Hong Kong—Loss through Government Opium Policy.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what loss to the finances of the Colony of Hong Kong will be caused by the opium policy imposed upon it by the Colonial Office: and what compensation, if any, from Imperial revenues will be paid.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The whole question, including the points to which my hon. friend refers, is under the consideration of the Secretary of State in consultation with the Governor; and I am not in a position to make any statement with regard to it at present.

East African Protectorate.

SIR C. HILL (Shewsbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the labour rules referred to on page 1 of the recent correspondence relating to affairs in the East Africa Protectorate [Cd. 4122] as having been fully approved by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies were submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State before promulgation.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir. The rules were promulgated by the Governor before submission to the Secretary of State.

MR. ASHLEY: Are we to understand that the President of the Board of Trade had authority to approve these regulations without consulting the noble Lord?

COLONEL SEELY: I do not think we can assume that at all. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will address a Question to my right hon. friend on the subject.

Land Tenure in East Africa.

SIR C. HILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the legislation relating to land tenure in the East Africa Protectorate, which is indicated in the despatch from Lord Elgin of the 19th March, 1908 (No. 9, in Cd. 4117), has yet been introduced; whether, if so, it has met with approval in the Protectorate; and whether the Ordinance, as finally settled, will be laid before Parliament.

COLONEL SEELY: An Ordinance is being drafted, but has not yet been introduced into the Legislative Council. The Ordinance, when passed, will be included among the papers relating to land tenure in East Africa Protectorate which will be laid before Parliament in continuation of the papers already present.

MR. REES asked if somewhat similar regulations would be promulgated for other Protectorates on the coast.

COLONEL SEELY: That is rather a large Question: I should like notice of it.

South African Compensation Fund.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford). I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the fact that correspondence from the High Commissioner in South Africa, with reference to the amount of administration of the Compensation Fund, remained unanswered for several months, occasioning a loss of £41,420 7*s.* 11*d.* to the Imperial Exchequer; and whether steps have been taken to expedite replies in the future to communications received by the Colonial Office.

COLONEL SEELY: The reference is, I presume, to Section 10 of the Second Report of Public Accounts Committee just laid. It is quite a mistake to suppose that any loss of public money occurred or that any additional charge was thrown upon the Exchequer through the action of the Colonial Office, for whatever may have been the merits of the question whether administrative expenses could properly be charged to the fund the Colonial Government had unquestionably full power to spend the money in increasing the compensation paid to protected burghers. I would refer my hon. friend as regards this compensation fund to the Report of the Central Judicial Committee printed in Cd. 3028. I must deny that there was improper delay in the matter on the part of the Colonial Office. The money has since been re-voted by Parliament.

Portuguese East Africans in the Transvaal Mines.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in signing their labour contracts, the native labourers for the Transvaal mines recruited in Portuguese East Africa are compulsorily repatriated at the end of their period of work; and, if so, whether the Government intend to make representations to the Transvaal Government with a view of altering the necessity of repatriation.

COLONEL SEELY: The Answer to both parts of the hon. Member's Question is in the negative

Dinizulu's Salary.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the attention of the Secretary of State has been called to the statement made on 3rd June by the Attorney-General that the legal documents which passed between the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the Colony of Natal, in 1897, showed that it was literally and legally the case that the payment of the salary of Dinizulu was a condition of the incorporation of Zululand with Natal; and whether, in view of the fact that the Natal Government have imprisoned Dinizulu and deprived him of his salary, without the approval of the Secretary of State, the opinion of the Attorney-General has been brought to the notice of the Natal Government.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State is aware of the opinion of the Attorney-General, and I would refer my hon. friend to the telegrams to the Governor which he will find in the Blue-book which is being distributed to-day.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: What about the answers from the Governor in response?

COLONEL SEELY: I shall be able to make a statement to-morrow.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): Are the Natal Government aware that all sections are united in the belief that the Government are in honour bound to pay Dinizulu's salary?

COLONEL SEELY: I am sure that every Member of the House will be glad to hear the statement from the front Opposition bench, that there is such a binding obligation. I think the Natal Government should be informed that that is the view of all Members of this House.

MR. MACKARNESS: Have the Natal Government expressed any dissent from the view of the Attorney-General?

COLONEL SEELY: I had better leave that till to-morrow.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government, in arriving at the conclusion to pay the salary to Dinizulu in disregard of the decision of the Natal Government, considered the effect such action would have upon the trial now proceeding, and also upon the *status* and rights of a self-governing Colony to manage its own affairs and the trial of alleged rebels.

COLONEL SEELY: Yes, Sir.

Natal Indemnity Bill.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Natal Indemnity Bill has passed both Houses of the Colonial legislature; whether the Government are now in possession of the terms of such Bill: whether those terms are identical with the terms of The Natal Indemnity Act, 1906, with the omission of Section 9 of that Act; and whether he will lay a copy of the Bill upon the Table before the debate upon the Colonial Office Vote.

COLONEL SEELY: Yes, Sir, the Bill has passed. It is similar to, but not identical with, the Act of 1906, the provisions for the prospective operation of the indemnity being omitted. Details will be found in the Papers distributed to-day.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Woodstock division of Oxfordshire, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether, in view of the obligation undertaken by the British taxpayer to provide Dinizulu's salary, His Majesty's Government will make every effort to secure the trial or release of the chief without further delay.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State understands that the preliminary examination is practically concluded, so far as the prosecution is concerned, and it is therefore to be hoped that Dinizulu will soon be brought to trial or released. The Secretary of State is not in a position to interfere in regard to the course of the proceedings.

Dinizulu's Trial.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Secretary of State has been informed by the Natal Government why it is necessary to examine more than 100 witnesses on behalf of the prosecution against Dinizulu before formulating any definite charge against him; and whether he can give any approximate date when the Attorney-General of Natal will consider that sufficient evidence has been laid before the magistrate to enable him to decide whether the prisoner shall be committed for trial or discharged.

COLONEL SEELY: The Governor telegraphed to the Secretary of State on Saturday last that the Attorney-General has informed him that he anticipates that the preliminary examination of Dinizulu will be completed as far as the prosecution is concerned almost immediately. The Natal Government have not specifically informed the Secretary of State of the reasons why it has been necessary to examine so many witnesses. But it is clear that, greatly as the prolongation of the preliminary examination is to be regretted, it would be unjust to Dinizulu to spring upon him any charge at the trial which had not been exposed to him in the preliminary examination; as a consequence the production of new evidence has rendered a multiplication of witnesses unavoidable. Dinizulu's counsel have not taken any legal action indicating a desire that the preliminary examination should be closed.

MR. MACKARNESS: Did not Dinizulu's counsel apply that the magistrates should be removed?

COLONEL SEELY: That was an objection to the personality of the magistrate and not the procedure.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the unprecedented length of the preliminary examination to which the chief Dinizulu has been exposed in Natal, its secret character, and the refusal of bail to the prisoner, the Secretary of State will inform the House whether by the law of Natal a British subject is deprived of the right to a writ in the nature of a writ of *habeas corpus* where he is unjustly detained in prison; and, if he is not so deprived, whether the Secretary of State is aware of any reason why such a writ has not been moved for on behalf of the chief.

COLONEL SEELY: The writ of *habeas corpus* does not exist, I understand, in Natal, but there is an analogous procedure. For such a procedure to be successful it would be necessary to show that the authority under which the prisoner is detained is illegal and as far as the Secretary of State is aware, it is, and always has been, open to the prisoner, if his legal advisers consider this to be in his interests, to take steps to test its legality. I presume that they do not advise such steps.

Dinizulu's Trial—Constitution of Special Court.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state who will be the members of the special court appointed to try Dinizulu; and by what law and rules of evidence the court will be bound at the trial.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir, I regret that I am not yet in a position to say who the members of the Court will be, but full information with regard to the composition of the Court will be found in the Papers which are now being distributed. I have telegraphed to the Natal Government to send the names in view of to-morrow's debate.

MR. MACKARNESS: Will the ordinary law of Natal obtain at the trial?

COLONEL SEELY: The answer to that will be found in the text of the Special Court Bill.

Alleged Flogging of Witnesses.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that Miss Colenso, in reply to a statement of Lieutenant-Colonel Green, Minister of Railways in the Natal Government, denying the flogging of natives in respect to the procuring of evidence against Dinizulu, has given twenty-nine cases of flogging, including some cases of the flogging of women, in addition to those officially admitted; and whether those cases of flogging will come within the purview of the proposed Indemnity Act, and their perpetrators become immune from punishment.

COLONEL SEELY: I am aware that allegations of flogging have lately been made and denied. With regard to Miss Colenso's assertion I notice that according to a Press telegram the Prime Minister of Natal on the 23rd instant stated that the Government had inquired into all the alleged cases of assault during the military operations in the northern districts and promised further investigation upon a formal complaint being made and some proof offered in support of Miss Colenso's allegations. My hon. friend will find information regarding the Indemnity Bill in the Papers which are being distributed to-day.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is it more favourable to the illegal action of the Natal Government——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member must not refer to a friendly Colonial Government in that way.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I did not refer to it in the way you thought, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member assumes that a thing is illegal. That remains to be proved.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: With great respect, Sir, everything done under martial law is *prima facie* illegal.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not the business of the hon. Member to lecture me on the subject of martial law.

Martial Law in Natal—Indemnity Bill.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, having regard to the sensation produced in this country by the method of administration of martial law in Natal, and the grave character of the charges advanced against officials in respect to their conduct towards the natives in carrying out the martial law system, the opinion of the House of Commons will be ascertained before the assent of the Crown is given to any Indemnity Bill passed by the Natal Legislature, and that such assent be not given when the Imperial Parliament is not sitting, and accordingly without opportunity of discussing the situation in Natal to any effective purpose.

COLONEL SEELY: The House will have an opportunity of discussing those questions to-morrow. Assent will not be given before the discussion.

Dinizulu's Chieftainship.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the effect of Section (b), Clause 1, of the Natal Indemnity Act, confirming all orders made by the supreme chief, will be to legalise Dinizulu's deposition from the chieftainship, which was proclaimed by Colonel MacNevil at Usutu last December, when he said Dinizulu would not return; and whether, having regard to the fact that, if this be the true construction of the Indemnity Bill, Dinizulu, even if acquitted, would still be deprived of his chieftainship, the Government propose to take any, and, if so, what, steps in the matter.

COLONEL SEELY: I do not think that Colonel McKenzie can at any time have had authority to issue an order of the supreme chief, nor am I aware that such action was ever taken by him. I do not think, therefore, that there is any reasen to apprehend the consequences feared by my hon. friend.

Land in Zululand—Alleged Breaches of Faith.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is in a position to communicate to the House the reply of the Government of Natal as to the powers in Zululand and in Natal respectively of the supreme chief, controverting the view taken by the Under-Secretary for Native Affairs on behalf of the Colonial Secretary of Natal; and whether the reply on the broader issue as to continuous breaches of faith with the Zulus in regard to their land, referred to on the 12th May, has yet been received.

COLONEL SEELY: The answers have now been received and the first will be found in the Blue-book which is now being distributed. It is not proposed to publish the other at present.

Legal Status of Zulus.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the constitution granted to Natal contains any exceptional reservations or conditions depriving the Government of that Colony of such powers as are possessed by other Colonial Governments; and whether the circumstances of the incorporation of Zululand with Natal so operate as to affect the legal *status* of the Zulus as subjects of the Government of the Colony.

COLONEL SEELY: The supreme chief has of course a special position in Natal as compared with other responsibly governed colonies and special protection as to lands was given to the Zulus on annexation. But these do not amount to depriving the Colonial Government of ordinary legal powers. The constitution of Natal is in the main the same as that of other responsibly governed colonies and the *status* of Zulus is similar to, although perhaps not identical with, that of other Natal natives.

Shipping Claims against Russia.

MR. McARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any final decision has yet been given in the Russian courts with respect to the claims for compensation for losses sustained by the British ships "St Kilda," "Hipsang," and "Oldhamia," respectively, during the Russo-Japanese war; and what is the present position of these cases.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. J. A. PEASE, Essex, Saffron Walden; for Sir EDWARD GREY): My right hon. friend has nothing at present to add to the Answer he returned to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for Darlington on the 11th ult., to the effect that these particular cases are still before the Prize Court and that the Embassy is doing all in its power to expedite the hearing.

MR. McARTHUR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any reply has been received from the Russian Government to the representations made by His Majesty's Government with regard to the cases of the "Knight Commander," "Calchas," and "Malacca," respectively; and what is the present position of the cases.

Mr. J. A. PEASE: As regards the "Knight Commander," my right hon. friend must refer to the Answer he gave on the 2nd ult. to the hon. Member for North Hackney, in which he stated that the Russian Government had refused to submit the case to arbitration. His Majesty's Government have expressed their regret at this decision, and have set forth in an official despatch the grounds on which they are unable to share the views of the Imperial Government in declining to assent to their proposal. As my right hon. friend stated in his Answer to the hon. Member for Darlington on the 11th ult., the attention of the Russian Government has again been called to the case of the "Calchas." The Russian Government have agreed to pay a lump sum in satisfaction of the claims arising out of the detention of the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steamers "Malacca" and "Formosa," and these cases are in course of settlement.

The Case of Mr. Luxenburg.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can now state the result of his demand on the Russian Government for compensation to Mr. Luxenburg for wrongful arrest and imprisonment.

Mr. J. A. PEASE: This case has been considered carefully in consultation with the Home Office and the Legal Advisers of the Crown. Mr. Luxenburg was arrested by mistake, kept in prison for a fortnight, and then released. There is nothing in international law on which we could found a claim to compensation as of right, nor is it the practice in this country to admit a claim when a man has been arrested by mistake and afterwards acquitted or released, though compensation has occasionally been given as an act of grace. In this case there is no doubt that Mr. Luxenburg has suffered severely from the conditions of his imprisonment, and in view of this fact, my right hon. friend is submitting the whole circumstances to the Russian Government, and is asking that some compensation should be given. He does not propose to publish Papers.

San Thome Cocoa Industry.

*Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British consular agent on the island of San Thomé is a Portuguese and a near relative of an influential planter engaged in the cocoa industry; and whether His Majesty's Government will consider the advisability of independent inquiry in the islands of San Thomé and Principe, with special regard to establishing accurate mortality returns, and to the alleged illicit traffic in labourers between the districts from which they are brought and the islands.

Mr. J. A. PEASE: The British consular agent at San Thomé, who is a Spanish subject and himself the manager of one of the larger cocoa plantations, was appointed on the recommendation of Consul Nightingale, who had visited the island and who considered that he was the most suitable person for the post. He is not a salaried official. With regard to the advisability of an independent inquiry into the servical system in the islands of San Thomé and Principe, my right hon. friend would refer the right hon. Member to the Answer given on the 29th October, 1906, to a Question put by the hon. Member for North Norfolk. My right hon. friend adds that the whole servical question is engaging the serious attention of His Majesty's Government, who are in correspondence with the Portuguese Government in regard to it. A Portuguese official is now actually on the spot investigating the subject with a view to the better enforcement of the regulations, and if necessary their amendment.

Ambergate Reservoir Works.

Mr. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the contractors for the Ambergate reservoir, Messrs. Wright and Company, have during the last two years deducted 6d. per week from the wages of all workmen employed upon their works; whether such deductions are alleged to be made for the supply of tools and medical attendance, without first obtaining the sanction of the workmen to make the same; whether any audit of such accounts has been made in accordance with Clause 9 of The Truck Amendment Act, 1887; whether any report has been received upon the subject from the district factory inspector; and what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): The enforcement of the provisions of the Truck Acts in this employment does not rest with the Home Department, but my right hon. friend made inquiry of the contractors, and I am informed by them that during the period they have been engaged on these works, about twelve months, they have made a deduction of 1d. per working day for tools and medical attendance; but that this deduction has been made by agreement with the workmen to whom the proposal was put at the outset, and who unanimously desired that the arrangement should be made. It is stated that it is the invariable custom in this trade for the men to provide their own tools, and some could not be engaged at all if they were unable to obtain their tools in this way. There has been no audit up to the present, the contractors stating that they were not aware an audit was required, but they are perfectly willing that the accounts should be audited.

MR. JOHN WARD: Do the Home Office propose to take proceedings against this firm for an infringement of the Truck Act?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Home Office has no authority to do so.

Convict Prisons—Female Directors.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many women are members of the boards of directors of convict prisons.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: There are two ladies on the Board of Visitors for Aylesbury Prison, the only convict prison where female prisoners are detained.

Merthyr Tydfil Police.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to difficulties which have arisen in connection with the transfer of police from Glamorgan County Council to the new borough police force at Merthyr Tydfil; and whether he will take such action as may be necessary to safeguard the existing pension rights of such constables as may be so transferred.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The pension rights of constables depend on statute and are independent of any action the Home Secretary can take, but my right hon. friend does not think that any difficulty need arise. No constable need enter the new force except by his own wish. If a constable who has three years service or upwards is transferred on a mutual agreement between the police authorities, he carries his pension rights with him. If there is no such agreement the constable ought, before joining the borough force, to have an undertaking from the police authority of the borough, to allow his previous service of three years and upwards to count for pension.

Confidential Documents as Waste Paper.

MR. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is now able to state the result of his inquiry into the case of the shipment of bales of prison registers and other confidential documents from Hull to London and from London to Bordeaux, which was discovered by the bursting of a bale on a ship lying in the Thames during the first week of May.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I find that the bale in question was part of a consignment of waste paper which was removed from Wakefield Prison by a firm which has a contract with the Wakefield Post Office for the removal of their waste paper. I regret to find that no stipulation that the paper should be treated as confidential had, in this case, been made by the prison authorities. In future, all records of prisoners and other confidential papers will be destroyed or obliterated in the prison. The Secretary of State is obliged to my hon. friend for drawing his attention to the matter.

Asiatics in the Transvaal.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will place in the library a copy of the circular from the Trade and Labour Council of Johannesburg to the trades councils of the United Kingdom, pointing out the feeling which exists amongst local workers against outside interference with the policy of the Transvaal Government in regard to Asiatics, and appealing to British labour unions to support that policy.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): I have been unable as yet to obtain a copy of the circular to which my hon. friend refers.

*MR. REES asked if the decision of an important conference of trade unions in South Africa, objecting to the interference of the Home Government in labour questions, could not be made known in this country?

MR. CHURCHILL said he had tried to get the information for his hon. friend. If however he was in possession of some, perhaps he would communicate it to him.

Automatic Couplings.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the compulsory adoption of automatic couplings in the United States in 1893 has reduced coupling accidents by 80 per cent. in one year, the average reduction during the last six years being over 70 per cent., notwithstanding an increase of 70,000 men and 523,083 vehicles; whether the proportion of coupling accidents acknowledged by the railways in the Return of shunting accidents for 1907 exceeds 24 per cent., or 1 in 4, of the 3,221 shunting accidents recorded in that year; whether the Royal Commission on Accidents to Railway Servants in July, 1899, condemned the shunting-pole system and urged trials of automatic couplings and like appliances; and whether he will exercise the powers vested in him under The Railway Employment (Prevention of Accidents) Act, 1900, and institute exhaustive tests of the various automatic couplings offered, with a view to secure an appliance that will reduce coupling accidents in this country.

MR. CHURCHILL: I fear that my hon. friend has misread the American statistics. Coupling accidents in the United States, including fatal and non-fatal alike, appear to have been reduced by 80 per cent. between 1893 and 1902, that is to say in nine years, not in one year. Since 1902, however, there has been a considerable recrudescence. For whereas the lowest figure of 143 fatal accidents was attained in the United States of America in 1902, in the five years 1903–1907 the number of fatal accidents of this class in the United States has varied from 243 to 311. I am aware that the figures are not in all respects comparable with the total for this country—which only varied in the same period from 9 to 23—but they indicate that an automatic coupling is not an absolute safeguard. On the general question I must refer my hon. friend to the Report of the Railway Employment Safety Appliances Committee which has just been circulated, and in particular to Colonel Yorke's memorandum attached thereto.

MR. MADDISON: Is it not the fact that that Committee instituted no test at all of their inquiry.

MR. CHURCHILL: I did not follow the actual course of the Committee investigation, but the Committee was very highly qualified for dealing with the subject, and it had on it representatives of the men.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Did I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that the use of automatic couplings adopted in America does not obviate the danger of fatal accidents?

MR. CHURCHILL: I said they were not an absolute safeguard. Other accidents arise as the result of automatic couplings.

Weights and Measures Stamping Fees.

MR. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that some local authorities charge stamping fees on every weight, measure, and weighing instrument submitted for inspection, even though such weight, measure, or weighing instrument is found correct and already stamped; whether the regulations provide against such charges; and, if not, whether he will so alter the regulations so as to make fees payable only when weights are found unstamped or require adjusting.

MR CHURCHILL: The law provides that stamping fees shall be charged on the verification, but not on the inspection of weights, measures, and weighing instruments. Under the Weights and Measures Regulations of 1907, weights, &c., brought to an Inspector of Weights and Measures for verification should be dealt with as upon inspection. If my hon. friend has in mind any cases where this course is not followed I should be glad if he would furnish me with particulars.

Marine Insurance.

MR. MACLEAN (Bath): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware of the growth of P.P.I. (policy proof of interest) marine insurances, whereby insurers gamble in vessels in which they have no real interest and thereby put up the rates against the shipowners and other legitimate insurers and otherwise damage their interests; and, if so, will he take into consideration the advisability of devising means to counteract this growing evil.

*MR. McARTHUR asked whether it was not a fact that these insurances, while undoubtedly used for gambling purposes, were also extensively used for the insurance of interests which were real and substantial, but difficult of proof under the law of marine insurance.

MR. CHURCHILL: No doubt the matter presents many complications. My attention has been called to these insurances, and I will consider, in conjunction with the interests concerned, whether any action can usefully be taken with regard to them.

MR. MACLEAN asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would pay special attention to the case of the "Albion." The outside policies taken out by persons who had no real interest in the ship amounted to twice its value. Would the right hon. Gentleman take into consideration not only the financial interests involved, but also the serious risk of loss of life?

MR. CHURCHILL: Certainly I will give that undertaking.

Provincial Homes Investment Company.

SIR F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to a case tried before Judge Parry, in Manchester, in which a woman named Pointon recovered £37 10s. from a company called the Provincial Homes Investment Company; whether he is aware that the learned judge described this company's prospectus as containing in every page statements that are either direct untruths or alluring half-truths; whether he is aware that a similar judgment was given against this Company by Judge Greenwell, at Newcastle; whether he is aware that there are other companies obtaining the savings of the thrifty poor by the same misrepresentations; and whether he will have the affairs of these companies investigated by Royal Commission or otherwise with a view to their winding-up and also with a view to legislation which will protect the working classes in the future.

MR. CHURCHILL: My attention has been called to the case referred to by my hon. friend and to the remarks of Judge Parry. I have directed that a careful examination of the subject be made in order to see whether further legislation is necessary. I ought to add for the information of a number of persons who have addressed communications to the Board of Trade on this subject that the Board have no power, statutory or otherwise to require any sums paid to this or similar companies to be refunded.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Has the Board of Trade any power compulsorily to wind-up this company?

[The Answer was inaudible].

Meat Supply—The Proposed Inquiry.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, having regard to the danger to the cattle and means of livelihood of more than 200,000 small farmers and purchase-annuitants in Ireland from the free importation of the live cattle from Canada and the Western States of America, he will take care that Ireland shall be represented by at least one person practically acquainted with the Irish cattle trade on the proposed

Departmental Committee to inquire into the question of the meat supply of the United Kingdom.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether in consideration of Ireland's interests in the cattle trade and in a view of the attempt that is being made to allow foreign store-cattle into this country, thereby laying the Home herds open to the risk of disease, he will appoint on the meat Committee at least two Members from Ireland who have a practical knowledge of the subject from the agricultural point of view.

Mr. E. BARRY (Cork County, S.): At the same time may I ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, as Ireland is interested in the subject to be inquired into by the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the meat trade, he will appoint at least two representatives from Ireland who have a practical knowledge of the store and fat cattle industry as its affects the producer and the nation as a whole.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have nothing to add to the Answer I gave on Saturday to the hon. and learned Member for Waterford when I said that I am reluctant to add to the number of the Committee by the appointment of representatives of special interests or views. It is a Departmental Committee. Its reference is strictly limited to the specific financial and economic aspects of the question, and it does not extend to recommendations affecting the conditions of the importation of cattle. I am still in communication with the hon. Member on the subject.

Mr. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the reference to the proposed Departmental Committee on meat distribution will permit inquiries into the prevalence of disease in colonial and foreign countries, and the dangers of infection being conveyed to the United Kingdom and suggested removal of restrictions on importation of live cattle.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Questions affecting the diseases of animals in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, or the importation of live cattle from abroad, do not come within the terms of reference to the proposed Departmental Committee, which will be solely concerned with eliciting the facts as regards the effect of combinations on the meat supply of the United Kingdom.

London Electricity Bills.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will consent to the Second Reading of the London Electricity Bills (3) being put off till the autumn session so that the London local authorities may have an opportunity of considering the new proposals of the Board of Trade (which have only to day, 25th, been published in the papers) and submitting their views before the debate on the Second Reading takes place; and also whether any advantage will be gained by taking the Second Reading now.

Mr. CHURCHILL: My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. I am advised that it would be fatal to the Bills if the Second Reading were postponed to the autumn session. As regards two of the three Bills, the proposal to make the London County Council the purchasing authority is not new, but was considered by the Committee of the other House. Full opportunity will be given for existing purchasing authorities to be heard before the Committee and ample time will be available for the preparation of their case.

Mr. MORTON pointed out that very large expense might be avoided if the local authorities were allowed an opportunity of considering the matter by the Second Reading?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not think that possible.

Wales and Post Office Clothing Contracts.

Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his Department has made separate contracts with Irish firms for tailoring, boots, and waterproofs for postmen employed in Ireland; and, if so, why similar arrangements cannot be made in respect of postmen employed in Wales.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): As regards contracts with Irish firms I may refer my hon. friend to the reply I gave to the hon. Member for South Down on the 7th instant, of which I am sending him a copy. There is no separate branch of the postal stores department in Wales, and it would not be practicable to earmark for the Welsh service the work of a particular contractor. But I should be glad to receive tenders from Wales for the general supplies.

*MR. REES: What is the exact difficulty in treating Wales in this respect in the same way as Ireland?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: It is not a separate branch of the postal department.

MR. REES: Cannot it be made separate?

[No Answer was returned.]

Newcastle-under-Lyme—Postal Pay.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether under the new classification of post offices, the scale of pay of postmen at Newcastle-under-Lyme has been made less than the scale of pay at Stoke-on-Trent, and, if so, on what this difference in pay has been based.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The principles of the classification of the outdoor force and the modifications introduced by me, are explained on page 57 of the Parliamentary Paper issued on the 11th instant. Both as regards the units of work and the cost of living, Newcastle-under-Lyme is considerably below Stoke-on-Trent, the units of work being 754 at Stoke and ninety-one at Newcastle-under-Lyme, the figures of cost of living being ninety-two at Stoke, and that of Newcastle-under Lyme only eighty-eight. Stoke therefore falls into Class III, and Newcastle-under-Lyme into Class IV. for postmen.

MR. WEDGWOOD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware there is no definite boundary between the two boroughs—and that some of the streets are partly in Stoke and partly in Newcastle? May I further ask on what principle the figures relating to the cost of living are obtained?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: With regard to the first part of the Question they are two distinct postal centres. As to the latter part the figures are supplied by the Board of Trade.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL—POINT OF ORDER.

*MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) asked the Speaker's ruling on a matter arising out of certain occurrences which took place in the forenoon in Standing Committee C. That Committee met at noon to consider the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill. It became apparent that neither the Home Secretary nor the Under-Secretary to the Home Office had been nominated a member of the Committee. The Committee adjourned to see whether some arrangement could be arrived at. By Standing Order 48 it was provided that the nomination, discharge, or substitution of members of a Standing Committee were matters solely for the Committee of Selection. At a quarter-to-one o'clock the Committee reassembled, and the Clerk informed hon. Members that by the direction of the Committee of Selection two hon. Gentlemen had been discharged from the Standing Committee and the two Ministers nominated in their places. He now understood, however, that no meeting of the Committee of Selection, of which three members formed a quorum, had in fact been held for this purpose; and that no valid direction of the nature suggested could therefore have been made by them. In these circumstances he wished to know whether the Home Secretary or the Under-Secretary were members of the Standing Committee, and, if not, whether the proceedings of the Committee were valid, and whether any votes either of them had recorded were valid.

*MR. SPEAKER replied that the statement was correct, except in one particular —namely, when he said that the Committee of Selection made no order. He held in his hand the Report of the Committee, which stated that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and other Members had been discharged, and the Home Secretary and others put in their places. He could not go behind that.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) apologised to the House for the mistake which had been made, and explained that it was largely due to the illness of the Clerk of the Committee which prevented the orders of the Committee receiving that careful scrutiny which they always had.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C. (in respect of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Kearley, Sir Edward Strachey, and Mr. Lynch; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Secretary Gladstone, Mr. Herb rt Samuel, Mr. Solicitor-General and Mr. Leif Jones.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C. (in respect of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Freeman-Thomas; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. King.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee: That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee C. (in respect of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours (No. 2) Bill): Viscount Castlereagh.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order Confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill, without Amendment; Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill; Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill; Holderness Water Bill, with Amendments.

NEW BILL.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1901) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901," presented to Mr. Steadman; supported by Mr. Thorne; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 343.]

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the Borough of Shoreditch (Haggerston Division), in the room of Sir William Randal Cremer, deceased.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

SUPPLY [18TH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Army Estimates, 1908–9.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £840,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Pay, Bounty, etc., of the Special Reserves and Militia (to a number not exceeding 132,737, including 2,000 Militia Reserve), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): I think it will be well if I rise now to make a statement about the present position of the Special Reserve. There is a good deal of misapprehension current about it, and, I think, as regards the figures and facts, it is desirable that these should be placed as clearly and as briefly as I can before the Committee. The Committee will remember how the Special Reserve came into existence and broadly what its character is. It consists of two parts, each of which is touched by this Vote—a Reserve of men and a Reserve of officers. The Reserve of men is itself divided into two subdivisions, the "A" Reserve, which contains the Infantry and the Artillery, and the "B" Reserve, which is intended to provide for auxiliary services, postal corps, extra Army Service Corps men, extra engineer men, and so on, who can be raised upon what might be called a Militia basis. These we designed to get in connection with the Territorial Force; that is to say, to get the class of civilians that trains for the Territorial Force specially to train for the corresponding unit in the Territorial Force, and, of course, as supernumerary to the Territorial Establishment, to take engagement to go abroad on mobilisation. We think that will probably turn out to be effective in getting these extra men, but as their number is comparatively small in proportion to the rest of the Special Reserve, and as it is obvious we cannot get them until the Territorial Force through which they are to train is properly in existence, I do not propose to dwell upon that matter to-day. But the other and larger part of the Special Reserve is in a very different position. I would for the moment leave the officers out of account and deal only with the men, and of the men the most important part in size are the Infantry, but not less important, at all event in function, are the men in the Artillery. Dealing with the Infantry first, it will be in the recollection of the Committee that by a suggestion that came from the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, and which was accepted by the Government, the establishment of the Special Reserve came to be what it is to-day, 101 units—101 battalions—and in accordance with the suggestions of the right hon. Gentleman these units were made of nearly the same character and all of the same organisation, so as to fit them for performing two functions. They could, and must, be used to supply drafts for the wastage of war, and they are also organised so that at all events some of them—I think a considerable number of them—can either proceed as units when they are wanted for lines of communication, and to relieve garrison troops, or for the purpose of themselves taking part with their own officers, and the Special Reserve on its Infantry side in that way becomes divided into two functions. The 101 units will supply drafts, and they will also be available to go to the theatre of war, and some of them will obviously, when the time comes, be earmarked by the force of circumstances mainly for the production of one result and others for the other result. Should they be embodied, they will take, of course, the surplus Reservists of the Regular battalions of the regiments to which they belong, and as recruits come in in time of war it may well be possible that they will expand, and when they move from the depot, as the bulk of them would in such a case, to the barracks which have been rendered vacant by the Regular battalions going to the theatre of war, they will there be able to expand into additional battalions, which can be sent in due time either as drafts or to the front under their own officers. But the great function in producing drafts which the Special Reserve fulfils is to give scientific provision for the wastage of war. That is what the machinery is designed to do. With the pending withdrawals there would be seventy-four battalions of Infantry at home and seventy-four abroad, and fourteen Cavalry regiments at home and fourteen abroad. I will not dwell on the Cavalry, but each of these seventy-four battalions will have behind them one-third of the Special Reserve battalion, which takes the place of the old depot. Their primary purpose is to be there while the training is going on, both of Special Reservists and of men for the Line, to be trained, indeed, as the men who will form an establishment for providing the wastage of war. Hon. Members know what is the difficulty which formerly existed in connection with the Militia. The Militia at the time of the War had what used to be called the Militia Reserve—that is to say, 130,000 men were retained in the Militia for going abroad with the Regular troops, and when these were drawn on for drafts the result was to reduce the Militia battalion to a state of great weakness; so that, though it was useful in a time of war, its maintenance was disastrous to the Militia, and it was abolished, in the hope, however, that the Militia battalions would revive the force and get it out of its dwindling condition. But the Militia was dwindling steadily in 1906 when the changes now brought about were first projected, and the purpose of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act of 1907 was to provide something like a scientific system of producing men who would keep up the wastage of war. The War Office put it to the General Staff, who were asked what they recommended. They pointed out that the Militia was not maintained to go abroad, and that it depended on their goodwill whether they would come out and take service across the seas. They recommended in respect of the Militia Reserve retained to go abroad and on mobilisation that there should be 101 in all the battalions put together, or 58,580 men. All of these men are not fit to go, because young men of seventeen and upwards will be excluded, but they will form a reservoir out of which we can get 35,000 men. That is the actuarial calculation as to the Special Reserve. What is asked is that we should be prepared to supply for six months the wastage of war. These drafts will supply the wastage of war for the first six months, and then, of course, the 35,000 men being at the depôts training, another body will be ready to take the place of the first at the end of the six months, and so the machine will be at work to supply the wastage. There are 124 battalions of Infantry Militia, some of them very low in establishment and very low in the supply of officers. They are as low as 200 and 300 in strength. The establishment and the strength differ by about 50,000 men. The Department amalgamated 23 battalions with the others and produced 101 Special Reserve battalions, 74 to go behind the Regular battalions. An undertaking has been given that the Militia shall train until the end of this year's training. About half have now trained, and as they are trained they pass over into the Special Reserve. The result is that we have a substantial number of men of good age who have come over from the Militia and are now joining the Special Reserve. A question has been raised as to recruiting, and how matters will stand when the new system is in operation. I am glad to say that so far the recruiting for the Regular Army is going on very well. In 1906–7 the recruits taken for the Infantry of the Regular Army were 25,328; this year the number is 27,666. For the first six months of 1907 we received through the Militia for the Regular Army 5,271 men; and this year we have taken from the Militia and the Special Reserve 5,249 men. On 1st January the strength of the rank and file of the Militia Infantry and the Artillery together is 83,672; on 1st July the Militia is 44,137 and the Special Reserve 30,160, making a total of 74,297 men, so that we are not a very great deal behind what the Militia were on 1st January. It is true that we have given the Militia the £2 for turning over; but 71 units of Militia have turned over up to the 18th inst., and the total percentage of men who have come over is 70 per cent. The Infantry have come over at the rate of 69 per cent., and the Artillery at the rate of 75 per cent. There remains to turn over to the Special Reserve 49 units of Militia Infantry and 14 units of Militia Artillery. If they come over in the same way there will be a total coming over from the Militia of 41,918, to which must be added 12,000 recruits coming into the Special Reserve. It is not too sanguine to say, therefore, that we have in the Special Reserve 54,000 men in sight and over 30,000 actually in. The officers are coming over in an admirably large percentage. The next thing to consider is the conditions under which they are being trained. It is very curious to look at the table of recruiting. The War Office has found a very marked difference from the old state of things. In the period just before the summer months recruiting for the Special Reserve is at a much lower rate than it used to be for the Militia. But later on, and as the winter approaches, the rate is higher. The men will not give up summer employment, but as soon as they near the winter months they will be willing to come in. The Committee are not without experience of this. In the autumn of 1906 it was decided to train twenty Militia battalions experimentally for six months instead of forty-nine days. I have got here the table which shows the way in which it is working. The result is that the table of recruiting shows that the recruiting is going on almost in the same fashion for the Special Reserve as it does for the twenty experimental battalions which are trained on the same footing. The recruits taken between the 16th January, when we stopped recruiting for the Militia, and 18th July numbered 12.078. The number of Militiamen who have elected to join the Special Reserve is 20,258; the number who have elected to remain in the Militia is 4,085, and the number who have elected to take a free discharge is 4,478. The number of Special Reservists who, on completing three months drill, have joined the Regular Army is 1,161. Of those who have completed four or five months drill and are under eighteen, only fifty-nine have gone over to the Regular Army, and of those of eighteen and over who have completed five or six months training, eighty-seven have gone over to the Regular Army. Out of the recruits who have enlisted in the Special Reserve 10·82 per cent. have joined the Regular Army. The number of men in the Special Reserve over twenty years of age is 20,994.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) asked what the figures were in regard to men over twenty.

MR. HALDANE: I have not the figures here. That is how matters stand so far as the men are concerned. I will not trouble the Committee with the details of how the various battalions have come over, but I have got here some particulars relating to the officers. The officers are coming over to the Special Reserve better than the men. The men have come over at the rate of about 70 per cent.; but the officers have come over, I will not say *en bloc*, but in a very large proportion of cases *en bloc*. I have stated on a former occasion that the deficiency of officers, including India, is 8,640, and I wish now to explain what steps have been taken to make that formidable figure good. In the first place we have made a Special Reserve of officers the standard of which is the Continental standard of service of one year with a Regular unit on the part of a candidate who has got the necessary knowledge tested by appropriate tests. But we know that, in order to get the Reserve of officers full, it will be necessary to go to the Universities and public schools. We are opening up a sort of second or alternative career to young men who are going in for the professions, but who are not too busy to give a little time to soldiering. If they train for two years in the reformed cadet corps at the public schools that will let them off four months of the twelve which is to constitute the standard, and if they give two years more in the University corps that will let them off another four months. We offer to the University student who is to be a doctor, a barrister, a solicitor, or a schoolmaster, on the production of what is called the "B" certificate, if he chooses to go through four months work with a Regular unit, a commission as a Reserve Regular officer. He gets £20 and his outfit, and he gets £35 down as a solatium for the trouble he has taken in getting his "B" certificate in the belief that that is a very useful sum for a man to receive when he leaves the University. He will be paid as a Reserve officer and he will have to train troops with his Regular unit for about fifteen days in the year. The whole organisation for the training of officers, both in the public schools and at the Universities, has been put under the General Staff. Already arrangements have been concluded with six Universities, and officers' training corps have been formed, the total number of undergraduates who have joined being 2,092. From fifty-nine public schools we have got 7,049 qualified cadets. Of course I do not suggest that anything like all these will become available for the Reserve which we want for mobilisation; but it is satisfactory that, in the case of a scheme which has been working for only a few weeks, so many students and schoolboys should have come forward. Cambridge has given 540, and, in addition, forty-five for the cavalry. Oxford has done still better, and has, up to date, given 674. Manchester has given 111, and it is estimated that Birmingham will furnish 280. The detailed figures relating to the public schools show that Harrow has given 287, Clifton 300, and Uppingham 212. The arrangements in regard to Eton are not yet complete. There is a great deal of evidence of keenness to make this military training a new part of a University career, and it seems to me that this is altogether to the good. Out of 1,113 Militia officers 921 have come in up to date. The proportion which has come over to the Special Reserve, from the regiments which have completed their training is 82 per cent. That is not a bad result, but a good many more

Special Reserve officers are wanted, and the training machinery of the University and public school training course cannot be expected to produce them for several years. Therefore interim means have to be taken to facilitate matters. The first appointments during the transition period will have to be under easier conditions. The plan is that a year shall be the standard except where cut down in connection with the training courses of the Universities and public schools. For the present it is proposed to allow the average candidate for Militia officership to join the Reserve after four months training in a Regular unit, provided he comes in before 15th December next. We have got 82 per cent. of the old Militia officers, and we are beginning the process of getting new officers for the Special Reserve. The process must be very slow until the new training machinery becomes available, but the condition of the Reserve officer will be better than it is under Militia conditions. There will be better pay, better rank, and better provision for giving him employment. It is proposed to allow them to take the place in the Regular battalions when officers were wanted of Regular officers who have been seconded. The colonel of a Special Reserve battalion will be a Special Reserve officer, the major will be a Regular major, there will be three Regular captains and five Militia captains; there will be two Regular lieutenants and eleven Special Reserve lieutenants. The position of Special Reserve officers will be much better than that of the old Militia officer. I am in great hopes that something will be done to meet social necessities. I was in Cumberland the other day, and I found that there was a great difficulty in finding employment for labour during a period of distress. I suggested to a large employer that the men should take their six months training, and I was informed that such a system was unknown, but if it were known it would meet a want in the labour market, and would be much appreciated by those who were responsible for finding employment for men. The miners are short of work at a different time, and I think that the Special Reserve system may be also worked as to enable employers of labour to do something to mitigate the trouble of unemployment. In a letter written by a right hon. Gentleman, who, we all regret, is disabled by illness from taking to-day the distinguished part which he generally takes in these debates, this sentence is, I think, a little too strong. He wrote—

> "Enough has been said to show that, even under the most favourable conditions, the Special Reserve not only may be, but must be, an absolute and disastrous failure as far as the infantry portion of it is concerned."

I do not know why it should be a failure when there is such a large proportion of recruits over twenty years of age. Why should it be a failure when the Militia are coming over as they are at the present time? Why should it be a disastrous failure with such an organisation of officers and such a number of men? Why should that be a disastrous failure which is organised under the advice of the most competent General Staff with the view of providing in definite fashion for a want which up to that time has been characteristic of the British Army? I am far from suggesting that full machinery for making good the wastage of war has yet been provided, but we have got a long way on the road. An immense amount of work has yet to be done, but it is a sound plan to recognise that the days of the Militia are over; and it is not by accident, but by force of circumstances that the organisation of that force has become rickety and that its officers and men are dwindling away, and that they have better prospects with a Reserve which is constructed, designed, and organised for the fulfilment of a definite function and the officers and the men of which are maintained to fulfil that function.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said that the right hon. the Secretary for War had given a very interesting historical review of what had happened to the Militia and to the Special Reserve during the last few months, but he had not told the Committee one word to enable them to judge whether this new force would make an efficient land force any more able to meet an enemy than the force which he had destroyed. He thought that this discussion was far and away the most important which had taken place this year in connection with our land forces, because it was the first time that the new organisation of the Special Reserve had appeared in the Estimates. The Special Reserve had been avowedly started for two purposes. First of all, it was to take the place of the old Militia which had done such good service in the past; and in the second place, to make up in some small degree for the reduction in the Regular Army. He would first compare the loss and gain in numbers. Leaving out, for the moment, the Militia Artillery and other corps, on 1st October, 1907, the strength of the Militia Infantry was 67,740 non-commissioned officers and men. In order to make the comparison fair between the old Militia and the Special Reserve they must rule out all men, except engineers, who were over thirty-six, and all men under twenty, because the right hon. Gentleman had declared men over thirty-six unfit for active service, and under regulation men under twenty were not allowed to be sent abroad in case of war, or to serve abroad for any other purpose. There were 7,500 men in the old Militia infantry over thirty-six, and 18,300 under twenty, or an actual total of 25,800 to be deducted from the number of men serving in the old Militia Infantry. There were, therefore, 42,000 men available in the Militia Infantry on 1st October, 1907. But there must be further deducted 10 per cent. for casualties or as being medically unfit, say, 4,000, leaving 38,000 Militia Infantry fit to take the field. That force had been absolutely wiped out by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. Again, since the right hon. Gentleman came into office he had reduced the Regular Army by 12,000 foot guards and infantry—nine battalions and their Reserves. Taking these two forces together they had 50,000 men who had been wiped off the pay-list of the British Army. That was a very large and a very serious weakening of our defence forces. What did the right hon. Gentleman propose to put in their stead? If they looked at the Army Estimates it would be found that the right hon. Gentleman proposed to establish an Infantry Special Reserve, numbering 59,000 non-commissioned officers and men. These men were to be all under thirty-six years of age, except the engineers, who were a small body. Now, in order to compare this body with the old Militia, he thought the right hon. Gentleman would admit that it would be perfectly fair to deduct from it the same proportion of men under twenty as was in the old Militia, because the men would be recruited from the same class and be of the same age. Allowing 10 per cent. for casualties and as being medically unfit, and for those under twenty years of age, that would amount to 23,000. Deducting these from the proposed establishment of 59,000 men there would be a Special Infantry Reserve of 36,000 non-commissioned officers and men compared with 38,000 of the old Militia, or 2,000 to the bad. Therefore, he had destroyed since he came into office 12,000 Regular and 38,000 Militia Infantry, and proposed to substitute for them 36,000 effective Infantry Special Reservists, making the net loss to the country's defence 14,000. That was the very minimum loss, because it was impossible to imagine that the strength and the establishment of the Infantry would coincide. Last year the old Infantry Militia was 31,000 non-commissioned officers and men below the establishment, and it was extremely unlikely arguing from the analogy of the old Militia that the right hon. Gentleman would get anything like the number of men for the Infantry Special Reserve that he wished. He would point out to the Committee that on 1st July only 25,500 had been recruited out of the 59,000 the Secretary of State wanted, and of those not more than 18,000 were over twenty years of age, and therefore only 18,000 were available for the purposes for which he created this Reserve, which was to be the Reserve of the Regular Army in time of war. From 15th January to 16th May, 4,545 less recruits of all arms were enlisted in the Special Reserve than were recruited for the old Militia last year. The recruiting had fallen by 5,000, so that the right hon. Gentleman was not likely to get so many recruits for the Special Reserve as he got for the old Militia, and indeed how could he expect to? This year too they had been obtained mostly by the old Militia permanent recruiting staff of 2,232, who in the future were to perform other duties, and the right hon. Gentleman was now going to rely on only 148 recruiting officers. Besides this he had deliberately dispensed with the services of 7,500 men of over thirty-six years of age who were in the Infantry Militia. He could not understand the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman with reference to this age limit. If he had insisted upon every man who had reached thirty-six years of age being medically examined to see if he was an exception to the general rule, and if he was found to be medically unfit, discharging him, he would have been with him. But why should the right hon. Gentleman say a man was not fit for active service after he had reached thirty-six? There were 10,000 men now serving with the Regulars, 4,000 of whom were in the Colonies and India, and 3,500 in the Reserve over thirty-six years of age, and yet the Second Reserve must not take these men who were most useful as non-commissioned officers. When he had 3,500 of them in the First Reserve it was somewhat pedantic to say that they must not serve in the Second. That was extremely hard on the Special Reserve, which the right hon. Gentleman desired to make a success, because it was these older men who were required to steady and stiffen the ranks. The right hon. Gentleman was so hard in the matter of age that he would not even allow men who were thirty-one years of age who had served seven years with the Colours and five in the Reserve to take on in the Special Reserve till they were thirty-six. He knew of two instances which had already happened. His hon. friend the Member for Petersfield, who commanded a Special Reserve battalion, had told him of two men who for many years were most valuable non-commissioned officers who had served their full twelve years and whom he was obliged to tell, owing to this ridiculous regulation, that they were of no use to him. He had demonstrated that since the Government came into office they had reduced the Infantry by 14,000 as the minimum and had disposed with the service of 7,500 men over the age of thirty-six, a large proportion of whom would be most useful men to have in the Special Reserve. How could the right hon. Gentleman justify these reductions not only in the Regular but in the Special Reserve? He surely could not say the reduction was justified on the ground that the Infantry Reserve in 1899, when the Boer War broke out, was sufficient. Let the Committee read the War Commissioners' Report. Fifty-five battalions went out short of strength, some of them being as much as 200 below. The Reserve of the Guards alone sufficed. The Regular Infantry strength to-day was 5,000 less than when the Boer War broke out. Instead of the Special Reserve being superior it was immeasurably inferior to the strength of the Militia in 1899. There were now 5,000 less infantry and not more than half what the Militia was in 1899. The action of the right hon. Gentleman had made the position much worse, as he would find when the next war broke out. Could it be justified on the ground that we had an enormous Reserve at the present time? He had supposed the right hon. Gentleman would have justified it on those grounds until he heard the Under-Secretary of State for War make a speech in another place on 16th July. Lord Lucas was asked why he had closed down enlistment into Section D of the Army Reserve, and replied that the Reserve at the present time was unduly inflated. They thought the Reserve was too large, and therefore they would not allow men to join the Reserve. If that was the Government's view it was no use arguing with them. It was perfectly true that our Reserve had increased by 40,000 men since the Government came into office, but the Reserve which was now so large would in a year or two begin to diminish, and in the course of six years dwindle down to an insignificant factor. But all the credit which was due for the creation of the present Reserve must rest not with the Government, but with Lord Middleton and the right hon. Member for Croydon, who by their extension of the terms of enlistment, three years with the Colours and nine with the Reserves, founded the Reserve which existed at the present time. In 1899 the Reserve was found to be ridiculously inadequate. Lord Midleton took office and stated the three-year Colour system in the Line; this system broke down because of the drafts for India and concurrent seven and three years Colour service had tc be initiated. So much for the Infantry. What had the right hon. Gentleman done for the Artillery? In 1907 there were 11,000 Garrison Artillery Militia present at training, non-commissioned officers and men. There were now to be only 1,450 Special Reserve garrison gunners. The Regular garrison gunners had been reduced by 5,000; 11,000 Artillery had been abolished by the right hon. Gentleman, and in their place were 1,450, and the Committee was asked to consider a Reserve of 1,450 sufficient.

MR. HALDANE said that was not quite correct.

*MR. ASHLEY asked whether the right hon. Gentleman said there were more than 1,450 Garrison Artillery Reserve.

MR. HALDANE said there were 15,000 Field Artillery, 5,000 less than there were originally.

*MR. ASHLEY: Do they appear on the Estimates?

MR. HALDANE: Yes.

*MR. ASHLEY said in that case he did not press that point. The right hon. Gentleman was about to abolish 2,400 Horse and Field Artillery, and said he wished to train Special Reservists to take their places. Had he desired to train the Reservists to supplement these men he would have been entirely with the right hon. Gentleman, but he thought it would be most pernicious to use them in substitution. Take the case of training and organisation. The Militia Infantry battalion was an entity in the past. It had regimental traditions and feelings; it was proud of having served in the Crimea and in South Africa; indeed, Members of that House, who had been associated with the Militia were aware that officers, non-commissioned officers, and men were as proud to serve in their Militia battalion as were the officers and men of any line battalion. They had their organisation, band, mess and everything that a line battalion possessed. All that, however, had been swept away, in order to have these special battalions, which were just the old line depots brought back in their worst form. The right hon. Gentleman had cut down the staff to a most absurd degree, and his hon. friend reminded him that the depot staff was abolished altogether. Where these 220 extra Regular officers were to come from he really did not know, because he could not imagine that any Regular officer who really cared for his profession would join a Special Reserve battalion, if he was able to get a job anywhere else. Indeed, he thought, apart from the military side of the question, that the money inducements which were going to be offered were not such as to induce him to go there. Take the men of the Special Reserve battalions. They were going to have them at seventeen, in many cases younger. The recruit would be trained in a squad in a corner of the barrack square, apart from the regular recruits for the Line. He did not say that he would be bullied, but he would be treated in an inferior way until he volunteered for the Line. He would have coaling duty and all the dirty work of the barracks to perform, and at the end of six months time he would drift away with just enough money in his pocket to keep him from doing any regular work, but not enough to maintain him in a proper state. He would come up next year for a fortnight's training and six days musketry, and that would go on for three years, and at the end of that period, when the boy had become a man in age, he was turned into a first-class Reservist. If the right hon. Gentleman, instead of reducing the Army, had said he was going to have these men to supplement his proper Reserves, he would not have had a word to say, or he might have said that it might be an improvement on the past; but what the right hon. Gentleman had done was to reduce the regular Army by 24,000 men (12,000 Infantry), and, in substitution for the Reservists, he was putting forward these half-trained boys to take their place. In February last the right hon. Gentleman himself had said that the Militia was composed of youths of seventeen years of age who could not be sent to the front until they were twenty, and had added that it was a deplorable state of things. So it was a deplorable state of affairs, but then they had just as deplorable a state of affairs in the Reserves of the right hon. Gentleman. Why had they all this upset simply to have a more deplorable state of affairs than under the old Militia? In regard to the question of discipline, in the old Militia the men were associated with those who had the right to command, and the habit of obeying came automatically. The men knew their captain, officers, and non-commissioned officers; they were associated with the men who would be with them on active service, and when they went abroad with their units they, therefore, obeyed automatically. What was to happen in the Special Reserve? They knew perfectly well that the officer who had trained the Special Reserve recruit would not be the officer who would lead him in time of war; the non-commissioned officer who had trained him for Army work would not be the officer who would command him on the field of battle; the comrades who had stood right and left of him in the barrack square when he learned the goose step, would not be with him when he fought the enemy; and, what was more, the very corps in which he enlisted would in all probability not be the corps in which he would fight in battle, and the man who joined the Rifle Brigade at Winchester might very well be sent abroad with the Seaforth Highlanders. How could the right hon. Gentleman expect that these boys, trained so inadequately, could be efficient substitutes for the veteran Reservists who had served seven years in the ranks, and who were now abolished? This plan must undoubtedly be a failure, and he, personally, could conceive only one way—it was an expensive way, for it would mean building barracks—out of the *impasse* into which the right hon. Gentleman had got by having abolished the Militia. He must revert to three lines instead of two. He must have a Regular Army, he must have a Special Reserve as a short service Army, and then he must have a Territorial Army in reserve. Instead of having Special Reservists trained for six months and for three weeks every successive year, let him make a minimum training of one year. He would then always have a military body which was an entity, and not a fortuitous collection of individuals in a Special Reserve. It would always go on exactly as a Line regiment, and it would enable the Government in time of stress to not only get a considerable number of efficient men to fill up the ranks when depleted by war and disease, but would also enable these Special Reserve battalions to go abroad in time of war. Under present conditions it was perfectly impossible that they could fulfil these functions. The number of men in each battalion must be nearly doubled, and the period of training must be raised from six months to a year. If the right hon. Gentleman did that, he thought he would revive the old Militia in its best form, and would get a military body which would be a strength and not a danger to the Empire.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said the speech of the hon. Gentleman was a sample of the way in which hon. Members thought it their duty to find fault with everything in a system because there was something in it of which they disapproved. No doubt the Secretary for War was in a very difficult position, and his advisers, being Regular officers, had given him advice which did not apply to Reserve battalions. The hon. Gentleman opposite had said that the Militia had traditions which had been swept away and nothing put in their place; but the Reserve battalions were exactly the same as the Militia battalions. The hon. Member shook his head. But he himself, like the hon. Member, commanded a Reserve battalion, and he found it quite possible—he had taken care to do it—to maintain the old traditions, and to have the band, colours, and so forth. He quite agreed that it was difficult to continue old traditions when a great change was made. He was old enough to remember when a greater and more comprehensive change than the present one was made in the Militia battalions, and when they ceased to be the Militia of the county and became infantry attached to other battalions. That was a long time, and it caused a great shock to a good many people. Still, that had not stopped the Militia, nor would the present change stop it. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Blackpool had gone on to say that there were 5,000 less recruits for the Special Reserve. But as the Secretary for War had explained, recruiting did not commence in the early months of the year, but in the autumn or winter. This had been carefully explained by the Secretary of State. Men did not join in the early part of the year, because six months brought them to the summer, and that would interfere with their summer work. They joined in August or September. If they took 1906, they found that the recruits had joined the regiments, where there was six months training, in the late autumn and early winter, and not in the spring and summer. That accounted for a great many more than 5,000. Besides which, it should be remembered that there was always a sort of stage-fright in connection with anything new, and for some weeks men would hardly join on any terms. Of course, there was a slight check at the start, but he had no doubt that as regarded the Special Reserves there would be no difficulty as far as men were concerned. The hon. Member for Blackpool had referred to the question of separate training. If there was to be a training separate from that of the Regular troops it would be a very serious thing for the Reserves. There were three things which stood in the way of their being trained with the Regular recruits. In the first place they were being trained with a rifle that was obsolete, while in many cases the Regulars had the new rifle, and they could not be drilled together. That was to be got over very soon he understood, and he hoped they would have some information as to when the new rifle would be issued. Secondly, there was the question of clothing, which made a distinction between them, and it was a very serious distinction. He hoped gradually the Secretary of State would manage to get over that and do away with any material difference in the clothing of the troops of both classes. There was a most elaborate scheme issued, he thought, by the Director-General of Recruiting and Gymnasia, who had the instruction of these men because they were supposed to be recruits. They were recruits for the first three months, but not after that time, and it was the Director of Troops who ought to have the training of these men, and they ought not to be treated entirely as recruits. However, their recruit training had been laid down for the six months in such a way that it could not coincide with that of the troops required to join their Regular battalions in three months. The man that joined the Regular Army got three months drill at the depôt and was then sent on to his Regular battalion. He had to learn a certain amount in three months. But a syllabus had been made out by the War Office authorities for men who were going to be trained for six months as Reservists who they thought could not learn enough in the first three months to be put alongside the Regular recruit. In fact, there were two different systems of training ordered by the War Office. He hoped that that would be stopped before long, and that the first three months of a soldier's training, whether Reservist or not, would be the same, and that the three months afterwards would be dealt with in other ways. The right hon. Gentleman had made great efforts to get the officers he wanted by school and University corps. They might be very good things, but they had not produced a great number of officers in the past, and he did not believe they would in the future. It was no use to say there were 2,000 men in the corps of the Universities and 5,000 in the corps of the public schools. There was no guarantee that they would ever be officers. It was true that officers of Militia had been offered £20 a year, and those cadets were to be given £25 when they left the cadet corps and became Reserve officers, but that would not make a very great difference or encourage many men to go into the Reserve Army. The difficulty had been that they could not get enough subalterns in the Militia, but they had all the same difficulties in the Special Reserve, except that they had training for six weeks instead of four, and there were very few youngsters who would appreciate that. One thing they were asked to do was quite impossible—to give a longer period to it at just the moment when they were entering into the world. In the old days it used to be two months training for Militia officers and now it was to be three. That would be rather a difficulty and he would press on the Secretary for War that the difficulty in getting officers would be very much increased by requiring them to be better trained. It was true that if they could afford to insist on a higher stand ard they might have longer training with Regular units, but the unfortunate part of it was that they had never been able to get enough officers without this higher standard, and it was a question whether they would have enough officers of the old standard—he was quite sure they would not get enough of the new. The Secretary of State ought to make it easier for men to go into the reserve of officers instead of more difficult by raising the standard. He did not see that it was necessary in the least to put them in important positions or to promote them. He might leave them as second-lieutenants until they were efficient, but he should make it as easy as possible for them to be made second-lieutenants. It was suggested that these officers would be better trained because they would be attached to a Regular unit, but that was not a good way of getting all the information they required for making them into officers. It was a very bad training for an officer, and the sooner it was altered and he was sent for a shorter period to a school or training depot the better the officer would be and the easier it would be to get officers. He hoped these little details might be altered, and he was sure that with such alterations the Special Reserve would be quite as efficient as the old Militia. It would be available to be sent abroad, which the old Milita was not, without volunteering, and there would not be much difficulty in raising the numbers of the battalions to any standard that was required. The age of thirty-six might be too low, but even at that it was quite possible to get what would be a very strong stiffening of the Special Reserve battalions in the form of men who had been through their Army training and the Reserve, and in time of war probably bounties might be given them to join and create the next battalion that was to be formed when the others were wanted to be sent abroad. He believed the scheme would be a success. He was sure the Militia had not been injured by it so far, and he hoped it would be strengthened by small improvements which might yet be made.

MR. ASHLEY moved the reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made and Question put, "That a sum not exceeding £839,900 be granted for the said service."—*Mr. Ashley.*

MR. GUY BARING (Winchester) said he would like to give his approbation to part of this scheme—the idea of raising the Auxiliary services on a Special Reserve basis. He thought that a very good idea and likely to work well. He also thought the reserve of officers would be strengthened. The right hon. Gentleman had said he was adopting the Continental standard for the reserve of officers and giving them one year's training. But that year was very soon whittled down when he said service with a cadet corps would entitle him to take off four months of the year, and service in a University corps to take off four more; the result was that in the end he would only have four months with a regular battalion instead of the year which Continental officers had, which was hardly on all fours with his statement. There was another point in which he thought the right hon. Gentleman would do an injustice to the Regular officer. That was that these Reserve officers were to step into a Regular battalion to take the place of officers seconded. Many times in his life he and his brother officers had sat down to calculate how soon they would command a battalion, and they had more or less a line to go on, but with Special Reserve officers coming in and out when they pleased, it would be very hard indeed on the Regular officer who wanted to get some idea of how his promotion was going. He would very much like to have some explanation on that point. With regard to the quality of the men to be turned out in the Special Reserves, with an establishment of 62,000 men they were only going to have 35,000 if war broke out. That was rather a falling off. They had also to face the fact that undoubtedly out of that 35,000 a very considerable number would be scooped up by the battalions mobilising. The right hon. Gentleman had to increase his establishment if he was to avoid that, and as to that he had to consult his colleagues and his Party, and then to get the men; so there was a great deal before him if he wanted to have even

35,000 men out of the Special Reserve. These men were going to be the Reserve of the Expeditionary Force of 160,000 men. The Expeditionary Force no doubt would be well trained and equipped, but they would require drafts which would be made up from the Special Reserves. How did their training compare with that of the drafts which Continental armies would get? The right hon. Gentleman was one of the members of the Cabinet who received messages from the German Emperor, and he had a message not long ago congratulating him on the formation of the Territorial Army. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had received any congratulations upon the formation of the Special Reserve. It was ridiculous to compare the Special Reserve with the German Reserve, who had been trained for certain one year and probably for two years. How could those men take the places of Regular soldiers after only six months training? The fact that they had a voluntary enlistment forced them to give up 11,000 or 12,000 recruits every year for the Regular Army. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman's force would ever be trained fit to take the field. The statement which the Secretary for War had made about men enlisting in the winter was not in his favour, because that was the worst time for training soldiers. He would like to know if the training was to be given at Aldershot, Salisbury Plain, or at the depot. There was a great military difficulty here, and he regretted that the right hon. Gentleman instead of showing them a way out of it had left them no better off. He did not think anything would be done till they had a reverse in the Field or some regrettable incident happened, and then they would probably have a War Commission. Some general would be crucified and the blame would not be put in the right place, which was the House of Commons.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover) said the debate had reminded him of an old adage that they might do anything with bayonets except sit on them. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to be between the devil and the deep sea, because the Army was bleeding to death his Special Reserve, and the Territorial Force was bleeding the Special Reserve. The Special Reserve must always be weakened by this process, and they were in a position which was by no means satisfactory. If they were going to be short by many thousands in the Special Reserve, and 50,000 short in the Territorial Army, he was sure the House and the country would prefer that the right hon. Gentleman should get up and declare that he meant to get the men somehow. He had always believed in the scheme brought forward by the Secretary for War, provided he could get the men. He was inclined to think that the way out of the difficulty would be to insist upon those counties which had not contributed their proper quota by 50 per cent. providing the remainder. He did not see why those counties should not be called upon to do so. His hon. friend behind him had stated that it would be a bad plan to train soldiers in the winter, but he was inclined to believe that training them in both summer and winter was a good plan, and if that fact was better known they would be able to get more men. As regarded the age limit about which the hon. Member for Blackpool had spoken, he agreed that it was desirable to get a doctor's opinion in regard to the men of thirty-six years of age before getting rid of them. It seemed very strange not to enlist men over thirty-three years of age because they would reach thirty-six years of age before their service was up. The Secretary for War might think over that point, because it was one which might help him. With regard to the clothing of both officers and men, it was changed so often that it became a great strain upon the resources of the men. It had been said that another member of the Cabinet had been interfering in War Office affairs, and that was rather hard upon the civilian servants at the War Office, and he hoped no more would be heard of this complaint. In conclusion, he desired to call attention to the absence of so many hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House.

*MR. W. NICHOLSON (Hampshire, Petersfield) said that as one who had served some years in the Militia and who had had a slight experience in the Special Reserve perhaps he might be allowed to make a few remarks. He would like to call the attention of the Committee to the conditions under which recruits joined the Special Reserve now serving at the depots. A recruit joined in order to undergo six months drill. If he was eighteen years of age and completed three months drill he could then go on to the Regular Army and receive a bounty of 30s. If he was seventeen years of age or under he could do six months drill and at the conclusion he would receive a 30s. bounty and go into the Army. If in the Army they laid down a rule that they would take no recruits under eighteen years of age, why did they give a recruit in the Special Reserve 30s. to join the Army when he was under eighteen, and might be only seventeen or under? The special recruits did six months drill at the depot, and they did it side by side with the men who went into the line. His point was that the pay of the recruit for the line was the same as that of the recruit for the Special Reserve, who received in addition a bounty of 30s.

MR. HALDANE said he got it whether he went into the Regular Army or not.

*MR. W. NICHOLSON said that for the Special Reservist who went into the Army at the end of six months there was a bounty of 30s. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the number of recruits who had done three months drill and joined the Regular Army numbered 1,161. That was the reason a bounty of 30s. was given at the completion of three months drill. The right hon. Gentleman had not told them how many recruits joined the Regular Army at the age of seventeen who had completed six months drill. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether there was at all the depots sufficient accommodation for the carrying out of musketry drill by these recruits. Those who at the end of five months were dismissed home in consequence of there being no accommodation for the musketry drill did not receive the bounty, while others who had only done three months drill and had joined the line had their bounty paid. This was considered unfair, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would look into the matter. With regard to the question of allowing the men who had served in the Army to enlist in the Special Reserve, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would alter the age from thirty to thirty-five or more. He was sure that many men were kept out in consequence of the arrangements already in existence. With regard to the question of officers, he hoped he might be allowed to call the attention of the Committee to the extraordinary regulations under which they had to serve. The officer of the Special Reserve was on a different footing from every other officer in the Army. He had to undertake to serve for a year and during that year he could not retire, and he could only give notice of his intention to retire at the end of the year. He was bound to the Army for a year, he could be sent away from his unit, he could be sent to any other unit, or he could be sent to any other part of His Majesty's forces. This pressed very hardly on the younger officers. He instanced the case of a boy who wished to join the Special Reserve when he came down from Cambridge or Oxford. If he joined the Special Reserve he was bound to it for a year, and perhaps it might be that, in consequence, he was unable to take up other employment that might be offered to him. The senior officers especially found it very hard that they had to retain the responsibility of belonging to the Special Reserve for a year under any circumstances, and there was a great feeling among those officers that they should be allowed to retire if they wished. One way out of the difficulty which had been suggested was that if an officer wished to retire he should be allowed to do so by paying back the £20 which he had received. He was sure it would be difficult to get officers unless they got a chance of retiring. Another point to which he desired to call attention was that an officer of the Special Reserve was bound to go abroad with any unit, and not necessarily the battalion to which he belonged. An officer of the Territorial Army was not bound to go at all, and consequently that officer was able to make his own terms with the War Office. Again, an officer of the Territorial Army might choose to go with his own battalion or not at all. He was, therefore, in an entirely different position from the officer of the Special Reserve. Referring to the training of the officers of the Special Reserve, the hon. Member said that at the present time they were going to be allowed to take on special duty if their services were required. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman why it was that the officer of the Special Reserve had not been allowed to take the place of a Regular officer at the depot when no Regular officer was available. Speaking on 21st February last at the Militia Club dinner the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "We shall require for purposes of the new third battalions a considerable number of additional Regular officers—more than 200. These are officers who must be there all the year round at their work. Now we are quite prepared to consider with you whether it is possible for Militia officers of the old organisation to help us to the accomplishment of that end. It may be that we may find ourselves in a position to offer to you commissions which will enable those of you who desire and are qualified to come in and take your place as part of the 220, if that is the exact number of Regular officers whom we require for this new task. At any rate, this is a matter into which we are prepared to go with you, and we shall rely on the advice of your representatives in securing to us the particular standard of men who are able to do the work of the Regular officers and to be present the whole year round."

He had asked the right hon. Gentleman how many commissions, if any, had been offered to Militia officers who desired to come in as part of the 220 additional Regular officers required in the new third battalions, and on 20th July he received the following reply—

> "No such commissions have been offered to Militia officers in place of the proportion of Regular officers allocated to the new third battalions, nor was this at any time contemplated. As the outcome of a conference with the representatives of Militia Commanding Officers the Army Council have arranged to employ Special Reserve officers both with Regular units and at the depots, in the latter case where the number of recruits at the depots exceeds a certain number. Special Reserve officers will be employed with Regular units when, as often happens, there is a temporary shortage of Regular officers, or when Regular officers are seconded. I may add that to enable Special Reserve units to obtain junior officers pending the machinery of the new training corps becoming fully operative, the Army Councils have decided, as an interim arrangement, to allow candidates for commissions in the Special Reserve to qualify by serving with a Regular unit for four months provided that they apply for commissions before the 18th of next December, instead of the full probationary period of twelve months."

He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman how he could reconcile these two statements. It was a matter of disappointment to the officers of the Militia, many of whom thought they would be elegible and qualified to come in and take part as Regular officers in the depot. He hoped the matter would be reconsidered by the right hon. Gentleman. He was sure that there was not a sufficient number of Regular officers available to go to the third battalions. As to special service as a whole he pointed out that not only had the members of the different battalions been cut down, but many of the battalions, instead of being amalgamated as the right hon. Gentleman had promised last year, had been disbanded. That might seem rather a minor matter, but it was not so regarded by the officers of the battalions which had been disbanded. He was very sorry that the War Office had seen fit to do away with the services of some of those officers who had had experience of war and who were well qualified to be officers in the Special Reserve. He pointed out that the War Office had cut down the establishment of the existing Special Reserve. In the case of the battalion with which he was himself connected there used to be ten companies and now there were only eight, and the establishment had been reduced from 1,000 to 500. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had not allowed the Special Reserve sufficient staff to undertake the duties which would fall to them in future. In connection with the reduction of the staff many non-commissioned officers had received notice to go in the next few weeks. He thought the question of reducing the staff should be reconsidered, and that instead of cutting it down sufficient staff should be allowed to meet emergencies.

MR. HALDANE was understood to say, in respect of the Winchester case, that there had been a misapprehension in the treatment complained of, but that the point would be dealt with. As to the officers of the Special Reserve, a conference of Militia officers had been assembled, and he understood that the Committee had decided that another suggested plan was preferable. The

War Office, however, was anxious to do all it could to meet the case of the Militia officers, and he would consider the matter further. He believed that the suggested arrangements of the Committee were satisfactory to the Members present, even if they had not worked out so in practice.

LORD J. JOICEY-CECIL (Lincolnshire, Stamford) said the right hon. Gentleman prided himself that his Special Reserve battalion would be able to go abroad as a solid battalion in time of war, and that he would be in a better position than he was with the old Militia battalions in the last war. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would be no better off. He had done away with the Militia battalions which used to supply drafts for the line battalions. Under the old system they had a certain number of battalions which they could send abroad anywhere because they always volunteered when wanted. Consequently the War Office knew what number of men it had. Now they had done away with those battalions, and he did not see that the forces of the Crown had been strengthened. The Secretary for War was always saying that the great drawback to the old Militia Reserve was that at the commencement of a war the Militia found themselves deprived of their best men, who were taken to fill up the line battalions; and that he had done away with this trouble for ever. As a matter of fact the trouble was done away with after the war, by abolishing the Militia Reserve, and so keeping the Militia battalions intact, except for volunteering for the Regular Army. So, if a Militia battalion of 400 men were sent to garrison, say, Aden, or some other place, the authorities would know that there were 400 men there till otherwise ordered; and that none of them had been enlisted to serve with any but their own battalion. The Secretary for War had reverted to the old plan of Special Reserves, as, if a Special Reserve battalion was sent out for garrison duty and a reverse happened, say in Aden or India, and men must be had, a telegram could bring a warship and embark practically the garrison, leaving the place undefended. He contended therefore that there was danger in doing away with the Militia as had been done. He believed that the men they would get from the Reserve battalions to supply the deficiences in the Line would in most cases require a great deal of knocking into shape before they were fit to take their regular place in the line battalions. The position which Regular officers would have to take during the training of the Special Reserve battalions must cause friction, and *esprit de corps* would be absolutely extinguished by enlisting men for general service in the Special Reserve, and also by mixing up Regular and other officers. He did not agree with the hon. Member for Lichfield that the traditions of the Militia battalions would go down to the Special Reserve battalions. The feeling in the majority of counties was just the reverse, and the plan of drafting reservists from one regiment to another would have the effect of preventing men from joining the Special Reserve battalions.

*CAPTAIN MORRISON-BELL (Devonshire, Ashburton) thought that we were as a nation in a very serious position as regarded our Army. We had done what he considered the strangest thing that any nation could possibly have done, by abolishing not only a large number of men, but a very important part of the *personnel* of the Army before we had anything to take their place. He could not imagine any other nation doing anything so short-sighted. When he heard the hon. Member for Lichfield saying that he hoped the training of the Special Reserve officers would be made more easy than at present in order to fit them for the duty which they might be called upon to perform in time of war, it led him to think we were entering into a very dangerous position. He did not think that the present training of those officers was a bit too arduous. He himself had had experience in the Militia, of which he was an officer before he joined the Regular service. He knew they thought a great deal of themselves and believed they were nearly as good as the Regulars, but when he got into the Regular Army he found that he had a great deal to learn. Seeing that, so far as he could understand, the Reservists would have to take the place of Regular soldiers in time of war, he deprecated strongly the idea of reducing the training which was given to them at present. It would be disastrous to make that training less onerous for those who would have, in the event of a campaign, to take their place in the Line. He had also been greatly disappointed with the remark of the Secretary of State for War that some of the Special Reserve officers, when occasion arose, would have to take the place of combatant officers. The right hon. Gentleman knew well enough that there was a very deep feeling right through the service that at the present moment officers were thinking themselves extremely badly treated because of this foolhardy reduction in the number of battalions. Owing to that reduction a great number of officers were sent into the Line battalions, promotion was stopped to a considerable extent, and much injustice was done to those unfortunate regimental officers who were the backbone of the service. Those regimental officers were threatened that if they were seconded for particular duty, Special Reserve officers were to be brought into their places, and that would make it absolutely impossible for the regimental officers to secure their promotion. He knew of a particular instance where a senior subaltern had only a few months to run to complete nine years service when another officer was brought in and stopped his promotion, with the result that he had to wait nearly three years before he got his troop. All that had caused a great deal of feeling in the service. It was no use asking officers to serve in the Line regiments when statements were made such as those of the right hon. Gentleman. They felt that the moment might come when, after all, they were not going to get the promotion which they deserved and had worked for. He hoped that the Committee would be given some sort of explanation of the remarks which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman, for he felt very strongly and he knew that the regimental officers felt just as strongly that they had not been well treated, and there was great soreness amongst them because officers were brought in from other regiments very much against their wishes and so prevented them getting their step. Another point was that they heard over and over again that there was a great dearth of officers, that they did not know at the present moment where to look for officers to fill up vacancies both in the Reserve and in the Regulars. It was no good talking about the Eton and Harrow Volunteers being able to furnish a sufficient supply. It was well-known that the percentage of officers coming from such cadet corps was not very great, and it was no use pretending to the country that because we had cadet corps in the public schools we should have a sufficient supply of officers. The question of the sufficiency of officers was a most serious one, more especially when they did not know where to look for them, and he felt it was no solution of the problem to say that we had these cadet corps in the public schools. They had had cadet corps before; they were not new institutions, and therefore, from past experience they could not be looked to to provide a sufficient supply of officers. He only hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would give some explanation on the points that he had raised. He was certainly not one to run down any scheme, and he sincerely hoped that this new scheme of Special Reserves would be a success. He felt very nervous about the matter. He did not think much would be done by this winter training. The training was becoming more practical every year, and he did not believe in the men being put into depots by way of training for the work which they would have to do in time of war. Then there was the question of shooting. If these Reservists were to be asked to take their place in time of war among the Regulars, they should have facilities given them for perfecting themselves in their duties. They should not be allowed to have old rifles, but those which they would have to use in time of war. If, as he understood, they were to be armed with the new rifles, then he would urge that there should not be too long a delay in supplying them, and also proper rifle ranges at which to practise. He hoped the scheme would be a success, but he did not at present see that they could look forward to it with much hope of its being so. He sincerely trusted that the men would come forward, that every facility would be given to them to attain proficiency, and that the training would not be reduced or in any way made easier for either officers or men.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he did not rise to take the part in the debate which his right hon. friend the Member for Croydon was so well qualified to take, because his knowledge of the circumstances was not comparable with that of his right hon. friend who, unhappily, had had to leave under medical orders, and could not be present. He rose to ask two questions. He was in full agreement with his hon. friends in deploring the reduction which the Government had thought fit to make, both in the Regular Army and in the number of Militia battalions. He thought it a very unhappy step, the consequences of which they were not even yet in a position fully to measure. His first question related to the drain which would be put on the Special Reserve Force if, unhappily, hostilities broke out. The theory, as he understood it, was that the function of supplying the waste of war would only begin after the battalions had been adequately mobilised. If his memory served him rightly, the old Reserve was inadequate to meet the necessities of mobilisation at the time of the South African war. Was he right in supposing that the normal Reserve in future would not only be not greater than in 1899, but would actually be less, because the number with the Colours was less now than it was then?

MR. HALDANE: The Reserve produced will be in the normal 117,000. That is sufficient to mobilise the battalions for home defence.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the answer of the right hon. Gentleman as regarded the figures was satisfactory, but he was a little puzzled to know how that result was arrived at, for this reason. He believed the establishment was lower than it was in 1899. The terms of service were the same as in 1899. The Reserve in 1899 was inadequate, and he should have anticipated under those circumstances that the right hon. Gentleman would not have been in the favourable position in which he seemed to think himself. If the right hon. Gentleman could give the House some assurance on that point it would be a great satisfaction to many hon. Members. We were in a very favourable position as to Reservists because the late system gave a great many men for that purpose, and it was unfortunate, from that point of view, that it had to be abandoned. But it was necessary because it could not supply the drafts for India. He wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman had not, in trying to arrive at a system satisfactory from many points of view, found that it was not satisfactory from the point of view of sending battalions into the field at their full strength. The right hon. Gentleman would find that the number of units in the Reserve was not normal; the Special Reserve would have to be drawn upon at once and the Special Reserve would be at once reduced to far below its proper strength. It would be seen that his first question referred to the mobilisation of the battalions for the field. His second question referred to the Special Reserve itself and especially to those battalions in the Special Reserve who were regarded as in the fullest sense the successors of the Militia, and who would probably be called on in an emergency to take the place of Regular garrisons in the Mediterranean and elsewhere over sea. Did the right hon. Gentleman think that under his system they would have the same *esprit de corps* as the old battalions of Militia working under officers who had trained them? It had been made a matter of criticism of his scheme that the drafts from the Special Reserve might be sent to any battalion to make up the wastage of war. That, he took it, was inevitable, but the consequence by which a man might be called on to serve in a regiment with which he had no connection or local association was to be deplored. But his question did not relate to that part of the problem. It related to the use of those Special Reserve battalions by themselves, not as supplying drafts. Would they go on foreign service, for which they were now liable, with the same officers, carrying with them the same traditions, and in all respects as favourably constituted as existing Militia battalions were when called upon to volunteer in times of emergency?

Mr. HALDANE replied that it was the intention to preserve the *esprit de corps* of the battalions, and to give them as far as possible their own officers. They never knew what might happen when they went to the theatre of war; but their desire was to go on as at present. As to the drain on the Reserve, the right hon. Gentleman would remember that there was a great deal of discussion last year over the actuarial calculations. He himself did not feel competent to check the actuarial calculations, and he was not sure that anybody in the House could. But he had them made again, and the numbers arrived at were obtained, he thought, from taking 89,000 of the ordinary Reserve and 25,000 of Section B. That gave, and he thought that was the way in which the result was arrived at, about the figure he had mentioned.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that in the Territorial Army the officers were excused from being obliged to serve as High Sheriffs, whereas the officers of the Special Reserves were not so excused. Why was that? He would like a reply to that question. He might be allowed to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman, at all events, on his attempt to get officers from the Universities and public schools. He thought that that was the right way to go about the matter. But he was afraid that he could not congratulate him on getting the men he required, and if he got officers they would be of no use without men. It seemed to him that the recruits would be found to be youths of under twenty years of age, who would be of little or no use in actual warfare. Many of them were certainly weedy and undeveloped, and they enlisted because they had been starved to a great extent, their parents being so badly off that they could not afford to bring them up on heavily-taxed tea and bakers' bread, with most of the nourishment taken out of it, and which might or might not be cheap. Certainly, this was one of the "advantages" of allowing our markets to be free to nations outside of Great Britain. There was another thing which had struck him in connection with the recruiting of immature boys; it was that the new rifle kicked a good deal more than the old one, in spite of its bell mouth. He was afraid that this new rifle kicked so much that the poor lad of seventeen would not be able to let it off more than twenty or thirty times, instead of perhaps 100 times, as would be required in actual warfare. It seemed to him that it was these underfed, immature lads who were to help to hold back the thoroughly trained, picked, fully-developed and well-fed men from Germany, or other countries, and they had to be able to do that with six months training, and until the Territorial Army could be got into form. It would appear that the Secretary for War had declined to allow old Volunteers and old men of the Militia and Army to be so organised that they could be used in case of emergency. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had put his foot down and said that he would not have it. He pointed out that these old soldiers and Volunteers of forty or fifty years of age had received a thorough training, and were of a great deal more use than these poor boys of seventeen years of age. Probably they could get them at considerably less expense. He would like to give an example of the sort of horses which were hired for the Artillery forces. He happened to have a friend who lived not very far from where he resided; he had known him for a good many years; he was a butcher. Three horses were hired at £3 3s. a week. He happened to know them—they were all "screws"; and the butcher was told that they were on no account to go out for a walk. One horse was a small boy's pony; the second would not pass a bicycle except under very severe compulsion; and the third threw itself down when it was not pleased. None of them was strong enough for the guns. A fourth horse, with navicular lameness, was stronger than any of the other three, being up to 12st. 2lbs. He was sure that the right hon. Gentleman would see that in this case he had got economy and efficiency combined. He could not see how the right hon. Gentleman's scheme was going to work, and he thought Lord Tweedmouth was right when he said that this new scheme was a gamble. He thought the Secretary for War was gambling with the safety of the country; yet the right hon. Gentleman, from the speech he made in Bristol in May last, certainly had realised our dangerous position. This was what the War Minister had said—

> "That we must take care that we did not beat our swords into ploughshares before the other nations did the same; that there was no curse greater than war except being unprepared for it when it came, because defeat would mean the destruction of our trade, commerce, credit and security; that war came very suddenly, and nations still did wage war; that a blow at the heart of the Empire, at a great city like London, was a prospect so tempting to an enemy that they might be sure that on the least encouragement an enemy would take advantage of it; that it would be the easiest way of bringing a war to a conclusion, and would mean ruin to our country and starvation to our people."

That was what the right hon. Gentleman had said, and he would remind him that he had previously warned them that it was quite possible that we might become too poor to keep up the two-Power standard. He supposed that that meant we should have to depend upon our Army to defend us against invasion. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that our Navy might be evaded, and that we could not keep it tied to our shores. And it was on immature boys, with this short period of training, most of which was apparently to be carried out in the winter months, when it was impossible to do field work, the right hon. Gentleman told them they were to depend in case of serious national emergency. He would point out that the great German port of Cuxhaven was twenty-five and a half hours from Hull, and ten and a half hours from Berlin by troop train, and many German Army corps could easily be trained to that port. There was nothing near Hull except untrained Territorial units, which were not yet in complete existence, being without horses, and their artillery entirely useless. Colonel Repington, the military correspondent of *The Times,* on 6th June wrote that we should require 700,000; but the Secretary for War had first of all told them that he was going to get 700,000 to 900,000 for the Territorial Army and the Reserve.

MR. HALDANE was understood to say that he stated that the number, in time of national emergency, might rise to 700,000 or 800,000.

MR. HUNT said the right hon. Gentleman might have been wrongly reported, but he had certainly seen that statement. The military correspondent of *The Times* said we should require 700,000—500,000 mobile Army and fairly trained; 150,000 for garrison duty in Great Britain, and 50,000 to protect Ireland.

*THE CHAIRMAN: This is not relevant to the subject of Special Reserves. The hon. Gentleman is talking about other matters outside.

MR. HUNT thought he had about come to the end of his remarks. He hoped he would hear an answer from the right hon. Gentleman about the officers for the Territorial Army and the Special Reserves in connection with the obligation to serve as High Sheriff and to serve on juries, and that the right hon. Gentleman would also tell them something which would make them feel a little more comfortable about the safety of the country.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. ACLAND, Yorkshire, Richmond) said he might perhaps be allowed to say a few words on the general matters which had been raised in the debate. He thought that quite the most important question was as to whether or not the Special Reserve could be relied upon to perform the function for which it had been called into existence—namely, for finding the drafts. If they found that the Special Reserve was required to fill up the battalions, and only some portion of it remained for drafting purposes—the purpose for which it had been called into being—then to a considerable extent it would have failed. They relied not on the Special Reserve but on the ordinary Reserve to raise units to the full strength at the beginning of hostilities. They had been asked two or three times in the course of the debates: "As it was the fact that some units were not able to mobilise at full strength at the beginning of the South African War, how will you be certain that that will not occur again, and that you will not have to call upon these Special Reserves in order to mobilise your units in the first place?" The answer was largely that the condition of things at the beginning of the South African War was by no means a normal condition. In the first place, they had just before that time been creating new units, and had been re-enlisting men from the Reserve into these units. The Reserve had been specially depleted to form new units, and was therefore considerably below the strength it would otherwise have been at.

Mr. ASHLEY: How much below? Not very many.

*Mr. ACLAND said that there had been considerable re-enlistment from the Reserve into the Line. Another reason for the special difficulty was that they had not power at that time to call out men from Section D until the whole of Section B had been exhausted. Now, they could take men from Section D when they wanted them, and therefore those special disadvantages which existed at the beginning of the war no longer existed. They were, of course, in a specially advantageous position now owing to the Reserve containing many men who had served for three years, but it was as certain as anything could be that when the normal had been reached, provided care had been taken that units did not sink below the safe and proper establishment, the ordinary Reserve would be amply sufficient to complete the units to the full strength.

Mr. ASHLEY: I wish the hon. Gentleman would explain how, in view of the fact that at present the Infantry are 5,000 below the strength they were in 1899, 5,000 fewer men could produce a greater Reserve than was produced in 1899.

*Mr. ACLAND said he was only speaking about such units as existed. It was no doubt true that units had been done away with in the last few years—not by one Secretary for War alone. He could not pretend that the same total force would be mobilisable as at the time before any reforms had taken place several years ago. Then there was the important question whether the training which was going to be given to these Special Reserve units would be sufficient to fit them for this purpose of providing drafts for the Regular Army. Time would show. All they could say for certain at present was that the training these men were having would be at any rate a great deal better than the training which the Militia used to have. Very good opinions were given as to the results of the training of the *Spectator* Company, which was trained during the winter—the worst time of year. The training of the Special Reservists would be for six months, and it would give very much better material than anything they had had before. More they could not say. With regard to the officers, there, again, surely they would be in a better position. The normal position of the Special Reserve officers under the new conditions would be that they would have been through a special two-year course at a school, a special two-year course at a University, and four months attachment to a regular unit. That, again, was a great improvement on anything which was asked for before, and especially in this way—that to spread the training over a series of years and to have graduated courses which were not all taken in a few months together was, he believed, a much better way of training men who already possessed a certain amount of education than trying to concentrate their training altogether, because they were interested in their work, keen about it, and thinking about it, and picked up in one year very quickly at the place they left off the year before. Then there was a question about the bounty on transfer to the Regular Army. Here the right hon. Gentleman who wrote a letter in *The Times* that morning had fallen into an error. It was not a fact that there was a special £2 bounty on transfer from the Special Reserve into the Regular Army. The £2 bounty was for transfer from the Militia into the Special Reserve, and the bounty given on transfer from the Special Reserve into the Regular Army was 30s., and that given, not as a bounty on transfer into the Regular Army, but as a bounty on completion of the six months service. They regarded the men as having earned that bounty whether they joined the Regulars or not, and they did not offer the special bounty to try to induce men to go over into the Regulars extra to that which was given in any case.

*MR. W. NICHOLSON: The 30s. bounty is given to boys of seventeen or under. On the other hand, the War Office lays down that eighteen is the earliest age for any boy to join the Regular Army.

*MR. ACLAND said that that was not so. These bounties were not given to boys of seventeen. They would take great care to see that no boys of that sort joined the Regulars. But they were no doubt taking boys of seventeen and a half, joining the Special Reserve at seventeen, doing their six months and getting their 30s. They were no doubt taking these boys younger, at the end of their six months training, than they would like to take them if they came straight as recruits for the Regulars. They had the disadvantage in that case that they were younger, but they had the very great advantage that they came after their six months training and therefore in a much better physical and military condition than they would be if they sent them away for six months and then took them at the age of eighteen. They gained in efficiency and lost perhaps in the age at which they were taken into the Regular Army.

*MR. W. NICHOLSON said that according to the Regulations a recruit at the conclusion of six months might join the Regular Army even if he had not attained the age of eighteen years, provided he fulfilled the necessary physical requirements, and he was to receive his bounty. If the boy was under eighteen the country had to pay for him for the extra six months and keep him during that time, and did not gain a man who could go on foreign service. The country had to keep him so many months longer until he could go on foreign service.

*MR. ACLAND stated that the quotation just read from the Regulations showed that the statement previously made by the hon. Member that these boys were taken by the Regulars under seventeen was quite erroneous. Referring to a further point raised, it was, of course, true that they had taken powers to post these Special Reservists to any unit in the Army of the arm to which they belonged. That was inevitable. They could not give anything like an absolute guarantee that men would only be sent to join the Regular unit to which the Special Reserve unit belonged. It might quite well be that in those particular units of the Regular Army there had been no wastage at all. If that were so, it would surely be unreasonable to ask them to lock up the Special Reservists belonging to those units and not to post them to other units in which there might have been very heavy wastage. He was sure it was intended not to break the Territorial connection, but they could not give any guarantee on the point. It had been said that officers were going to be posted to Regular battalions instead of officers seconded, but that was only intended to be done very much as a temporary measure. It was not intended thereby to reduce the rate of promotion, but there might be periods when an officer was seconded for a comparatively short time and where it would not be fair to make a promotion, because he would be soon coming back and the particular rank that he belonged to would be over-full. It was very carefully considered by the Adjutant-General, and he could not imagine anybody more careful as to rights of officers of the Regular Army. With regard to jury service, surely it was true that the Territorial officers and men got less pay and probably quite as much if not more responsibility than those of the Special Reserve. The responsibility of the Territorial also lasted the whole of the year, whereas that of the Special Reservist was only for a comparatively short period. It was only fair, therefore, to give the privilege, such as it was, of being excused from service on juries all the year round to men of the Territorial Force.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said it was a thankless task to have to criticise the Special Reserves, and it always went against the grain to criticise the provision made for the defence of the Empire. He thought the speeches delivered that night had taken the right and just course. When the Minister for War last rose from his seat it was to offer to the Leader of the Opposition an assurance that in connection with the Special Reserves the *esprit de corps* should be carefully watched and preserved. It was very difficult indeed for those sitting on the Opposition side of the House to realise that that was the attitude of the Minister for War. The men who enlisted in this force were not told that they might be drafted in any time of emergency to any other unit and that they might be called upon to fight in a unit to which they were not accustomed. This applied not only to non-commissioned officers and men but also to the officers. Any officer of the Special Reserve when war broke out or a national emergency arose might be drafted off to another unit to fight among perfect strangers. Of course the officers would feel those strange surroundings less than the men, but in the case of the men it would be more serious, because they were greatly influenced by the fact that they had with them comrades to whose habits and friendship they had been accustomed, and to be thrown amongst complete strangers seemed to him to be a curious way of safeguarding the *esprit de corps* of those troops. Why did the right hon. Gentleman go out of his way to destroy sentiment in connection with this force? He did not believe there was any assembly which was more controlled by sentiment than the House of Commons. He had seen the House almost in tears over sentiment, and he had often seen it reduced to laughter. The House of Commons did not ignore the fact that sentiment was one of the greatest powers in the world, and yet the right hon. Gentleman when handling this part of the defensive forces went out of his way and destroyed one of the finest sentiments by changing the name of the Militia, around which military men had clustered ever since the days of Waterloo, ever since the days when they garrisoned the Mediterranean, and ever since they volunteered for South Africa, where they did a noble work on behalf of their Queen, King, and country. Why could he not allow them to remain under the name of the Militia of which they were proud? He had now given them an emasculated kind of title known as Special Reserve. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman ignored the power of sentiment always, although he had done so in connection with this force. What chance was there of this being made an efficient force? The lads joined at seventeen years of age, and as soon as they were any good the best of them would be drafted off into the Army. So this force on which they would learn to rely as years went by, in which the right hon. Gentleman had succeeded by regulations in destroying *esprit de corps* and sentiment, would be constantly emasculated by the removal of all those who constituted its best members and there would be only the residuum left. They were to have six months training in their first year. That surely was little enough for such a future as the right hon. Gentleman proposed to place them in. The next year's training dropped from six months to three weeks. Those lads did not come from the classes which provided the Territorial Army. They did not come out of the great operative and textile centres throughout the country, but they came more or less from a poor class and many of them had suffered from unemployment. They joined this force, got their six months training, and the next year they got three weeks training—which was far too little—and in the meantime, while they were not being trained for the other forty-nine weeks of the year, they were seeking employment and were bound to deteriorate. For forty-nine weeks in the second year they had to seek a precarious livelihood, and they would deteriorate not only in physique, but intellectually and morally as well. This could not possibly be avoided under the system. Why should they be told that they could rely upon this Special Reserve which was marked off as something peculiarly choice? This was the force they were to rely upon in case of war. It was true that boys learned quickly, and at seventeen a boy would learn in half the time that a man at twenty-seven would take, but it should not be overlooked that they were equally quick at forgetting what they had learned. Instead of taking care of these men, nurturing them, protecting them so as not to allow them to deteriorate, they were allowed to suffer through unemployment. It should not be forgotten that the Militia sent out 24,000 men to the South African War, but he would like to know how many this Special Reserve could send out. Out of the 58,500 who would be necessary to form the establishment of the Infantry, only 18,000 at the very utmost would be available to go abroad in time of war. During the South African War the Militia sent out 24,000 men, and they did grand work. When the right hon. Gentleman's Special Reserve was formed, it would not be able to do what the Militia did with an organisation which had sentiment and *esprit de corps*, which the right hon. Gentleman had done his best to destroy. What could they say about the men trained in the depots? The one thing they wanted now was to be able to train the brains of their men, and the humblest private in the Special Reserve ought to have his brain trained. They wanted to institute initiative amongst the men. They would be sent out to do work in extended order, and they could not always be in touch with the captains and others. The men would have to think for themselves, and they were not being trained in the country where they could be taught to take cover. How could they train the men to take cover in a barrack square? It could not be done. The first year the men might get a little training, but the second year's training would be fatal to any powers of initiative in the men. They wanted them to think. These were serious considerations which ought to be kept in mind by the Secretary of State for War before he gave the assurance to the Leader of the Opposition that the *esprit de corps* was to be carefully nurtured and preserved in connection with the Force which he feared very much would never really be an efficient Force. His hon. friend the Member for Mid. Devon, who had had considerable military experience, said he was nervous about it. He did not wonder at that. The word of the hon. Member in the matter ought to carry considerable weight. What did the hon. Member think of boys of seventeen being sent to garrison Malta and other places like that? The right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee that the Special Reserve was going to be sent out to Malta. He would like to see the right hon. Gentleman attempting to send boys of seventeen to garrison the Mediterranean fortresses. There was not a mother in the country who would not be coming up and saying: "You will not send my son of seventeen to those climates." The Prime Minister had had a hot time in regard to the suffragettes, but that was mere child's play compared with the experience which the Secretary of State for War would have with the mothers of England, who would give him such a time as he was never likely to forget. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take to heart many of the things which had been said by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House. He hoped that, notwithstanding the present regulations which were very much against the *esprit de corps* which was always essential in a British military Force, the sentiment which enabled our soldiers to rally round the name which they held dear would be shown, for without it a military Force nowhere could do any good.

*CAPTAIN MORRISON-BELL said there was one remark of the Secretary of State for War which, he was sure, the whole of the officers of the Regular Forces would receive with the deepest disappointment, namely, the statement that the officers of the Special Reserve were to be allowed to go into the places of those seconded from their regiments. Were these Special Reserve officers to fill the gap? If that was the intention of the right hon. Gentleman, he felt that he would cause the greatest disappointment to the officers of the Regular Forces. The regimental officers were the backbone of the Army, and yet they had been passed over again and again and others had been put into positions which might have been given to them. There might be reasons for that, but he did not know what they were. He thought it was a mistake to put in the Special Reserve officers, and he hoped it was not too late to reconsider the matter. If he commanded a regiment, and an officer came to him to ask to be seconded under these circumstances he would see him——[laughter]. This was a serious question, and the proposal would cause the greatest consternation among regimental officers. There was no justification for it, and he hoped there would be some further reference to the matter by the Secretary of State.

Mr. ACLAND said the matter was made perfectly plain by the Secretary of State in the following Answer to a Question on 20th July—

> "Special Reserve officers will be employed with Regular units when, as often happens, there is a temporary shortage of Regular officers, or when Regular officers are seconded. I may add that to enable Special Reserve units to obtain junior officers pending the machinery of the new training corps becoming fully operative the Army Council have decided, as an interim arrangement, to allow candidates for commissions in the Special Reserve to qualify by serving with a Regular unit for four months, provided that they apply for commissions before the 18th of next December, instead of the full probationary period of twelve months."

It was not intended to block the hopes of promotion of the regimental officers.

Captain MORRISON-BELL said that if these Special Reserve officers were going to be put in the place of officers who were seconded for three years a great injustice would be done to the regimental officers, who already felt that they had a strong grievance.

Mr. HALDANE made a remark which was inaudible in the Press Gallery.

*Captain MORRISON-BELL said he could not take great comfort from that statement. Already promotion had been delayed to a most dangerous degree, and the officers were deeply disappointed. The officers knew at present that they had a very poor chance of promotion to the command of a regiment. From start to finish promotion was slow, but now they were told that Special Reserve officers were to be put in. That would make promotion still slower, and there was not the slightest justification for such an injustice being done.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis) concurred in the expression of pity which had fallen from hon. Members on the other side of the House as to the abolition of the Militia. He believed that the Militia had been abolished through the procedure in past years by which the Volunteers had entered so much into competition with the Militia. He understood that of the 101 battalions there were twenty in Ireland where there was no competition with the Territorial Army. Of these twelve were kept intact and eight were draft-producing battalions. He wished to know how the right hon. Gentleman had succeeded in recruiting officers and men from the Militia in Ireland as compared with the recruiting of officers and men from the Militia in this country, where the Territorial Army was in competition.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 77; Noes, 231. (Division List No. 224.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.SirAlex.F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn. G(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, Major E.F.(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charlse Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber,Capt.W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hill, Sir Clement
Hope, JamesFitzalan(Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.-Col. A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
McArthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip

Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ashley and Mr. William Nicholson.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Balfour, Rebort (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Herbert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W, (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Delany, William
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Essex, R, W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peadboy (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithness-sh
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Micking, Major. G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter

Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick,B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne,G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Wadsworth, J.
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt.Hn Sir ThomasP
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1908-9.

Class II.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £40,830, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

*Mr. A. PONSONBY (Stirling Burghs) said that he desired to raise a question in the sphere of foreign politics, which was of the greatest importance at the present time. He alluded to the state of affairs in Turkey, especially as it affected our policy in Macedonia. It was with a feeling of great embarrassment that he touched upon this subject, not only from the fact that he was addressing the House for the first time, but also because events in that part of the world had been passing with such surprising rapidity during the last few days that anyone who took a close interest in the foreign politics of Europe was obliged to feel that his views were daily and even hourly undergoing some change or modification. He had intended to raise the question of Macedonia not in any spirit of criticism or even of complaint, but with a view to supporting and encouraging the right hon. Gentleman the Foreign Secretary in the attitude he had taken up with regard to affairs in the Balkan Peninsula. And he ventured to choose this subject because three years residence in Constantinople had enabled him to realise how complicated was the path of any Minister and with what difficulties and dangers it was strewed, in any negotiations he had to carry on with the Turkish Government. There were many ways of approaching this intricate problem. Indeed, there were many grounds for forming political opinions on any subject. People built their political opinions on moral foundations, on legal and economic foundations, and on humanitarian foundations; and he thought that those who built their views on humanitarian foundations, although they might sometimes be laughed at for indulging in sentimentality, in the long run, whether they were dealing with problems which concerned our social life at home or with national and international questions, their views were generally found to be disinterested, just, and generous. But it was not only the humanitarian view that had to be considered in regard to this question. The whole problem was fraught with danger and concerned closely the interests of all the great Powers of Europe. Perhaps he might be allowed to allude to matters as they stood before the last two or three weeks had very much altered the state of affairs. The right hon. Gentleman the Foreign Secretary, after two and a half years, finding that no real change had been made and that the situation was really becoming more dangerous, and that the population of that unfortunate country was suffering more and more from misgovernment, drew up a scheme of reforms which met with general approval, and which was submitted first of all to the Russian Government and eventually to be transmitted to the other Powers and ultimately to the Sultan himself. He considered that the scheme which the right hon. Gentleman suggested was one that was moderate and would be effective if it were ever accepted. There was no doubt that there was every justification for taking strong measures, considering that for the last two years, since the promulgation of the Mürsteg programme, there had been absolutely no amelioration; on the contrary, the state of affairs had become considerably worse, and the outrages of the bands had increased. Before attaching blame to any particular section, it must be remembered that retaliation was often more violent than the original act which provoked it, and, to use a phrase employed two or three years ago by the Leader of the Opposition, "the balance of criminality" did not rest with that particular section of the population which was responsible for the greatest number of outrages, but with the authority in whose hands the government or mis-government of the country lay. If the bands of Servians, Bulgarians, Greeks and Albanians had been treated with equal justice, or even with equal severity, a very different state of affairs would have been the consequence. But as those who had studied the problem closely knew well, favour was shown to the Servian and Greek bands in order that they might counteract the encroachments of the Bulgarian bands. He, therefore, insisted that the blame rested on the responsible authority. That was not the Turkish Army. The Turkish Army, if properly officered and with efficient generals, would be, he might say, almost the most formidable Army in the world. The blame did not rest with them, nor with the Sublime Porte. The Sublime Porte only consisted of a number of officials who registered the decrees of the Sultan and who, with all the wiles of Oriental diplomacy, managed to frustrate the demands of the Powers. No, the ultimate authority responsible was the Sultan himself—that strange and, he might say, uncanny personality who, in his cowardly retirement at Yildiz, managed to control the affairs of his country and the destinies of every individual one of his subjects with a control so complete and so absolute that it might be fairly said that no autocrat had ever before managed to get the whole authority centred in his own person to the same extent. It was with the Sultan that they had to deal. He did not wish to elaborate the scheme of reforms of the right hon. Gentleman the Foreign Secretary. There were many points in it which might be considered the absolute irreducible minimum for the reform of these provinces. But to what extent was everything changed by the revolution now going on? This revolution had been accomplished very rapidly. To what influence was it to be chiefly attributed? There was no doubt that the Young Turkey movement had had a considerable influence, but he believed the disaffection in the Turkish Army, widespread for so many years, had gradually come to a head. The Young Turkey Party had taken advantage of the opportunity and also of the Albanian national movement. The result was that the Sultan had granted a constitution. He believed that that constitution would be very like the one granted in 1876; it was a ruse on the part of the Sultan in order to tide over an embarrassing moment. He had shown great skill in the past in dealing with all sections of people, with the Armenians, with the Macedonians, and, time after time, with the Powers of Europe, and no doubt in this instance he would know how to deal with his own countrymen and his own race. With the Army against him he knew that resistance was useless, but he would no doubt find means to get them on his side. If, however, this revolution were successful, if it was a great liberal movement which was to result in better treatment being meted out to the Christian subjects of the Sultan, then it would be wrong for us to interfere, and we ought to stand by and look on sympathetically. But he doubted whether it was a movement of that kind, and he thought that in a few months time it would be seen that this concession, given by the Sultan at a time of danger, had not diminished any of his power. The Secretary of State when he spoke would be able to tell the Committee what was going on, but in the condition of flux in which Turkey now was it was not likely that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to outline any definite policy. He himself felt, however, that the right hon. Gentleman's schemes for the reform of Macedonia should not be put aside altogether, but should be kept until a favourable opportunity could be found for putting them forward. When they were pressed he trusted the Government would not assent to any mitigation, weakening, or whittling down which would have the effect of rendering them as useless as many of the reform schemes which had been presented to the Sultan before. He was not a great believer in the Concert of Europe and the council of ambassadors at Constantinople. Unanimity was apparently the main object, and they were only completely successful if they were absolutely inactive. But if it was intended to work through the Concert, then it should have a conductor, and he suggested that this country could undertake that rôle better than any other Power, because we had a high reputation for disinterestedness and for being the champions of international justice. When he travelled in Turkey he had been received with embarrassing cordiality, not because he was attached to the Embassy, but because he was an Englishman. The right hon. Gentleman would know how and when to press his schemes and there was no one who enjoyed greater confidence or who was supported by a more powerful public opinion than the right hon. Gentleman who now occupied the position of Secretary of State. Before concluding, he might be allowed to refer to the misgovernment in another great Empire, namely, Russia. And he would, with all respect, urge the right hon. Gentleman to remember that even in an Empire where we were not bound by treaty obligations and where there could be no question of our interfering with the internal affairs, the heartfelt sympathy of the British people was on the side of the oppressed and not on the side of the oppressor, and any attempt on our part to condone, even by expressions of official cordiality, the misdeeds and unjustifiable cruelties of an authority who must be held responsible for the misgovernment and persecution, would not be approved by the people of this country who were lovers of justice and political liberty.

Mr. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) said the questions which he desired to raise were the two most prominent questions on the stage of international politics at the present time, namely Macedonia and Persia. What was the paramount interest of Great Britain in Macedonia and Persia? In Persia we had great commercial interests. Our trade with that country was in the past greater than that of any other country in the world, and at the present time was only second to that of Russia. We had constructed a telegraph line from one end of the country to the other, and anybody travelling in Persia and taking note of the currency would find that the bank notes issued through a British bank. In Macedonia our commercial interests comparatively were small; but in Turkey, of which Macedonia was a part, they were very large. But commercial interests were not the paramount interests of Great Britain either in Macedonia or Persia. Our paramount interest in those countries was to maintain their integrity, to foster so far as that might be possible by a friendly outside Power like ourselves, of all the best elements of the population with the object of preventing the extension at the expense of those countries of the great military Empires of Europe. Everything that tended, therefore, to strengthen these countries was a British interest. The right hon. Baronet had put the case extremely well on a previous occasion when speaking on Macedonia. He said that the greatest weakness of Turkey itself was the continuance of the Macedonian difficulty. So long as we held India on the one hand and Egypt on the other this country could not afford to be indifferent to the condition of the populations of the countries that lay in between. Should that condition become bad and the population suffer from any cause whatsoever; should the Governments which ruled over them become indebted to a very large extent either to the Government or to the concession hunters of any particular country, then the result might be that these populations would come under a foreign control. They might lose their own native resources and strength, and the tendency would be for one or other of the great military Empires to approach ever nearer to our borders in India and Egypt It might be asked how we were going to prevent the great military Powers of Europe extending into these countries. That was a difficult question to answer, and he certainly would not argue that it was possible for a country with resources like ours single-handed to arrest the aggression of great military Empires in these countries. What he would urge was that we should do nothing by our diplomacy to assist them in that direction. On two occasions in recent history we had so assisted. We assisted in 1902 when we refused a loan to Persia at a high rate of interest on excellent security. From that refusal dated the Russian predominance in Persia, and all those deplorable events which had recently happened in that country, including our exclusion from the paramount position which we had previously occupied. Only last year there was another question which had a great influence in the same direction, he alluded to the concession of the 3 per cent. increase in the Turkish Customs. He had never concealed his admiration for the manner in which the right hon. Baronet, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had conducted the final stage of those negotiations. His hands were, he had no doubt, in a sense tied by the action of his predecessor; but he did say that the grant of this 3 per cent. had had the effect of releasing other revenues for the purpose of the great enterprise known as the Bagdad Railway; and this concession on our part had been a very powerful factor in bringing about a relation of financial bondage between Turkey and Germany, and the extension of German influence over that country. With regard to the question of Macedonia, which was raised by his hon. friend the Member for Stirling Burghs, how did the matter stand at the present day? After nearly five years of so-called reforms —the Mürzsteg programme was introduced in 1903—the condition of Macedonia was now actually worse than it was before the Powers ever put their hands to the plough. If he merely took the period —and he only did so because it was a convenient measure of time for hon. Members — during which the present Parliament had sat, a period of about two and a half years, no less than 5,000 people out of a population of 2,000,000 had met with violent deaths in Macedonia. The figure was even possibly higher. Now the blame for this state of things had been thrown upon the bands; and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, in a memorable speech some years ago attributed the blame to the bands in a much quoted phrase about the balance of criminality. One heard little of this view at the present day. It had become plain that the bands were only a symptom of the disease and had little to do with its real cause. What was the real cause? Obviously it was bad government on the part of the Turkish Government. And it was more than that—it was the refusal both on the part of the population of Macedonia and on the part of the adjacent Balkan States to recognise the seriousness of the reforms introduced by the Powers. The Macedonian peasant contrasted his lot with that of his brother or his cousin who lived under a very much happier state of things in the adjacent Balkan States; and those States themselves, having no confidence in the reforms, and looking forward to the break up of the present order of things in Macedonia, were all engaged in pegging out their claims. He thought that he had a perfect right to say that the bands were not the cause of the state of things in Macedonia, but were merely a symptom of that state of things. What had the Powers done? They had combined to introduce the machinery of reform, but they had altogether omitted to supply the motive power. The machinery of reform they had put down in the shape of some forty military officers for the *gendarmerie*, and of two civil agents and four financial advisers who proferred advice to the Turkish Inspector-General. But they had never supplied the motive power—that was to say, they had never given these officers or civil agents any real executive control of the affairs of Macedonia. These officers ate out their hearts in the wild mountains of Macedonia. He had talked with them; he had enjoyed their hospitality; and he had found that they regarded it as disgraceful to the Powers of Europe that they should send their officers to Macedonia on such a purposeless errand. They had no power; and their superiors at Salonika, with the financial and civil agents, were always thwarted by the counsels which prevailed at Yildiz Kiosk, whence the Sultan pulled the strings. He had preached from this text whenever he mentioned the subject of Macedonia; and therefore, he was delighted when during the debate of the 25th February, he had listened to these remarkable words of the right hon. Baronet, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

> "With things as they are in Macedonia, anything which is less than a real remedy can be but little better than a farce."

That was the conclusion which he had himself expressed. What was the real remedy? His hon. friends beside him were, at all events, deeply interested to find a real remedy. There were two alternative remedies which they might adopt. One was that they might copy the example of the Ottoman Public Debt Commission, an institution controlled by Europeans working with native officials, and which had produced the most admirable results without in any way offending the susceptibilities of the people. They might follow that precedent, and might press for the grant of control to the financial Commission which they had already established. Or, they might keep the Financial Commission, as they kept the *gendarmerie* officers, to assist the Turkish officials, and they might appoint a Turkish governor with the consent of all the Powers, for a definite period of years, to be irremovable without their consent, and to have a pension on retirement. That was the alternative remedy; and it was the remedy which was suggested by the right hon. Gentleman in that memorable speech of the 25th of February. Personally he cared little which of these two remedies they adopted, and he thought that his hon. friends would agree with him in that matter. But what they wanted to know was this. If this were the real remedy, why had there been this intolerable delay in putting it into application? Why, the proposal to appoint a Turkish Governor responsible to the Powers was a proposal which dated from the time Lord Lansdowne was in office—before the present Government came into power. He thought they had a right to ask why it had taken all this time to put this proposal into practice. The right hon. Baronet had told them, by way of explanation, in the debate of the 25th of February, that the delay was due, at all events in part, to the exhaustion which was felt by the Powers after the naval demonstration of 1905. He did not traverse that. He recognised that it had been difficult to do anything with the Powers in that frame of mind. But what he did say was this—that since that naval demonstration of 1905, two things, and two very important things, had occurred. Two weapons had been placed in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman which were not in the possession of his predecessor, Lord Lansdowne. On the one hand our consent was necessary to the increase of the Customs, and we ought not to have given our consent except upon the condition that the reforms should be real reforms. We ought to have obtained the "real reform" of which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken in February last, failing which we ought to have refused to penalise our trade by giving our adhesion to the increased duties. Then again, about a year ago we concluded a very notable convention with Russia—the Anglo-Russian Convention. Russia, as the House knew, was one of the Powers which occupied a special position in the Macedonian question. In September of last year we concluded that Convention, and what had we given to Russia under it? We gave her priority of commercial exploitation over a large part of Persia —in fact, the greater part of Persia. We gave her equal rights with ourselves in Tibet, though the nearest Russian territory does not adjoin Tibet, but is hundreds of miles away. In Afghanistan we gave Russia the privilege of sending in commercial agents and we even engaged that Russian goods should be admitted into Afghanistan on the same terms as ours, though Afghan goods had to pay enormous duties on the Russian frontier. The concessions made to Russia under the Convention were undisputably great and far-reaching; and the House were led to hope that, as a consequence, they would be able to work with Russia in a much more friendly way towards the solution of the many problems in which both countries were interested. They had therefore, a right to expect some consideration from Russia in settling such quesions as that of Macedonia in a thorough-going way. The debate in which the right hon. Gentleman announced his "real remedy," took place on the 25th of February. On the 12th of March, in answer to the hon. Member for Tottenham, it was stated that a despatch had been addressed to the Powers putting forward the views of His Majesty's Government, as expressed in the debate. On the 23rd of July, many months afterwards, he had himself put a similar Question; and the right hon. Baronet told him that only a part of the reform proposals had as yet been submitted to the Powers at all. He hoped the right hon. Baronet would explain the discrepancy between these two answers. He understood that the present position of the matter was this. We had made a proposal to the Powers for the organisation of a flying column to hunt the bands; and the other proposals—a Turkish Governor responsible to the Powers; the retention of the financial delegates, placing them on terms of equality with the civil agents; and that the civil expenditure should be made a first charge upon the Macedonian Budget. These proposals, he understood, would follow later, and were likely to be submitted not by ourselves, but by the Russian Government. He would like to know why there had been all this delay in dealing with these proposals. He hoped the Russian Government would not allege —as was alleged by certain Russian newspapers—that delay was necessary owing to recent events in Macedonia. He saw no reason why the movement which had set the Army in a position of power in Macedonia should in any way delay the presentation of the reform proposals to the other Powers. He could understand that it might delay the proposal for the hunting of the bands; because the bands had fraternised with the Army, and there was no reason at the present moment for organising a force against them. But surely those who led the Young Turkey movement, and who had established themselves in a position of supreme power in certain districts of Macedonia, would not be averse to the adoption of the "real remedy" enunciated by the right hon. Gentleman. He thought one of the main contributory causes to the liberation of Turkey which had just taken place had been the presence in Macedonia of the foreign *gendarmerie* officers and the civil agents. The Turkish officers had seen among them a number of officers from various other Powers, well paid, well clothed, men who really enjoyed a position which inspired respect. They had also seen a great improvement in the collection of taxes, and he was sure this result, at all events, was due to the excellent work which had been done by the European members of the Financial Commission, which he did not wish to disparage in any way. He was loth to believe that the Young Turks, now that they had established themselves in a position of power, would be anxious to rid themselves of all these foreign institutions at a moment's notice. He should think they would rather be disposed to accept gladly the right hon. Baronet's real remedy of a Turkish governor in Macedonia, practically independent of the central Government. It was true that the Young Turks hoped to reform the Government as a whole; but, even if they succeeded, Macedonia, where the Christian population were double the Mussulmen, must always present a special problem which would have to be treated in a special way; and he could not help thinking that the wisdom of those who controlled the new movement in Turkey would for all those reasons accept the reforms of the right hon. Baronet without demur, with the knowledge that, when they had contrived to reform the central Government, and had convinced Europe of their capacity, these props round the edifice of Government in

Macedonia would be thrown aside and the building handed over to its rightful owners. There was one other point to which he desired to allude. He trusted the right hon. Baronet would give it to be understood that our consent to the increase in the Customs duties would not be granted for more than seven years. The general receipts of the province had increased by £234,000 Turkish within the last two years, and the Financial Commission expected that they would be able still further to increase the revenue by £100,000 Turkish in a year or so. This revenue had not been obtained by grinding down the peasants. On the contrary it had been accompanied by an amelioration of their condition. It had been obtained by forcing the well-to-do taxpayers, who formerly eluded taxation to make their due contributions to the revenue.

Turning to Persia, it was noticeable that the same reform movement which had overspread Macedonia had taken root in Persia, but there it was a thoroughly popular movement. It did not spring from the Army as in the case of Turkey. The idea of a Persian constitution had become accepted by the people of Persia of all classes, not merely as a political expedient, but as an article of faith. As a result of that they saw the rising into being of a popular assembly, which had been temporarily suppressed, not by purely Persian forces, but by such forces under Russian direction. On the 23rd of June the Persian Parliament House had been reduced to a mass of ruins. The day before, the Shah had held a council with his Russian advisers, and had given orders to the Russian commander to deal with his subjects as he liked. The result had been that shell and shrapnel were brought against the Parliament buildings and the adjacent mosque, and the Popular Assembly was suppressed after some bloodshed. It could be shown—and it was a matter of some importance that it should be shown—that this action on the part of the Shah was wholly unconstitutional. By Article 45 of the Persian constitution it was provided that the Royal firmans would be sanctioned only when they had received the signature of a responsible Minister. It could not be contended that the suppression of the Popular Assembly was sanctioned by any Minister responsible to the Assembly. It should not be overlooked that in December last, when the Shah for the first time attempted a *coup d'etat* against the Parliament, the Legations of Britain and Russia, the two protecting Powers of Persia, pressed their advice upon the Shah to observe his promises to the Popular Assembly. They had, therefore, made themselves parties to the establishment of a constitutional *regime* in Persia. In July of this year Russian officers on the active list of the Russian Army made it possible for this same Shah to break the promises which he made to the Popular Assembly at the instance of the Legations. He thought that was a novel procedure. Great Britain had in the past lent British officers to Persia; but they had never taken sides in a constitutional grievance between ruler and people. In the present instance Russian officers had taken part in the suppression of one arm of the constitution of the country whose servants they were, namely the Popular Assembly. They had been told that much would depend upon the spirit in which the Anglo-Russian Convention would be worked. Was that the spirit? What was the outstanding feature of the Anglo-Russian Agreement? It was that it professed to be an instrument for the maintenance of the integrity of Persia. It was stated in the preamble that both Powers had mutually engaged to respect the integrity and independence of Persia; and the right hon. Baronet had told them—and he was very glad to hear this declaration—on the 25th of May, in answer to one of his Questions, that the maintenance of the integrity of Persia was one of the principal objects of the Convention. The question he wished to put was this: If the maintenance of the integrity of Persia was one of the principal objects of the Convention, how did they propose to maintain that integrity if they allowed the Parliament to be suppressed? The only way in which they could maintain the integrity of such a loose organisation as an Oriental country was by assisting the central Government in that country. Now one of their great difficulties in assisting the Central Government of Persia had always been that the money was paid over to the Shah, and went into the Royal Treasury to be expended on motor cars, gramophones and other luxuries. The principal grievance between the Shah and the popular party had been that Parliament had insisted that guarantees should be given that all moneys paid in future to Persia should be devoted solely to national objects. They could not set Persia on her legs, or give that solidarity to the Government which was necessary in an Oriental country, unless they had a Parliament who would see to it that the national funds were devoted to national purposes. Some hon. Members—and even the Secretary for Foreign Affairs—might object that it was no business of ours to interfere in the internal affairs of Persia.

* MR. REES (Montgomery Burghs): Hear, hear.

MR. LYNCH: If by that cheer was meant friendly assistance to the people of Persia then he maintained—and he challenged his hon. friend to contradict him—that for a period of 100 years they had consistently interfered in the internal affairs of Persia. Every Shah of Persia from and including Mohammed Shah in 1834 had been placed on the throne with British assistance. In the case of the last two Shahs—Muzaffer-ed-Din and Mohammed Ali Shah—we had shared these friendly offices with Russia. These two Shahs had come to the throne with the assistance of Russia as well as of Great Britain. Moreover, it was the practice for a Shah of Persia to announce to the two Powers—Russia and England—the person whom he nominated as his successor. Not only had the two Powers thus interfered in the internal affairs of Persia, but they had also stood as sponsors for the National Assembly. It followed therefore, that, if the Anglo-Russian Agreement was going to be worked in the spirit of maintaining the integrity of Persia, it was essential that the National Assembly should be upheld against the plots of the reactionaries. He asked the House to consider the importance of Persia to Great Britain. At the present time the Russian frontier touched our Indian frontier only on the Pamirs, in the regions of almost impassable icefields. But if Russia were to absorb Persia, and come down to the line drawn on the map by the Anglo-Russian Convention, they would have a land frontier contiguous with that of Russia for no less than 1,200 miles. Was there any hon. Member of the House who for a moment supposed that this country with its present military resources could defend such a frontier as that? To those hon. Members who were of that opinion he would like to read a short passage from a very important despatch addressed by the Government of India to Lord George Hamilton on 21st of September, 1899. This was what the Council of India said—

> "We desire deliberately to say to your Lordship, with a full consciousness of our responsibility in so saying, that, difficult as we find it in existing circumstances to meet the financial and military strain imposed upon us by the ever increasing proximity of Russian power upon the northern and north-western frontier of India from the Pamirs to Herat, we could not contemplate without dismay the prospect of Russian neighbourhood in Eastern or Southern Persia, the inevitable consequence of which must be a great increase of our own burdens; while the maritime defensibility of India would require to be altogether reconsidered were the dangers of a land invasion to be supplemented by the appearance of a possible antagonist as a naval Power in waters contiguous to Indian shores."

The Indian Government, under the full sense of their responsibility, said they could not contemplate without dismay the occupation of those districts of Persia by Russia. But, supposing another course were adopted, and Russia got Persia over to her side, and organised a Persian army. He would like to quote on this point the views of the most experienced soldier whom they had ever had out in those parts, the late General Sir Henry Rawlinson. This is what he had written after serving for some time as an instructor and commanding officer in the Persian Army:—

> "There are no people in the world who offer better rough material for military purposes than the Persians; the physique of the men is

> admirable, and their powers of endurance are great; their general intelligence and personal courage are beyond all praise. If the Persian material were placed at the disposal of a European Power who would encourage and take care of the men, and develop their military instincts, a fine working Army, very superior in my opinion, to anything Turkey could produce, might be obtained in a very short period of time."

In a lecture at the Royal United Service Institution in 1858 Sir Henry had previously said that—

> "It was impossible to avoid foreseeing that as any European war becomes developed in the East, the military resources of Persia must be called into action. In fact, it seemed that we could not have a more formidable engine of attack and defence launched against India than a Persian Army commanded by Russian officers. In the same way we could not have a more efficient instrument of defence than the same Army led by British officers, or by officers acting in our interests."

Those were weighty words, and he did not desire to add anything to them. In the present critical phase of the fortunes of Persia and of British relations with that country he commended those words to the consideration of the Government, of the House of Commons and of the country.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that until now the House had not had the opportunity of considering those relations which lay at the very bottom of all these questions. The hon. Member for the Stirling Burghs had expressed his hostility to Russia and the greatest anxiety to concern himself with the internal affairs of that country, and he had expressed the greatest horror of what was going on there; and yet at the same time the hon. Member was supporting Anglo-Russian action in Macedonia. To him it seemed to weaken their policy if it were to be supposed that they were specially inclined to act with Russia only, or, at any rate, specially inclined to act with a group of Powers which invariably excluded one of the great Powers. He spoke with the greatest hesitation upon a subject of extreme delicacy. Personally he had no complaint to make of the language or so far as he knew it of the policy of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in this respect. The speeches which had been made here about the *entente* with France and its supposed necessary consequence in a certain *entente* with Russia were correct and generally approved of, and were perfectly consistent with friendly relations with all the Powers. Unfortunately persons were continually writing articles which were supposed to help the policy of this country, and in foreign Parliaments persons made speeches which were supposed to express the foreign policy of this country. It was said that we had succeeded in isolating Germany. He did not in the least impute that to the policy of the Government. He found nothing in the language of his right hon. friend to give ground for that suspicion, but it was most unfortunate that throughout the world that explanation was given of our foreign policy. He was not speaking of the danger of war. He was not one of those who believed in the likelihood of war. He was speaking of the danger, from the point of view of our policy in all parts of the world, of such a belief. As to the *entente* with France, that it should be closer if possible, and that it should be permanent was desired by all of them, but there were some who wrote as though we had achieved this curious measure of success, that while there was no alliance with France, and while France did not desire a military alliance with us, we on our part should defend France as though a military alliance existed between these two countries. As a matter of fact by glosses such as he had described there was a risk—that of promoting the rapid increase of armaments. The direct tendency of comments such as those which were made without contradiction all over the world was to increase the German Fleet, and to force the literal execution of the German naval programme of construction, and, therefore, to involve us in corresponding construction, and in a race of armaments to add to our burdens. Moreover, he could not but think that it directly weakened our policy in Macedonia. At the present time the Committee were in this position. They were not acquainted with the whole of the proposals of the Government, but only with a portion of them. They did not know what the Powers had said in reply in regard to that portion, and they were unable, therefore, effectively or usefully to discuss the policy. But it was described as an Anglo-Russian policy, and he thought it would be far more likely to achieve success if it represented also the Powers which had the most influence in Turkey. Personally he had every hope, without having too much confidence, that the Powers would welcome the return at Constantinople to the constitution of twenty-eight years ago. He doubted whether they could usefully discuss the details of that subject that night, although it did come under his general belief that our policy had been weakened by its being represented that one of the great Powers had been isolated. There had been in the House no real debate on another great international occasion, namely, the conference of the Powers at the Hague. Some of the papers which had been promised in regard to the conference had not yet been circulated, and he had hoped to have them in time for that debate. What they might be he did not know, but it was impossible to read the Papers which had been laid before them without seeing that there was hostility all through the Hague Conference between Germany and ourselves. One result had been claimed for the Conference. The Leader of the Opposition and the French Foreign Office had said that it was the only result, and the late Prime Minister said that an enduring result and very solid achievement of that conference was the agreement to create a maritime court. In the instructions given to Sir Edward Fry the Government put that proposal very high indeed; they gave the most direct instructions to Sir Edward Fry that the Government were anxious to see the constitution of an international tribunal of appeal from the decisions of the Prize Courts, and wrote that, if the Hague Conference accomplished no other object than the constitution of that tribunal, it would render inestimable service to mankind. That was very strong language. He understood that the Germans were aware of the proposal. We communicated it just before the Hague Conference began, and they made no reply, but at the conference itself they gave notice of a Resolution on the same subject. They were called first, and the result was that our proposal became a German proposal, and it was adopted as such. Since that time the question had gone backwards. The German Government stated that Germany took the initiative for the establishment of that tribunal, but that they were acting with "some degree of caution." Then a Question was asked in this House by the hon. Member for Norwood, and in reply the late Prime Minister said that there must be legislation by Parliament before the ratification of the Convention could take place. It seemed to him pretty clear from the proceedings of the conference that there was jealousy and hostility behind the scenes all the time between Germany and this country, and he confessed that he was not surprised,—as a policy, which was perfectly correct and defensible in itself, had been described as one which had isolated Germany. He was not surprised that a feeling of irritation should have grown up, and that suspicion had been thrown on our policy in all portions of the world. He was far from being convinced that our policy in regard to the Congo State was not influenced by the same cause of difficulty and hostility. We were as deeply committed in regard to the Congo State as in regard to Macedonia. This Parliament would be sitting in the autumn months, but it would be sitting dumb so far as foreign affairs were concerned. There would be no opportunity for debate on this subject. Both in regard to the Congo and Macedonia the Government were under deep promises to this country. It was, therefore, all the more incumbent on them before the House separated that they should state what they would be responsible for, and what their pledges were in regard to the Congo State. The fresh Congo Papers had not yet been distributed, and curiously enough the Belgian Government had stated publicly that they insisted on their immediate publication. The Government would have to carry out the promises made to the House in Congo matters as in Macedonian matters, and he would like very briefly to state, subject to correction if he was wrong, and subject to confirmation of hon. friends on both sides if he was right, what he understood these promises to be. The Secretary of State had told them that he had represented to the Belgian Government that it must be a condition precedent to any annexation that the Congo State should be taken over on terms which would afford a guarantee to us that the conditions of our Treaty and the Berlin Act were carried out. The circumstance to which we attached most importance and which that guarantee was concerned with was stated by the Secretary of State in the words "A radical alteration in the economic system." In reply to Questions on 25th June, as to whether the changes required and to be so guaranteed would include the free collection of rubber by the natives and the sale by the natives to merchants of all countries, the answer was that all concessions should be subject to native rights and that the natives must not be debarred from the collection or rubber or from the sale of it to merchants of all countries. He thought "concessions" was a word of undue limitation. The right should exist anywhere throughout the territory, and not in the territory of the concessions only. Subject to that, the answer was thoroughly satisfactory. But since that answer was given there came the White Paper called "Taxation of Natives, and other Questions" and in that he confessed he thought that rather too much importance was given to secondary questions, such as those relating to currency, at the expense of our main position. How dangerous it was in dealing with Belgium to make any concessions at all might be seen from a comparison between statements on page 2 and page 37 of the White Paper. On page 2 the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in a letter dated 27th March, 1908, said—

> "His Majesty's Government have every confidence in the earnest desire of the Belgian Government to introduce thorough and far-reaching reforms into the present system of administration in the Congo, and they are therefore particularly anxious to maintain an attitude of strict forbearance, and to abstain from any act which might be construed as interfering with the complete liberty of action of the Belgian Government in the future management of the internal affairs of the Congo.'"

The Secretary of State went on to say that there must be adherence to our treaty and the Berlin Act which covered everything. What did the Belgian Government do? They omitted these words, and took solemn notice of the words which he had quoted. They said—

> "The Government of the King are happy to take act of the assurance given by the Government of His Britannic Majesty 'to abstain from any act which might be construed as interfering with the complete liberty of action of the Belgian Government in the future management of the internal affairs of the Congo."

Sir Charles W. Dilke.

At this moment the Belgian Government were professing, not for the first time, their most anxious desire for complete publicity in regard to their position. Last week an article appeared in *Le Temps* which stated that the Belgian Government had insisted that the correspondence should be published as speedily as possible; but they had not yet got it. This country, at all events, had nothing to lose by publicity. The position was clear, and he had set forth why our expectations ought to be carried out. If the present session passed over without the Act of annexation being passed, it was highly probable that the matter would drag on and that in November, when this House was known to be sitting, but from the nature of their proceedings they should be prevented from expressing their opinion, a state of things might arise when the Foreign Secretary might be glad if they reminded him and the Belgian Government through this House of the promises which had been given, and of the policy on which both sides of the House were united in supporting the Government. There was only one other matter, closely connected with the feeble administration of the Congo in the interior, to which he wished to draw attention. As a result of the captures which had taken place by thousands of revolted troops who carried on slave raiding and the sale of slaves, a stream of slaves continually passed to Portuguese possessions on the islands of San Thome and Principe. A party of convicts were also sent to serve their sentences in these islands. The slave trade was carried on by the Portuguese Government, and the report which Mr. Burtt had made upon the subject had been toned down for publication. They had been told that the Government were giving anxious consideration to this subject, and that communications had been made with the Portuguese Government with regard to it. A Captain Francisco Paola Cid, who had been formerly a governor of the territory, it was said, had been sent to report upon the whole matter. He thought that this excrescence on the

Congo, which was notoriously continuing to the present time, was a matter which required more rapid attention than the Government had yet given to it. They had allowed themselves to be put off with promises; those promises had not been kept any more than those which had been given by the Belgian Government. In conclusion, he wished to say that in his opinion our policy in all parts of the world was not facilitated by attempts which were made in many quarters to direct it against a particular Power. This country meant peace; but we had a great interest besides that of peace—the interest of not pushing warlike preparations, and, consequently, the cost of these warlike preparations, to the extreme.

*EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.) said he thought the House owed the right hon. Baronet a debt for having raised the general debate on foreign policy, and for having redeemed their discussions from the charge that they entirely concerned themselves with the internal affairs of other countries. He supposed they would all be glad if the Government could do or say anything which would mitigate or remove the unfortunate suspicion which our foreign policy appeared to excite in some quarters in Germany. On the other hand, he confessed that it was difficult to understand, apart from the constructions placed upon it in the Press, why a policy, which consisted merely in trying to remove the grounds of friction between ourselves and other countries with which we had various controversies at issue, should excite the suspicions of any other Power.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): What about Lord Cromer's speech?

*EARL PERCY said that Lord Cromer's speech illustrated the difficulty of bringing about a better atmosphere of public opinion either in this country or Germany until the two Governments could arrive at some kind of agreement for arresting what had become an acknowledged rivalry in naval armaments. In regard to the Congo question, he agreed with the right hon. Baronet that they would be faced with some difficulty next session by the fact that annexation might be decided upon without our having any opportunity of debating it. They must trust to the Government with regard to the proper time to renew our representations, but they should be renewed before annexation was decided upon. The despatch of the Belgian Government left on his mind the impression that that Government, having assured us of their general concurrence with the reforms which we had urged, thought that they might now investigate at their leisure the systems prevailing in other parts of the Congo basin, and that they were under no necessity to communicate any further information as to the precise steps by which they meant to carry their professions into practice. If that were their view, it betrayed a very serious misconception of the position of this country; and he was not quite sure that that misconception might not be strengthened by the sentence in the despatch of the Foreign Secretary when he said that it was not our desire to prescribe the precise method by which the administration of the Congo should be brought into conformity with the principles of the Berlin Act. There was no doubt that the present Congo administration was a violation of the Berlin Act. But it was also a violation of the expressed conditions under which the original International Association obtained recognition from this country and from America—and so obtained the *status* which alone enabled it to become a party to the Berlin Act at all. The vital point, as it seemed to him, was that before we gave our consent to the annexation of the Congo by the Belgian Government we should insist that in the Treaty of Cession, the same legal security which was provided for the rights of the concessionary companies should also be secured for the rights of the natives by the restitution to them not only of land sufficient for occupation, but also of their original freedom to sell all the products (except ivory) grown in territories which are not effectively occupied by the companies and exploited by means of free labour hired in the open market. Passing to the question of Macedonia, he would be glad if the right hon. Gentleman found it consonant with the public interest to make a statement with regard to the present state of Turkish affairs. There seemed to be a general impression in the responsible Press that in view of the events of the last few days England and Russia would take time to look around and reconsider their position before they presented their new reform schemes to the Sultan. He imagined that this impression was well-founded. It would appear somewhat absurd to enter into a solemn discussion as to the co-operation of the military and gendarmerie for the repression of these bands, at a time when the bands had temporarily disappeared and the military had broken loose from control.

And it must be remembered that whatever other results might follow from the present constitutional movement in Turkey, it was almost certain that it would increase rather than diminish the general dislike and opposition to interference from outside. He had always believed that the desire for reform was as widespread among the Mahomedans as among the Christians, but at the same time it sprang in no small measure from the conviction that only the removal of the most glaring abuses would rescue their country from constant and humiliating tutelage on the part of the Powers. Speaking for himself alone, he had never pretended to view with any satisfaction or hope the schemes for so-called autonomy, partial or otherwise, in separate provinces of the Turkish Empire. He believed that it was idle in the light of past experience to expect that they could persuade the Mahomedans that a policy of that kind was anything else than a first step towards the dismemberment of the country, nor did he think that their belief in the justice of the European Powers was likely to be strengthened by the contrast between their constant readiness to apply the strongest pressure at Constantinople, and their extraordinary reluctance to go beyond the most polite representation to the Governments at Sofia, Belgrade and Athens, who were responsible for permitting the equipment and passage of the bands. He had no desire to go back to the details of the reform scheme which was adumbrated in the last speech of the Foreign Secretary and of which they had some further information in the White Paper, but he must allude to one part of the scheme for which the right hon. Gentleman was responsible and upon which he confessed he looked with some regret. The right hon. Gentleman, following in that respect the policy of Lord Lansdowne, declared some time ago that he thought that it would be unfair and unjust to ask Turkey to reduce her Regular forces in Macedonia unless we either asked for a corresponding reduction of forces by the Bulgarian Government or unless the Powers were ready to give a collective guarantee for the maintenance of the integrity of the Turkish frontier. The idea of a collective guarantee fell through owing to the opposition of the Russian Government. The right hon. Gentleman then very properly dropped the proposal that we should insist on the reduction of the Turkish Army. But what he thought it was unjust to do directly he did indirectly. He laid down the condition that the support of the troops must not be made a charge on the Macedonian Budget.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I said that the civil expenses were to be the first charge.

*EARL PERCY said all the evidence went to show that, if the civil administration was to be made a first charge on the Budget, the finances would be wholly inadequate to support the large force which the Turks were compelled to keep up in Macedonia. What must the practical result of that policy be? It was neither just nor expedient, because it must throw upon the unfortunate taxpayer in other parts of the Turkish Empire the greater part of the burden of maintaining the army in Macedonia.

MR. LYNCH said a great part of the expenditure in Macedonia was found by the 3 per cent. import duty, which was derived from the trade of the whole of Turkey.

*EARL PERCY was glad to hear from a free trader that the 3 per cent. import duty was paid by the foreigner and not by the consumer. He had only raised this point for the purpose of showing the extraordinary difficulty, he thought the impossibility, of treating the Turkish question piecemeal. We seemed now to be in the presence of a general movement on the part of all races and creeds to combining together for the pursuit of common reforms on the basis of a common patriotism. We might be sanguine or the reverse as to the results of that movement, but, at all events, let us do nothing to prejudice its success. This country had always had a great reputation among the populations of the Turkish Empire for being probably the only disinterested Power in Europe, and he earnestly hoped that at the present juncture we would show by our words and our diplomatic action that nothing would please us better than the success of any movement for reform from inside, which might perhaps eventually free us from the necessity of having to interest ourselves in the internal affairs of the Turkish Empire.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot think that the noble Lord's account of the proposal which I made with regard to the civil and military expenditure of Macedonia really gave a fair impression of what that proposal was. The words of his to which I took exception were that we had demurred to the military expenditure being defrayed out of the Macedonian Budget. We did not demur to the military expenditure being defrayed out of the Macedonian Budget. What we did demur to was the part of the Macedonian Budget allocated to civil expenditure being starved for the sake of the military expenditure. We did not attempt to say that either one or the other should have been defrayed out of the Macedonian Budget. What we did attempt to lay down was that, if there was not sufficient for the full amount of both, the civil expenditure should be defrayed first and the deficit on military expenditure should be made up by funds from elsewhere. The noble Lord says that that would have caused the expenditure on the Army in Macedonia to be defrayed by taxpayers in other parts of the Turkish dominions. But the army is not kept there solely for the internal purposes of Macedonia. It is kept there, as other nations keep large parts of their Army on their frontier, for the sake of the integrity of the whole empire. My hon. friend the Member for Ripon seemed to me to be urging that in making the Anglo-Russian Convention we might have used that as a lever to get some special co-operation with Russia in regard to the Macedonian question which might have shortened the delay that is taking place in pressing reforms. That is exactly what we could not do. It was expressly understood that the Anglo-Russian Convention was being arranged between the two Powers to deal with parts of the world and interests in those parts of the world which concerned themselves, and that we were not going to bring into that Convention any extraneous interests which might be a cause of offence to other Powers. Therefore we could not mix up the two things. As to the delay which has taken place, I made no secret at the time when I originally placed the proposal before the House that we were not going to take isolated action, and that we must carry the other Powers with us. Neither Russia, nor England, one or other, nor both together, had either the disposition or the power to attempt to settle the Macedonian question without consulting the other Powers, and if it has taken a long time it has simply been due to the fact that there are so many Powers to be consulted, and that the problem itself is very complex and full of details. But I will ask to be excused to-night under the special circumstances from going in any detail into the question of Macedonian reform. The situation has changed, and has changed so suddenly and yet so greatly in the last few days that I would rather confine myself to some general observations upon how the prospect is affected by the changes which have taken place. They must be general observations only, because it is too soon to pronounce a definite, considered opinion. My hon. friend the Member for Stirling Burghs in a speech to which the House listened with interest and welcome, knowing well the interest which he has taken in politics, and expecting from him, as I am sure they are entitled to expect in future years, much help and useful support in our debates—in his speech he analysed what the situation in Macedonia had been. It may be summed up in one word. The root cause of the mischief of the situation has been bad, weak government. It is that which has been the temptation to neighbouring States, or to the citizens of neighbouring States, or those who in Macedonia itself are of the same nationality as the neighbouring States —it is that which has been the temptation to them to strengthen their own nationalities in Macedonia at the expense of each other. The Government being weak, being incapable of adopting methods for the preservation of order, played off the one party against the other, instead of taking strong, vigorous, and impartial measures. It is against that situation, against those methods of governing, we, in common with the other Powers of Europe, have been for some years protesting. There was some protest from the Turkish army and from the Musulman population; but the extraordinary part of the matter is this, that these sudden events of the last few days, though attended with violence which in some circumstances might have been expected to lead to further violence and disorder, suddenly produced, for the time, order, security, even rejoicing. It is a very remarkable situation, and it comes at the very moment when we submitted to the other Powers proposals for forming a mobile force composed partly of Turkish troops and partly of *gendarmerie*, to be placed at the disposal of the Turkish Governor, and organised in Macedonia by Turkish officers and the commanders of the *gendarmerie*, in order that this force might be allocated for the purpose of putting down the bands impartially and vigorously. At this moment—so far as my information goes—at this moment the bands have melted away, they have dispersed under the influence of the events which have taken place. Well, of course, if this state of things continues, if these bands have really dispersed for good, there is no further need for the mobile force. We welcome the momentary situation and trust it may last. We trust that the Balkan States and also Greece on the border will use their utmost endeavours to secure that it shall last, and that no advantage will be taken of anything which has occurred in Macedonia itself for anything but a good purpose; that those States will do all in their power to prevent bands being recruited from their own territories, and will do their utmost with the Powers of Europe to preserve the present situation. Our object has never been political, as the hon. Member for Stirling has said; it has been truly humanitarian and disinterested. It is known at home, but is not yet credited abroad, that for us the Macedonian question is the question of good *versus* bad government. It has been pointed out that our object in Macedonia has been to derogate from the authority of the Sultan as head of the Mahomedan faith and the integrity of his dominions. There is, of course, no truth in that. Then it has been said that our object is to assist the Christians against Mahomedans; but, as we know, we have only been acting in the Macedonian question because of the treaty obligations we have in common with other Powers in regard to particular parts of the Turkish Empire, and we are well aware that, while the Christian population has suffered from bad government, Mahomedans have suffered as well. It comes back to this, that in the Macedonian question our sole desire is to see good government introduced; and if Turkey is going to improve the whole government of the country and ensure that the Mahomedans and Christians shall benefit equally by the improvements, then it is better that the Macedonian question should be settled by the Turks taking in hand and doing what for years we have been urging them to do than by pressing partial reforms on reluctant, unwilling and obstructing authorities. I noted the apprehensions expressed by the hon. Member for Stirling that things may not turn out so well as they promised at first. Well, of course we must wait events; but at the present time I can only say this: our own sympathy must be with those who are trying to introduce reforms, and I should be the last to prophesy that they will fail. If they succeed, then they must succeed by their own efforts; but our sympathy is with them. I will only say this: we shall continue, watchful and earnest as we have ever been, in pursuing the object of securing good government in Macedonia, and in the other parts of Turkey with which we are concerned. But at the present moment it would be impossible to forecast by what methods that object would be achieved; and I will only say with reference to present events in Turkey that we welcome the news that the Sultan has proclaimed a Constitution. We welcome the news of the strength of the feeling which has brought about the proclamation of the Constitution; and while not relaxing our watchfulness, while not becoming slack in our desire to do all in our power to promote improvement in Macedonia, we shall for the present preserve an expectant and sympathetic attitude. I come to another question of great importance which I should not have touched upon if it had not been touched upon by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. It is a question of great importance and of extreme delicacy, and, indeed, he himself recognised by the manner in which he spoke that it was necessary to be careful and guarded in the words he used. It is as necessary for me to deal with it delicately, and I would not myself have introduced it into this debate. I do not complain that it has been introduced; but it is a serious question. It is undoubtedly most undesirable that any section of opinion in this country should represent it as an object of British policy to isolate Germany. It is equally undesirable that any section of public opinion in Germany should believe in that being the case. When you come to deal with a question of the relations between two great Powers of this kind, I would ask the people who really wish to form an opinion of the feeling of the two countries towards each other not to take too short views. The feeling of any two great countries towards each other may vary in degree from year to year; but I at least say this—that anybody who reviews the history of the last twenty years impartially must be bound to admit that the attitude of this country has not been that of a Power which was reluctant to be on good terms with Germany. And if on reviewing the last twenty years you carry your mind back to the events which occurred in the first decade of the twenty years, you will find that there was at one time a moment when there was constant friction between this country and France, and at another time a moment when there was constant friction between this country and Russia. Now what have we done in recent years? We have come to agreements with those two Powers which have removed the friction which existed, and removed all danger of a breach of the peace either between us and France or between us and Russia. That is a distinct change. But does any Power in Europe say to us that a favourable balance of power from their point of view depended on our being on bad terms with France or Russia, or any other Power? We have settled by agreements which are known to the world certain causes of dispute, removed possibilities of friction between us and these two Powers. It is not so long ago—I think only last year—that Prince Bülow said that the policy of Germany did not depend on provoking enmity between other Powers. I would complete that by saying that, as far as we are concerned, it is no part of our policy to give our friendships any hostile point towards any other Power. But we must be free to make those friendships. Having made them, I am willing to give the utmost guarantees that we shall use them for the mutual advantage of ourselves and the other countries with which we are concerned; but we shall not take advantage of those friendships to make enmity between our friends and any other Power; nor is it our object to isolate any Power whatever. And, after all, when the isolation of Germany is spoken of, I think it is only fair to bear in mind that Germany has two allies. We have never grudged that alliance; we have never considered that alliance as directed against us, and if we have made agreements with France and Russia (which, by the way, are public to the world, while those of the Triple Alliance are not) there is as little reason to suppose that the object and motive of these agreements was isolation or unfriendly action towards any other Power. Let me examine the point which the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean raises with regard to Macedonia. His argument was that there might be an impression that, because Russia and ourselves were acting together on the

Macedonian question, we were forming something apart from other Powers which might give offence to them. I will explain exactly how these proposals about Macedonia arose. We made proposals which were announced in this House, and those proposals were made on our own account without consultation with other Powers, simply because, in our opinion, the situation was such that it was necessary, either that we should dissociate ourselves from the reform movement altogether or that it should take some more vigorous and active shape. After we had made these proposals, Russia intimated that she would be prepared to advance some proposals of her own going in the same direction but not going so far, and the other Powers including, I am pretty sure, Germany, were among the first to say that they would be willing to receive the Russian proposals and to accept them. The proposals were discussed between us and Russia because we at first adumbrated the larger scheme, for it was important for us to know how much substance there was going to be in the Russian proposals in order that we might make up our minds whether we could give them our cordial support; but as far as other Powers were concerned, they showed not only readiness but even alacrity to accept the Russian proposals after ours had been announced. Therefore there can be no question of the action of England and Russia in Macedonia having originated in any desire to form a group among the other Powers. With regard to the Hague Conference, if we had had any political design we should not have chosen as our first delegate, as we did, a man of the highest character, of great learning in international law, and of great judgment, but one who had had no experience as a diplomatist. If we had had a political object in view we should have thrown considerations of international law to the winds and chosen the most experienced diplomatist we could find. We gave everybody a guarantee that we should discuss all questions at the Hague Conference on their merits; and, as a matter of fact, if he read the proceedings, the right hon. Baronet will know that, while we were often at variance with Germany, we were at variance, I think, with almost every other Power in turn on some question. We were at variance, sometimes with one, sometimes with another, because we dealt with questions solely on their merits, and sometimes with one Power and sometimes with another we differed. But when Germany brought forward the Prize Courts Convention we cordially welcomed it; and if it has not proceeded faster since, it is due simply to this, that in order to adhere to that Convention legislation would be necessary here, and we cannot get that legislation through Parliament unless we have some further agreement with other Powers, including Germany, but not Germany alone, on certain points connected with the law of maritime war, in which it is obvious we must have some agreement with the great naval Powers before we can pass legislation to ratify the Prize Courts Convention. We have a conference which will meet in the autumn to discuss the question, and I hope it will arrive at an agreement which will enable us to ratify the Convention next year by the time named. With regard to the Congo, which, I think with the right hon. Baronet, is the third instance in which we were isolated, it is quite true that we have been alone except for the United States.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I did not say we were isolated.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I understood the argument to be that, owing to our general policy, we were weaker with regard to the Congo than we might have been, because the other Powers have not been willing to act with us. I have said over and over again that we should be delighted to welcome the co-operation of any Power and we should be relieved not to have to bear the burden of promoting reform alone. If any other power made the least intimation that it is taking interest in reform, we should be delighted to welcome their co-operation; and I can assure the House that with the burdens we have upon us, we have no false pride on our side and no artificial ambition to play the leading part ourselves if any other Power desires to do so. With regard to the publication of further Papers, we are quite ready, and I had hoped they would have been presented already, but the Belgian Government wishes to present Papers, including the ones we are going to present. They are also going to include some communications they have had with the United States. They are arranging that matter at the present moment, and the present situation is that I have informed the Belgian Government that we are ready to publish Papers at any time, and are only waiting to hear from them what the date of their publication will be so that we may publish them simultaneously. But when they are published I am sorry to say that they will be very incomplete. They end up with a communication we have received from the Belgian Government, but they do not contain our reply. They carry the matter as far as it can be carried by general assurances, and I hope the House will recognise that, as far as general assurances go, the line taken by the Belgian Government is very differen from that taken by the Congo Government. The whole tone of the correspondence is very different. The noble Lord is perfectly right in supposing that before we definitely accept the situation of the transfer of the Congo State to Belgium we shall need to send a reply to the last Belgian communication. That reply will take some consideration. It must deal somewhat exhaustively with the question of concessions and with our own right to have some say before we definitely recognise the transfer of the Congo State to another Power. We originally recognised the Congo State under a certain agreement and in the expectation that it would promote free trade and be a civilising influence. Those treaty rights we consider have been broken, and when the Congo State has broken the treaty rights which were the very foundation and origin of its existence the Powers which are aggrieved are bound and I consider entitled to examine very closely the terms on which that State is to be transferred to another, and to get explicit assurances as to the interpretation which will be placed on their treaty rights. Therefore when the next Papers are published I must ask the Committee to bear in mind that they are published quickly because the Belgian Government desire them to be published before the Belgian Parliament rises, and that, so far as we are concerned, they must not be regarded as complete because they necessitate a reply from us which will need some consideration and some time. The question of concessions is an exceedingly difficult one. I quite realise that it would be going on a somewhat exacting tack to demand of the Belgian Government that it shall apply in the Congo, if it becomes a Belgian Colony, some system different from and less free than that which exists in the Colonies of other countries who have possessions in the same region. What has our own practice been? I understand it to be this: before giving any concessions we have surveyed the country carefully, and we have then only given cocessions where it has appeared clearly that there were vacant lands which had not been in native occupation. In West Africa, I believe, our general practice has been to give no concessions, because we found that the different native tribes and villages had already parcelled out the land between them. In East Africa I believe there are lands which have never been in native occupation, and those lands are regarded as the property of the Crown and as available for concessions. The Congo Government pursued the reverse course. It gave concessions first without inquiring about native rights. The problem before the Belgian Government is to put that matter right. It is going too far to say there should be no concessions in the Congo State. Vacant lands, if there be vacant lands, we can hardly contend should not be the subject of concessions in the Congo State as they are in our Colonies. But the concessions which have been granted have been granted without any regard to native rights, and it is an exceedingly difficult matter to produce order out of this situation. The Congo question divides itself to me, roughly, into two heads—first of all there is the question of forced labour and abuse of it. The Belgian Government says definitely that forced labour must come to an end. If it is to come to an end it is essential without delay that the natives should be put in possession of large tracts of territory which will enable them to cultivate and to feed themselves and to trade, otherwise they would have no means of earning a livelihood. These tracts must come out of the concessionary area where there are natives in the concessionary area. The question of forced labour and the treatment of natives is one which I regard as an axiom in the eyes of any civilised State. The Belgian Government have made no scruple about saying they will abolish forced labour. In regard to the other branch of the question, the right of freedom of trade, we have proposed to the Belgian that if there should be difficulties of interpretation of treaty rights in this matter, the question should be submitted to arbitration. The humanitarian side of the question—the question of decent treatment of the natives—is separate from the commerical question.

EARL PERCY: Does that include the freedom of the natives to trade? Is that to be referred to arbitration?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No. It goes without saying that the native must have the lands of which he has been in occupation and freedom to trade in those lands. When you come to the question how vacant lands should be dealt with, the questions of the monopolies of a particular province and questions which are purely commercial, I should be prepared to refer those questions to arbitration, because I have always wished to make it clear that in the matter of Congo reform our prime motive at any rate has been the humanitarian motive. When it is purely a matter of trade interests as distinguished from the humanitarian interest, I think it only right we should deal with it as any other country would deal with it, and agree that it should be a matter for arbitration. Before the Government commits itself to any definite recognition of the situation as satisfactory, assuming that the Belgium Parliament decides to empower the Government to annex the Congo, we shall have to have had further correspondence, which we shall lay before the House, and the whole situation will have to be carefully considered by His Majesty's Government, who will then, no doubt, announce what their decision is. I can say little about the Portuguese question. We have brought all the information at our disposal before the Portuguese Government, and urged them to do all in their power and with as little delay as possible to put things into a satisfactory condition. Of course, anyone who reflects on the internal troubles of Portugal will realise that the time has not been a fortunate one for undertaking reforms in Portuguese territory. With regard to Persia, I will only say that the hon. Member for Ripon did not give a correct impression in regard to the Russian officers. The Russian officers were not sent in to suppress sedition. These were officers who had been in Persia for some years—long before the Anglo-Russian Convention. They were officers not sent in by the Russian Government, but acted as bodyguard under the orders of the Shah, and with regard to what part they may have taken in the events at Teheran I do not suppose the Russian Government itself has full information in regard to the facts. The general situation is this, that there are two parties in Persia, the constitutional party and the reactionary party, and that there has been practically a state of civil war, in which the Shah has won in Teheran, and the nationalist or constitutional party has got the upper hand at Tabriz. The only course for us to take in these circumstances is that, so long as there is no danger to British subjects, and there has been none, we shall not go one inch further in intervention than we can help. As long as we abstain from intervention, I hope the Persians will fight out their affairs in their own way. The hon. Member for Ripon recommended friendly assistance. Yes; but it is a very difficult matter offering friendly assistance when there is a state of civil war. When you offer friendly assistance the party to whom you offer it are apt to ask how far you are prepared to go, and there is no more dangerous thing than to offer sympathy and friendly assistance unless, when a dangerous state of affairs occurs, you are prepared to back up those who have leant upon you by going somewhat further. I can assure the hon. Member for Ripon that if we have not intervened in Persia it is not because we are more on one side or the other or because we have not got sympathies; it is simply because it is not right to leave people to expect your assistance unless you are prepared really to intervene to protect them. Take, for instance, the case of the Legations. There is a custom in Persia that anybody who has a grievance against the Persian Government takes refuge in a foreign Legation. It is a custom peculiar to Persia, and I am most desirous it should not be extended. In fact, it has really become necessary to keep it within bounds in Persia. Two years ago some thousands of people took refuge in the British Legation in Teheran because they were dissatisfied with their Government. The other day the same situation began, but we had only sixty-six persons who took refuge in the British Legation. The instructions that have been given are these: That refuge is not to be refused to anyone who is in danger of his life, but that refuge must not be given to people who use the Legation for political purposes. That is an obvious precaution, otherwise you would have to contend with political parties when some among them, suffering under a temporary disadvantage, took refuge in a foreign Legation to wait until the bad time has passed by and then take up the contest again. Any foreign Legation used in that way would have its position made impossible; and so we have restricted the right of allowing refuge to those who are in immediate danger of life. Within these bounds we have kept. That is the reason why refuge was refused at Tabriz, though refuge to a limited extent was admitted at Teheran. The state of excitement was very great at Teheran; a considerable number of lives were lost, and the fact that some of the constitutional party, in getting the worst of it, were taking refuge in the British Legation was a reason for some improper proceedings on behalf of the Shah's troops round the Legation, impeding access to it, and placing it almost under surveillance. We demanded, and we received, a proper apology for what had taken place; and if we did not ask for more reparation than that it was because there was practically a state of civil war in Teheran, and we passed by somewhat more lightly events that would have been taken more notice of had they been more deliberate. Then, with regard to the refugees in the Legation, we obtained a promise of security for their lives and their property. A condition was made in regard to some of them that they should go out of the country for a year and a half; but as long as we obtained security for life and property it was the utmost limit to which we could go without interfering with the politics of the country. As to joint action, I trust that we may continue to agree as at the present time on the policy of non-intervention in internal affairs. If there be in Persia genuine movement on behalf of freedom and good government which takes a practical shape, it will lack no sympathy from us. No action of ours will ever embarrass it; but the Persians must work out their own affairs in their own way. But as far as we and Russia are concerned, there is a genuine desire on the part of both to intervene as little as possible in the internal affairs of Persia as long as our own subjects are not threatened. That, I am sure, is a wise policy, because any Government in Persia at the present time which was known to lean on foreign support would be unpopular in the country, and what we desire is to see a Government there possessing the confidence of the Persian people.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said the House always listened with interest, and generally with great satisfaction, to the right hon. Gentleman, not only because of the gravity of the problems with which he dealt, but because of his own impartial attitude. He felt to-night that on one question the right hon. Gentleman had not spoken with the directness and clearness which they had been used to in his speeches, and that was on the question of the Congo. There had been one clear policy in regard to the Congo on both sides of the House. It was expressed with determination on the part of the last Government by Lord Lansdowne in 1903, and it had been continued by his successor the present Foreign Secretary. That policy was that the question of the Congo must be settled upon the basis of the Berlin Act. Speaking in this House on 26th February last in regard to the possibility of the transference of the Congo Government to the Belgian Government, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said—

"But assuming that this does not take place, and that after the close of the present Belgian

> session we have to deal with the existing Government of the Congo unchanged, then we must be free to deal with questions of this kind or others which may arise out of our treaty rights in our own way."

He and his friends relied absolutely on that assurance given with great deliberation by the right hon. Gentleman.

SIR **EDWARD GREY** said he did not wish to go back in the least on what he said in February. If no conclusion was reached at the end of the present Belgian session that would be a very grave circumstance to be considered by the Government as a whole.

SIR **GILBERT PARKER** said they were extremely glad to hear the reaffirmation of the right hon. Gentleman's statement. He was sure that he did not exaggerate in the least when he said that the speech delivered by the Belgian Prime Minister in July must have caused great anxiety in the minds of those who had been interested in this question from the beginning. In that speech he stated that there were practically no obligations on the part of the Belgian Government in connection with the Congo to other nations, and in effect he repudiated any responsibility on the part of the Belgian Government or the Congo Government to the signatory Powers of the Berlin Treaty. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman must have read that speech with anxiety. They all made allowances, of course, for speeches made under the stress of party passion. There was a great deal of opposition in the Belgian Parliament, and when speeches were made on such occasions there was always a temptation to appeal to the patriotic instincts of an independent people, and he had no doubt that the Belgian Prime Minister was somewhat led away by the circumstances of the moment. But the speech remained, and it had not been explained away. The Committee had no papers before them which could give them any understanding of the real situation. He gathered from the right hon. Gentleman's hesitation that the Government were not satisfied, because he said that the Government had received general assurances only, and that before the Government replied to Belgium's last communication they must carefully consider what course they might find it necessary to pursue. That was a grave statement, and it suggested to the minds of those who listened to the right hon. Gentleman that he was not wholly satisfied. Anyone who read the White Paper and other papers which had been published, and the speeches delivered in the Belgian Parliament, must have come to the conclusion that the fundamental evils which existed in the Congo under the present system were not being dealt with radically by the Belgian Parliament in the transfer that might be made. He referred to the question of concessions. The right hon. Gentleman said that assurances had been received from the Belgian Government that forced labour must come to an end. That sounded very well, but the right hon. Gentleman had allowed the Committee to see what was his view of forced labour coming to an end. It was that the native, if he was to have the position that was provided for him under the Berlin Act, must have an opportunity to trade. The natives must have rights in the products of the soil, and be able to buy and sell in currency to which the right hon. Gentleman had attached so much importance in his despatch. The right hon. Gentleman had given great satisfaction when he said that the position of the Government remained unchanged regarding this question as to the rights of the natives; and he made it very clear to the Committee that concessions on the present basis, without any formal system being established by which land might be set apart for the natives, and a communal tenure of the land be granted to the natives would not be satisfactory. All that this Government could ask was that the communal system should be recognised, and that the land outside the plantations and outside the villages should be set apart for the benefit of the natives, otherwise the end of the race inhabiting the Congo Basin was sure. When civilisation came in, and at the same time the kind of concessions which now existed in the Congo came with it, the natives must either be forced to work or the system must break down and the country become bankrupt. It had been said that the natives of the Congo would not be forced to work if the system proposed by the Belgian Government was established, but it would come in the end to the same thing as long as the natives had not a right to trade in the products of soil, and the right of tenure which they had enjoyed from time immemorial. At any rate it was the duty of the Government which took over the Congo to see that the vacant lands were set apart on a reasonable and impartial basis for the use of the natives. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not think him in the least inappreciative of the great difficulties under which he had laboured. It was always difficult to intervene, even when we had the right, in the internal affairs of another country. We were obliged to do it with the consent of all the Powers in the case of Egypt. We had done it in the case of Macedonia; but only successfully in the case of Egypt where we had the power to enter, to re-construct the administration, and to put our own people to work. Happily, in the case of Turkey it would seem as though the reforms would proceed from the inside, as all true reforms must proceed. The action of all the foreign nations could not produce true reform in Macedonia without the co-operation and consent of the Government primarily responsible, and we should not succeed with reforms in the Congo State unless the Belgian Government co-operated with us and accepted the principles of reform which we had laid down. He sincerely hoped that the assurances which the right hon. Gentleman had given in the past, and which he had renewed that night, but which still left them considerable anxiety with regard to the position of affairs, would be fulfilled, and that what the Government had striven for would be attained. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would be able when they met again in the autumn, if not before, to place before the country not only the assurance, but the simple fact that all that had been urged in previous debates in relation to the Congo would be accomplished; and that the Belgian Government, representing a great free, strong, and democratic people in modern Europe, would recognise that the system which had existed in the Congo was one which could not last in this age of civilisation and at this time, when every European nation understood the principles on which native races should be governed. If the Belgian Government and people recognised that, and made such a treaty of transfer as would incorporate the two clear principles which this Government had laid down, then, he believed, this country would once again have justified its pure humanitarianism and its real desire to assist those nations and those people who were struggling for better conditions. Happy were those free peoples who were too strong to be dispossessed, but blessed were they among nations who were prepared to be strong with the rest.

*DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford) expressed his pleasure that it was not our object to isolate any particular Power in entering into an *entente* with other Powers. The fact, however, was that Germany was isolated, and many felt that in the interests of the preservation of peace and the limitation of armaments the policy of an *entente* should be extended to Germany. He trusted the Foreign Secretary would use his best endeavours to bring that state of things about. With regard to freedom, he must just say they were witnessing a spectacle such as he believed the world had never seen. They saw freedom in travail, in what would be called the Grand Conception, in India, Persia, Egypt, Russia, and Turkey. It was with that movement, as it related to Egypt, that he wished to deal. In Egypt there were two parties, the moderates, who wished to see self-government under British influence, and the extremists, who wished for full and complete independence. There was, happily, no Clan-na-Gael party, or anything of that kind, in Egypt, and he was anxious that the Foreign Secretary should see that no such party was ever formed by a policy of coercion on our part, and also by taking care that the legitimate demands for reforms by the people should be no longer delayed. They all recognised that British rule in Egypt had been of undoubted benefit, but at the same time, Egypt to-day was in a position of political servitude which was unsatisfactory. The imperative needs of the country were self-government and extension of education. Some might advocate that it would be better to educate first, but his view was that self-government and education should be run together. We seemed unable to frame a scheme of education satisfactory to the people. Although we were meeting the need for education in some degree by introducing Arabic gradually as the medium of teaching in the higher schools, and by setting aside an additional £100,000 this year, it must be realised, when only £374,000 was spent on all the Departments of education for the instruction of 12,000,000 of people, that that sum was wholly inadequate. At the elementary schools there were only 24 per cent. of boys of school age in attendance. There were only four secondary schools provided by the Government in the whole of Egypt, and there was no University of modern character such as would be recognised in this or any other European country. The El-Azhar was chiefly a theological college. There was now a movement among the Egyptians to establish a University of their own, and he would like to know why the Government could not arrange financially to help such an institution. In Cairo there was a medical, a law, an engineering, and an agricultural school. Why could not the Government amalgamate those, and let them form the basis of a University for Egypt? If such Universities were established, they would be a great benefit to the intellectual as well as the moral life of the people. With regard to self-government, Sir Eldon Gorst in his first annual report argued against it, because such a small percentage of electors voted in the first stage. The reasons were the complicated system of election, and the fact that the vast majority of the Egyptians looked upon the Legislative Council and the General Assembly, which were purely consultative and advisory bodies, as a sham and a fraud. The remedy was simple; first, they should get rid of the system of electing delegates to elect the members of these bodies and then give real power to the institutions themselves. These institutions were started under British auspices by Lord Dufferin, but they had not been encouraged by this country. They had no power, no authority, and no reasonable or fair chance to show what was in them. What the Egyptians were asking for, and what he hoped the House would listen to and assist them to get, was a real Parliament with Ministers responsible to it, with power to legislate and to administer. At present the Ministers were mere puppets in the hands of the British advisers. If real power were given to the Legislative Council and the General Assembly it was felt by many that the party system would be developed, electors canvassed, elections hotly contested, and politicial life and character developed in the country. A Parliament in Egypt would be a tremendous force in the new life of the country, and it was the business of England to give it to them at the earliest possible moment. It was said that the capitulations were the great drawback and bugbear to Egypt, but the granting of self-government would be one of the best means, after free institutions had gained the confidence of the foreign Powers, of getting rid of the capitulations. He and those who thought with him felt there was no true national life, and could be none, in Egypt until these concessions were given. He hoped the Foreign Secretary would at an early period turn his mind and hand to this subject. The proposals of Sir Eldon Gorst with regard to the Provincial Councils had been condemned by Egyptians, because their functions were also of a merely advisory character. Egypt was at the present moment a source of great weakness and danger from foreign complications to this country. We could not get over that if we ignored what was just and right to the Egyptians. They were just as much entitled to govern their country as we were to govern our own, and until we recognised that justice could not be done. He would like to quote the advice of the late General Gordon on this matter. General Gordon said—

> "Do not take Egypt. Have a grip over it, and give its people free institutions."

After all, they believed that Liberalism was quite capable of solving the Egyptian riddle as it had solved most successfully the Transvaal and Orange River Colony problems. He asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to tell them what his policy was. An attitude of *laissz-faire* or *non possumus* was unworthy of the great Liberal Party.

He hoped his policy was a big, real, and good step towards a solution. He knew there were risks attendant on self-government, but it was infinitely better to risk embarking Egypt on the ocean of freedom than to let it remain in the dead sea of despotism.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman a question with regard to the alteration of the treaty with France as regards the imposition of duties upon certain goods imported from this country. He was informed there was a Commission sitting in France with the object of revising the Customs tariff between this country and France. It was proposed to make alterations in the import duties on elastic fabrics. It was first proposed to raise the duty upon all elastic fabrics from 200 frs. minimum to 250 frs., with a maximum of 300 frs. Since then it had been proposed to raise the duty on silk goods from 200 frs. minimum to 400 frs., with a maximum of 600 frs., and on artificial silk from 200 frs. minimum to 600 frs., with a miximum of 900 frs., and on cotton and woollen goods from 250 frs. minimum to 300 frs. He was informed that the Foreign Office had been communiccated with, and the reply of 7th July from the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was to the effect that the whole question was engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government. That morning he asked the Foreign Secretary whether the French Government proposed to increase the import duties on elastic tissues, and, if so, what steps the Government proposed to take to protect British interests. The answer he received was that the right hon. Gentleman did not know whether the French Government proposed to increase the import duties as no official publication had yet been made of any of the proposals put forward by the Customs Commission of the French Chamber of Deputies, which was now engaged in studying the revision of the existing French Customs tariff. How could that answer be reconciled with the statement of 7th July that the whole question was engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government? No answer at all was given to the last part of his Question as to what steps the Government proposed to take to protect British interests. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman thought it was impossible for him under the present one-sided system of free trade to take any steps to protect British interests. He was afraid that was a fact. He would, however, be obliged to the right hon. Gentleman if he would inform him whether it was possible for him to make representations to the French Government upon this revision and increase in the duties which would undoubtedly destroy a large trade which existed between this country and France, and at a time when unemployment was rapidly increasing.

SIR EDWARD GREY said there was no inconsistency in his answers. The first answer was that they were giving attention to the question, and it was as the result of that attention that he was able to give the House of Commons the answer to his second question. He was able to give him the information contained in the answer which had been given that afternoon. He could tell him what the position of the matter was. A French Parliamentary Commission had for some two years been considering what report it should make on the question of Customs duties. Nobody yet knew what that report was. It had not been published. If he were to make representations to the French Government their answer would be that they did not know what the Report of the Parliamentary Commission was yet. When it was published they would have to consider it, and so it was impossible to give any reply until the draft was published and considered. Therefore, it was premature to consider the question as between the two Governments at all.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he felt considerable diffidence in addressing the Committee after the hon. Member for Brentford, who was able to speak with confidence of the feelings and wishes of all the Egyptians! His confidence was colossal. It was of that kind which was only characteristic of profound acquaintance or profound unacquaintance with the subject. It was somewhat painful to those who had lived in Russia to hear the manner in which that Government was always referred to in that House, and though he believed he was the only Russian interpreter in the House he had had no opportunity to speak when the deplorable debate on the King's visit to the Czar took place, nor could he do more now than express his dissent from what the hon. Member for Stirling Burghs had said, and he recommended him rather to go to Russia and live amongst the peasants, than to take the sentimental imaginations of popular writers as his guide. The subject to which he wished especially to refer was the Bagdad railway. Could the right hon. Gentleman tell them anything now on this very important subject, which was a matter of pleasantry to certain hon. Members opposite, who hardly realised that it was a project of equal importance with the Suez Canal, in which this nation above all others was exceedingly interested. He understood that four new sections were to be made, and that the Porte was now in a position, thanks to our permission, to raise their Customs duties by 3 per cent., to give the necessary kilometric guarantee. He did not know if the door was open to us still to participate financially in this great project, but if it was he trusted we should, or at any rate that we should obtain some internationalisation or some power over the Gulf section, which would enable us to maintain the position we had hitherto had in the Persian Gulf, and in surrounding territory. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to tell them that something was being done following on the Anglo-Russian Convention to get control over the Northern shores of the Gulf and to obtain concessions there which might at any rate serve to keep other Powers out of concessions. He had received a letter that morning from one of the ports in the Gulf emphasising the importance of a subject on which he had several times interrogated the right hon. Gentleman—the great extent to which gun-running took place there. He was told that for three months in every year large cargoes of guns were run under the very bows of our gunboats, or at any rate close by, and were landed on the Northern shore, and sent up country to Afghanistan. Whether these guns came from England or Germany, they were destined to be fired at our own people. These questions were of as much importance as any others which had been debated, and even now perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would say a word or two upon them.

Sir **WILLIAM BULL** (Hammersmith) asked when the trial of the four Englishmen in Antwerp was likely to come on. He knew the Foreign Office had interfered in one particular, and they were acquitted of the first charges made against them. But since that another charge of stealing had been made against them, with the result that a trial was still hanging over them. Could the right hon. Gentleman give any assurance that the British Government would interfere to have them brought to trial as quickly as possible?

Sir **EDWARD GREY** said he was unaware that this last point was to be raised, but he would make inquiries as to the present position of the trial. He asked to be excused from entering into the question of Egypt at that late hour. The question of the Persian Gulf and the Bagdad Railway was also of very great importance, for the construction of the railway must be of great interest to any country that had possessions in the East. But he did not know that either of these subjects lent themselves to public discussion at the present moment. If he did not deal with the various points raised, it was not because he did not admit their importance, but because there was considerable difficulty in making a public statement at that late hour.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

Class I.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,000 (including a Supplementary sum of £5,000), be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Houses of Parliament Buildings."

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported upon Wednesday; Committee also report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD moved to insert after the word "consent" in line 9 the words "voluntarily and without intimidation." In order to understand the nature of this clause, and the effect of this Amendment it was necessary to go back for a few moments to Section 1 of the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act, 1907. By Section 1 of that Act, which this particular Bill was designed to patch up and alter, it was provided that—

> "If it appears to the Commissioners expedient to acquire land for the purpose of this Act, and if they have offered to the person who appears to be the owner of that land the amount which appears to the Commissioners to be its value, and if that amount has not been accepted then the Commissioners may acquire the land compulsorily."

By Section 3 of the Act passed last year it was provided—

> "That untenanted lands should be so acquired unless in the occupation of a new tenant, or unless the Commissioners think that the evicted tenant ought to be reinstated."

Then there was a proviso—

> "That no tenanted land should be acquired compulsorily which is in the possession or occupation of a *bona fide* tenant using or cultivating the same as an ordinary farmer, in accordance with proper methods of husbandry.

One would have thought that that was an exceedingly valuable proviso. It was clear that the Commissioners were not to come and take away compulsorily any land which was *bona fide* in the occupation of a *bona fide* tenant using and cultivating the same as an ordinary farmer in accordance with the proper methods of husbandry. Now the whole basis of this Act was designed to get rid of that proviso, and it started by saying that the Commissioners might acquire the land although in the occupation of a tenant *bona fide* farming the same, provided such tenant gave his consent in writing. It was perfectly clear up to that point what the scope of the Act was, but it was evidently felt that in drawing up the Bill that if the tenant gave his consent it ought to override the Act of last year. What was the effect of the proviso in the Bill? It was that the tenant should sign this particular consent in a particular way. They were entitled to have it made clear that if the tenant was to sign a consent which gave away the right he had to remain in possession of the land that consent had not been extorted by intimidation, but had voluntarily been given. Briefly, that was the effect of his Amendment. If it could be shown that there had been any intimidation or that the consent had not voluntarily been given, the effect of his Amendment would be that the transaction could be upset, and it would prevent the Commissioners from expropriating that land and taking it away from the man who was *bona fide* cultivating it when consent had been extorted from him in a way of which the Committee, he was sure, would not approve. From what the Chief Secretary for Ireland had already said it was evident that he was going to propose to leave out all those words which would give satisfactory security to the *bona fide* tenant in the transaction, and the proper place to put that security in was where the word "consent" was first mentioned. It was on those grounds that he proposed his Amendment. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 9, after the word 'consent' to insert the words 'voluntarily and without intimidation.'"—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said the hon. Member knew the law, and he knew that to insert these words would be contrary to all Parliamentary practice and an offence against the established principles of legislation.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he was satisfied if it was clearly understood that the consent had been obtained voluntarily and without intimidation. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BIRRELL moved the omission from the clause of words providing that notice of the filing of consent should be given to the landlord and published in a local newspaper and that the consent should not be acted upon if the landlord should satisfy the judicial Commissioner that the tenant had been compelled to give consent by unlawful means. The intention of the Act of last year was that anybody who held a farm from which somebody had been evicted should not be removed without his consent, even although compensation or another farm was offered to him. Therefore he had no objection to so much of the Lords' Amendment as related to that matter, and which required that the tenant should in presence of two witnesses attach his name to the consent, but he could not agree to the part of the Lords' Amendment which said—

"Notice of such filing being, in the time and manner prescribed, given to the landlord of the land to which the consent applies, and published in two successive issues of a newspaper circulating in the district in which such land is situate; and provided further that such consent shall not be acted upon if the said landlord, or any other person interested in or having a claim upon the said lands, shall, after having an opportunity of being heard in the time and manner prescribed, satisfy the Judicial Commissioner that the tenant was compelled or induced to give such consent by intimidation or other unlawful means."

He thought that was unreasonable, having regard to all the circumstances of the case. The original Act was not intended to protect the landlord at all. The sole object of it was to protect the actual tenant, and to secure that, he should not be removed until he had indicated his consent.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 13, to leave out from the word 'Commission' to the end of the clause."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) expressed his intention to support the Chief Secretary. When they voted on this question before, the view the Unionist Party took was that, if special powers were taken to restore evicted tenants, they should not be exercised to the detriment of men occupying farms who did not desire to vacate them. They devoted themselves to securing that a new tenant should not be displaced unless he was a consenting party. The Amendment inserted in the House of Lords necessitated so great a delay in restoring the evicted tenant that it practically made the Act of no value. If a new tenant was willing to go, and the conditions on which he was asked to go were satisfactory and fair, then Parliament laid it down that his land should be acquired. There never had been any suggestion of an appeal to the landlord as to whether he wished the tenant to go or not. It must not be overlooked that this involved considerable hardship to the landlord. After all, a landlord was a landlord in Ireland, just as much as in England or Scotland, up to a certain point, and if anything was done to deprive him of his property he had reason to complain. It should be remembered that this Bill sought to amend an Act of Parliament which attacked one landlord and had brought the management of his estate to the public eye. He was not going to criticise Lord Clanricarde's management of his estate. It was not an unpopular thing to hold up Lord Clanricarde to public contempt, but there was a great deal to be said on the other side. That, however, was not a subject which ought to be considered at that moment. They had passed deliberately an Act of Parliament for a particular object, and it had been proved beyond doubt that that object must be defeated unless this amending Bill were passed. He did not think that the Committee could ask the Chief Secretary to go further than he had done. On behalf of himself and his friends, having regard to what was said and done in that House and in the House of Lords, he said it would be impossible for them, if they were to be consistent with the declarations they had made and the attitude they had assumed, not to agree with the Government in the course which they proposed. That course was the only one to take in the circumstances. Although there was a deplorable amount of intimidation in Ireland which ought to be prevented, it was not the way to prevent it by refusing to pass this amending Bill. It could only be prevented by better administration of the law, a subject, however, which could not be discussed at present. With the *caveat* of expressing profound regret at what was really going on in Ireland, he should offer no opposition to the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that although he was entitled to look with suspicion on any proposals brought up in the middle of the night, he thought after the explanation given by the Chief Secretary it was quite proper to leave out the words proposed to be omitted. Believing that the interest of the tenant would be sufficiently secured, he agreed that the Amendment should pass.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

COMPANIES BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he wished to move the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. and learned Member for Kingston, after the word "Possession" to insert the words "to which this Act applies, and." These words led up to a new clause which was also on the Paper in the name of the hon. and learned Member for Kingston—

"(1) His Majesty may by Order in Council apply this Act to any British Possession where His Majesty is satisfied that by the law of such Possession a company incorporated in the United Kingdom and having a place of business in such Possession is entitled to privileges similar to those conferred by this Act. (2) His Majesty in Council may revoke any such Order when it appears that the law of the British Possession has been so altered that it would not authorise the making of an Order under this section."

The Bill proposed to give power to certain companies to hold land in England—a power which they had not at present. When the matter was discussed on the Second Reading it was naturally agreed that it was necessary to prevent undesirable companies springing up here and getting the benefits of the Bill while they were not subject to proper restrictions. The object of the Amendment was to apply the Act only where the laws of the Colony or Possession to which the Act would apply properly safeguarded the interests of investors.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, after the word 'Possession,' to insert the words 'to which this Act applies, and.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir H. KEARLEY, Devonport) said he had had the opportunity of speaking to the hon. and learned Member for Kingston with regard to these Amendments, and when the hon. and learned Gentleman explained to him what he wanted, he saw no real necessity for them. The hon. and learned Gentleman spoke specially of the Channel Islands. Only so recently as last year they had had a most important conference with the Channel Islands' authorities with reference to their bringing their laws up to such a point as to prevent the recurrence of the evils associated with the promotion of certain companies in these Islands. That conference had already borne good fruit. Jersey had already passed a law by which they gave no registration to a company in that Island unless it confined its operations to Jersey. As regarded Guernsey, the authorities met them to a considerable extent. Their law did not go so far as that of Jersey, but it had been already brought up to the point which satisfied the Board of Trade here. They had accepted our Companies Acts of 1890, 1893 and 1900.

As the House was aware the Government had a Consolidation Bill in hand which would incorporate these and last year's Act. A draft copy had been submitted to Guernsey and he had every hope that they would adopt it. Under these circumstances the hon. and learned Member for Kingston was good enough to say that the case he wanted to provide for had been met; and, therefore, he asked the hon. and learned Member to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD thought it was a great pity that the Bill now before the Committee had any restrictive or limiting words whatever. He should have thought that it would have been the right thing to see English companies incorporated abroad.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member was not in order in that line of discussion.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he might be in order in proposing a further Amendment by inserting the words "in British Possessions or elsewhere abroad."

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member could not move that now.

MR. RAWLINSON said that though he was hardly satisfied with the hon. Gentleman's explanation he would not press the Amendment.

Leave to withdraw Amendment refused.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that all he desired to make clear was that in England we had a large number of companies formed and registered and which did business in British Possessions as well as every other country on the face of the globe. When they found there were restrictions there was not a business man who did not wonder why there were these stupid restrictions to prevent business being done in the particular country. But when they found there were similar restrictions here with reference to companies in British Possessions, and that they were not permitted to hold land in this country, then they thought it was only reasonable that there should be restrictions against us. He hoped the Committee would agree with him that all these restrictions should be swept away, and that it should be made as easy as possible between one country and another. He regretted this Amendment because, although it would do something in the direction of these restrictions being swept away, it did not go to the extent he would like to see it go.

Amendment negatived.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD moved to add after "1907," the words "and complied with all the other requirements of Section 35 including an address to which notices might be sent or at which they might be served in accordance with such section." He said that the Amendment made it clear that, if a company registered abroad desired to do business in the United Kingdom, it must have the name and an address of a person in the United Kingdom on whom notice could be served and to whom process could be sent. It was to this particular section that the clause now before the Committee referred. If a company registered in a British Possession desired to own land in England, it was now required to comply with Section 35, subsections (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) of the Act of 1907; "(*a*)" required a company to file a certified copy of its memorandum or its charter or statutes; "(*b*)" said it must file a list of the directors; and "(*c*)" said it must give the names and addresses of one or more persons authorised to accept service. Why should there be a distinction made between a company which wanted to carry on business in England and a company which simply wanted to own land? This Bill wanted to make a portion of Section 35 of the Act of 1907 applicable to the company which wished to own land in England, requiring it to send in a list of its directors. But, supposing they did send in a list, if they did not go on filing one from year to year, in nine or ten years time it would be a list of dead people. What was the object of leaving out the other requirements of the Act of last year? He proposed that all the requirements of Section 35 of that Act should apply, and he would give two illustrations to show how necessary it was. Supposing a company owning land refused to pay rates, there would be no person on whom notice could be served. At present it was clear that no company could own land in this country unless it had got an address at which notice might be served; but if this Bill were passed in its present shape, it need not have an address, the list of directors might be an old list, and the articles or statutes of the company might have been altered fifty times without any of the alterations having been registered. If all the provisions of Section 35 of the Act of 1907 were applicable to a company which did business in England, they ought to be applicable to a company which simply owned land here, and he submitted that the Bill ought not to be accepted unless it was amended in that way.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word '1907,' to insert the words 'and complied with all the other requirements of Section thirty-five, including an address to which all notices or processes may be sent or served in accordance with such section, and continues from time to time to comply therewith.'"—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir H. KEARLEY said he could assure the hon. Member that they had secured all they wanted and that there was no necessity to draft the whole of the provisions of the section of the Act of last year into the clause. The main provision of the section was made applicable, and they were satisfied that no company would be able to take an improper advantage of the Bill. Under certain circumstances the other provisions of the section of the Act of 1907 would also apply.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that no provision was made for the filing of any alterations in the company's articles or statutes or in the list of directors, and subsection 2 of Section 35 which said that "a process shall be sufficiently served if it is left at that address," was left out. What was the object of providing for an address if they left out those words? Then why should not a company owning land in this country have to file a summary of its affairs at Somerset House the same as any other company, and be liable to the same fine of £50 if it broke any of the provisions of the section? He maintained that any common-sense man would insist upon these provisions being incorporated in the present Bill.

Sir H. KEARLEY: Does the hon. Member suggest we make these companies exempt from the provisions?

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he certainly suggested, that because they took certain subsections and said they should apply to companies owning land in this country but they did not intend to include the rest of the matters which were included in the section outside (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*). They were entitled to complain that the President of the Board of Trade was not there. He supposed he should not be in order to move to report progress, but at all events he desired to press his Amendment.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said as he was responsible for these paragraphs, and the Government had accepted his Amendments relating to paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) of Clause 35 of the Companies Act of last year, he thought the Secretary to the Board of Trade would be well advised in having alterations in the memorandum and articles of association registered at Somerset House. He had an Amendment moved that all companies registered abroad with transfer offices in this country should deposit their Articles and Memorandum of Association together with a list of their shareholders and the Government accepted that Amendment. It was very careless on his part not to have put down in the same paragraph an Amendment to the effect that any alterations in the Memorandum and Articles of Association should be at once registered at Somerset House; otherwise the articles might be altered from time to time in foreign countries where British companies were registered and they have no knowledge of it. He hoped the Under-Secretary would on the Report stage introduce such Amendments as would cover that point, which would be helpful in finding out exactly the position of these companies.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that if the hon. Gentleman would assure him that in the meantime the matter should be looked into with a view of seeing whether there were not some other provision in Section 35 that ought to be included, he would withdraw the Amendment.

*Sir H. KEARLEY said that Section 35 applied to every company incorporated outside the United Kingdom which had a place of business in the United Kingdom or a transfer office. Therefore, these particular Colonial companies in whose interest the Bill was being passed, only got the benefit of the Bill provided they were carrying on business in this country. If they were, the section in its entirety would apply to them. It was specified in the Bill that they must comply with (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*), which he thought was sufficient for the purpose. Section 35 of the Act of 1907 applied to all companies, whether foreign or Colonial, if they carried on business in this country.

Mr. RAWLINSON: Is there any restriction in this Bill to companies carrying on business in this country? A company may fall under this Act and not under the 1907 Act.

Sir H. KEARLEY said the Act only applied to companies established in British Possessions and carrying on business here. It had nothing whatever to do with ordinary businesses carried on here.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that if a company registered in a British Possession carried on business here it must comply with the whole of the 35th Section. But this Act would clearly only benefit a company registered in a British possession which did not carry on business here and was not complying with the whole Act but simply desired to own land, and the right hon. Gentleman's Bill was to allow that company to own land without complying with the whole section and without carrying on business, and it did not apply to a company that was carrying on business here at all.

Sir H. KEARLEY said that was exactly what the Bill did apply to. It applied to companies carrying on business here which were incorporated in British Possessions.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 32; Noes, 168. (Division List No. 225.)

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hill, Sir Clement
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Watson Rutherford and Mr. Hugh Barrie.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.

Mr. Markham.

Bowerman, C. W.
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell(Bristol,S)
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, W. E.(Derbyshire, N. E)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Morrell, Philip
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Peace, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Richards, Thomas(W. Monm'th
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir John H.(Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John(Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley(S'thampton)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Clause 2:

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee proceeded to a division.

Mr. JOSEPH PEASE and the MASTER of ELIBANK were appointed Tellers for the Ayes, and, there being no Members willing to act as Tellers for the Noes, the Chairman declared that the Ayes had it.

Clause agreed to.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD, on a point of order, asked the Chairman, under Standing Order 30, to record him as having voted against the clause just agreed to by the House.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That cannot be done.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he felt bound to look with the greatest suspicion upon Bills brought in like this in the middle of the night, and he should move to leave out Clause 1. His object was to get some explanation from the Government as to how the money was made up which was mentioned in paragraph (*a*), and that for Ireland referred to in paragraph (*b*). It seemed to him that to ask the Committee of the House to pass a section like that without any discussion or any explanation from the responsible Minister was an unreasonable proposal. The section involved no less than £3,000,000 for England and £700,000 for Ireland. These were large figures, and the Committee were entitled to some details before they agreed to the clause.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.) said that the explanation was a simple one, and could be given to the Committee in a few words. The mention of the sum of £3,000,000 in the clause did not necessarily mean that the amount in question was to be spent in its entirety. As a matter of fact, it was a sum within which the Commissioners could borrow and beyond which they could not go without the assent of the House of Commons. The sum was the same as that taken last year, and £500,000 less than the sum taken in the year before that. The amount mentioned in the Bill had, in fact, always been about the same. Of course the figures were inserted as the result of the knowledge possessed by the Treasury, who had some anticipations of the demands which were likely to be made by local authorities and others in the course of the year. These sums were put down in the Bill with the idea of leaving a sufficiently wide margin to meet all reasonable contingencies.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD asked whether in lending the balance of the £3,000,000 the House of Commons had in any way to be consulted. Who were the authorities that had to decide whether loans were to be made out of this money? Was there any control exercised by the House of Commons over the money? These were points that needed to be explained for the information of the Committee.

MR. HOBHOUSE said there was no actual expenditure of money at all. It only meant giving authority to public works.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD remarked that the House of Commons had no control over the works on which the money was spent.

MR. MARKHAM asked whether any portion of the money related to the Housing and Town Planning Bill.

MR. HOBHOUSE thought there was a section of the Bill now in Committee upstairs which referred to housing, but the Bill under discussion at that moment did not cover that.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2:

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD moved to omit the clause in order to ask whether the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill could tell them the meaning and effect of the clause. He gathered they were absolutely writing off sums, some of which were exceedingly paltry, but at the same time there were large sums. Under Clause 2, in fact, considerable sums of money lent from that Department in past years had been lost or were now to be wiped out. That was to say, the money had disappeared. These sums when they were authorised did not come before the House in detail, the House simply authorising a limit of £2,000,000, and it was found every year that a considerable portion of that money authorised to be borrowed had been lost, and the House was asked to write it off. What did they see in the list of items that were being written off? He found when he looked at the schedule to which the section referred that they were asked to write off a sum of 2s. 9d. No; the gentleman in question had 13s. 6d. lent to him and had paid 2s. 9d. off the money. It was a very praiseworthy thing on his part, but being an Irishman he could not help paying the money. He owed 10s. 9d. more, but that 10s. 9d. the Government had found out, having instituted an inquiry no doubt, was not recoverable. It was a bad debt. Therefore they were to lose it and they were to pass an Act of Parliament now to say that it was gone. When they looked at the next item they found——

*THE CHAIRMAN: This is not the time to discuss the items of the schedule in detail.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he bowed to the Chairman's ruling. He regretted that he was betrayed into discussing the items of the schedule, but that was not done for the purpose of picking out an item and saying it should or should not be disallowed. It was really done, if he might respectfully submit, for the purpose of illustrating the clause under discussion, which said that these amounts were to be absolutely wiped out. It was not only trivial matters such as those to which he had referred, but there were enormous sums which were to be similarly dealt with. It would be out of order for him to give the exact figures of these amounts, but they totalled upwards of £100,000, and it was a very serious matter indeed that they should be kept there at twenty minutes past twelve at night and asked to wipe out all these sums with practically no explanation, or chance of explanation, or discussion in that House. He did not know whether it was part of our Constitution that these loans should come before the House for confirmation or not, but certainly when they were lost and the House was asked to wipe them out they should know what they were and why the amount should be written off. Therefore he wished respectfully to insist on moving his Amendment that Clause 2 be omitted from the Bill unless he could get some reasonable explanation from the hon. Gentlemen in charge as to the items which had been lost and how the amounts to be written off were fixed. He thought it was most unreasonable. When he looked across the House he saw Members on the opposite side who came in pledged to economy, and then voted with their mouths practically closed on matters touching over £100,000.

MR. HOBHOUSE said the whole reason for the position was that the clause was a clause repeated in every Act of a similar character every year. It wrote off in one column or another of the schedule either the principal or the interest of the money advanced. The whole details of transactions were stated in a paper circulated in the House two days ago.

Clause agreed to.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that he had no desire to waste the time of the House and he would reserve further observations for the schedule except in regard to Clause 6. With regard to Clauses 3, 4, and 5, as to which he had given notice of Amendments he would not move.

Clauses 3, 4, and 5 agreed to.

Clause 6:

MR. HOBHOUSE said he moved an Amendment the object of which, he said, was to make quite clear the purpose of the Act.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 1, to leave out the words 'any of the purposes for which,' and to insert the words 'the acquisition of land or the purchase, erection, construction, alteration, or enlargement of any building or permanent work by.'"—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD said that the words were inserted in agreement with the Opposition who had some doubt as to the meaning of the words of the original Bill.

LORD BALCARRES: Does this cover ranges?

MR. HOBHOUSE: Yes.

Question put, and negatived.

Question put "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD moved to amend the proposed Amendment, so that it would read "the payment of monies necessarily required to be expended in connection with the acquisition," etc. He moved because he himself was the trustee of certain properties which had been occupied for the last twenty years by a battalion in connection with the Army. The lease of that property had been taken for all these years in the name of the colonel of the regiment. The lease expired just as the County Association was coming into power. A new lease was sought to be negotiated and what was the position? The Association said they had power to take the lease but no power to pay the paltry stamp.

AN HON. MEMBER: Write it off.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that what he wished to point out was that if County Associations were really to have proper powers of acquiring land as it was contemplated under the Act of last year they should be given powers not only to acquire land but to pay the cost of acquiring it. Difficulties had arisen all over the country in connection with the Territorial Force. All kinds of technical points had cropped up. To his knowledge property that had been acquired and taken over by these battalions had been hanging fire because of the difficulty that had been found in getting money. If they looked at the Act of last year they would find that the Army Council was empowered to provide these local County Associations with sufficient money to carry on their business. Why had they not done that?

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not arise on this Amendment.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD submitted that if they looked at the full meaning of these words which he suggested, "The payment of monies necessarily required to be expended in connection with the acquisition of land," they would see that they were simple words which would enable business to be properly carried on and enable these County Associations to do what any public body ought in reason to have power to do, to spend any money reasonably required for the purpose of acquiring land.

MR. HOBHOUSE thought that these words were hardly necessary. The question of payment did not arise. The proposal before the Committee was merely to extend the powers of the Public Works Loans Commissioners.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that as the hon. Gentleman did not approve of the words he had suggested he would, in order to save the time of the Committee, ask leave to withdraw them.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD moved as an Amendment to the original Amendment to insert after the word "by" the words "or for." He said that if they referred to the original Act, to which this was supposed to be an Amendment by way of elasticity, it was made clear that any of these transactions might be done by or for the County Association in each case. In each case he came across as a matter of business connected with the County Association the work had been done for them and not by them. The leases which they took were in the name of the principal Secretary of State, and were not taken by the County Associations at all. Under these circumstances he thought the Committee would see the reasonableness of his proposal that the section should read: "The acquisition of land or the purchase, erection, construction, alteration, or enlargement of any building or permanent work by or for a County Association." He hoped the Amendment would be accepted.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'by' to insert the words 'or for.'"—(*Mr. W. Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HOBHOUSE thought a moment's reflection would make it clear to the hon. Gentleman that the insertion of these words would enormously increase the powers of the Secretary of State and defeat the restriction which in accordance with the wishes of hon. Gentlemen opposite was inserted in the original Amendment to the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that he would not propose this Amendment if the Secretary to the Treasury put the matter in that way.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 4, line 3, to leave out the words 'is for the time being authorised by,' and to insert the words 'in pursuance of.'"

"In page 4, line 51, to leave out the words 'to borrow.'"—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule:

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that he should certainly have been content to have allowed the schedule to pass without question if the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill had given them some short explanation as to what the very different items contained in it were. He knew the hon. Gentleman had said that they were set out in some paper that had been published, but it was only in Committee that Members could go into these matters in detail, and especially when they came up, as they did now, in the middle of the night, it was important that they should not be allowed to slip through without some examination. He very much objected to some of the items in the schedule, and he contended that the Committee were entitled to an explanation on the subject.

MR. HOBHOUSE said that the smaller items and the exact circumstances of each case were set out in the White Paper presented to the House on 20th July. He thought it would be taking up the time of the Committee unnecessarily if he were to read out from a Parliamentary Paper, which was available to all, the particulars connected with each of the items. The fact that these items were set out in the White Paper referred to only showed, in his view, how carefully the Treasury did its work.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD explained that the reason why he asked this question was that, on reference to the White Paper, he found that the schedule was somewhat illusory. For instance, if they took the last two items in the schedule they found a loan of £53,000 to the Waterford and Wexford, now the Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbour Company, in regard to which a sum of £7,053 19s. 6d. had to be written off. Not only was that the case, but some of the principal sum of £53,000 had already been written off, together with £13,980 17s. 4d. for interest. There was no clear statement of this fact in the schedule, and it was necessary to examine very closely into the Bill to get at the true bearings of the transaction, which, looked at from every point of view, was a very serious one having regard to the loss it had entailed. Then in regard to the Limavady and Dungiveen Railway Company, he found that £19,601 was advanced, and no less a sum than £17,601 had to be written off, besides a loss in interest amounting to £12,232 3s. 1d. He thought that when the Minister in charge of a Bill presented them with a schedule of that description and did not choose to give them an explanation of what the items were, they were quite within their rights in making as effective a protest as possible.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported, as amended, to be considered this day.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said he wished to ask for the ruling of the Chairman on an Amendment he had to propose. The real substance of his Amendment was to leave out Part II., but in order to secure his object he thought it would be necessary for him to move to leave out Part I. to begin with.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that this point arose on the Schedule, and he thought the hon. Member had better reserve his Amendment till that was reached.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said that if they turned to the Schedule they would find that there was only one Act included in Clause 2. He wished to know whether, if Part I. was left in, it would not prejudice his opportunity of moving the deletion of Part II. from the Schedule.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that, as he understood, the hon. Member desired to move the omission of the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905. He desired to know whether, if the Committee passed Part I. of this Bill, it would make it necessary that there should be a Part II., so that the Unemployed Workmen Act would have to stand part of it.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said that what he then wished to know was whether if they passed lines 5 to 7 inclusive in the second paragraph of the first section, that would not still more prejudice his Motion.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I see that the hon. Member means the preamble. That comes after the Schedule, and therefore we are not passing the preamble at all at the present moment.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:

Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.) asked who was the Minister in charge of the Bill, as he wished to say one or two words on subjects connected with the clause.

SIR A. ACLAND HOOD remarked that there ought to be some Minister in charge of the Bill. He had sat in the House for many years while this Bill had annually passed through Committee, and he had never known it to be taken without some Minister being definitely in charge of the proceedings.

MR. HOBHOUSE: I am in charge of the Bill.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD: Is the hon. Gentleman responsible for all the Acts mentioned in the Bill? I think the action of the Government is unsatisfactory, and I move to report Progress.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE Leeds, W.): This is quite in accordance with the usual practice. When I was Junior Lord twenty-five years ago I used to be in charge of this Bill.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD said he recollected the right hon. Gentleman a great deal longer than twenty-five years ago, long before he was Junior Lord. In those days he was a great footballer and he always played the game. There were three Amendments down to the Schedule in regard to which the Minister ought to be there to explain. He moved to report progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 34; Noes, 137. (Division List No. 226.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive

Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hill, Sir Clement
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Scott, Sir S.(Marylebone, W.)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Lord Edmund Talbot and Mr. Forster.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A.Acland (Christchurch)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Sir W.Howell(Bristol, S.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down, S.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Mond, A.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward, W.Dudley (Southampt'n.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Clause agreed to.

Schedule :

Mr. EVERETT moved to leave out of the schedule "The Poor Rate Exemption Act, 1840." He said that by an Act passed in the 43rd year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, entitled an "Act for the Relief of the Poor," it was among other things provided that the overseers of every parish should raise by taxation of

> "Every inhabitant, parson, vicar and other, and of every occupier of land, houses, tithes, inpropriate, propriation of tithes, coal mines or saleable underwoods in the said parish in such competent sum or sums of money as they should think fit, a convenient stock of necessary ware and stuff to set the poor on work and also

competent sums of money for and towards the relief of the poor not able to work, and also for the putting out of poor children to be apprentices; to be gathered out of the same parish according to the ability of the same."

Two principles were noticeable in that Act, that every inhabitant or occupier was to pay; that it was a case of persons not property—and that ability to pay was to be the measure of payment. It was a great and good Act and a just Act, and upon it the foundation of all our rating system had been based. In 1840 a change was made in that Act. A measure was passed to exempt, "until the 31st December, 1841," inhabitants of parishes, townships and villages from liability to be rated as such in respect of stock in trade or other property to relief of the poor. The Act provided that it should not be lawful for the overseers of—

> "Any parish, township or village to tax any inhabitant thereof, as such inhabitant, in respect of his ability derived from the profits of stock in trade or any other property for or towards the relief of the poor,"

Provided always that nothing in the Act—

> "In anywise affected the liability of any parson or vicar or of any occupier of lands, houses, tithes impropriate, appropriations of tithes, coal mines or saleable underwoods to be taxed under the provision of the Act for and towards the relief of the poor."

It was this Act they were asked again to renew. The grounds for passing it were the practical difficulties found by overseers in ascertaining what were the profits accruing from stock in trade and other personal property. If they omitted to rate them or rated them wrongly the legality of the whole rate was invalidated. The Act was passed to remove this difficulty, but it was only passed for one year. In the debate on the passing of the Act Mr. Goulburn said that the necessary consequence of exempting one class of property from rating was the imposition of increased burdens on another, and therefore the Bill was strictly speaking an augmentation of taxes on every species of property to which no compensating advantage was given. He (Mr. Goulburn) added that the printed communications from the Poor Law Commissioners showed that a vast quantity of property would escape rating under the Bill which on every principle of justice ought to pay its proportion. The principle of the law of Elizabeth was that it should bear equally on all parties. The Act exempting people from liability had been renewed year by year for sixty-seven years. Why had that been done? Simply because the main provisions of the Act were so unjust towards different persons that no Government had dared to incur the responsibility of making it permanent. He respectfully submitted that the Act was grossly unjust and that the injustice of it was really becoming more serious, because while exemption was given from contributing to the relief of the poor a great number of other objects had also been added to it. The whole result had been that rates had become much heavier than they formerly were. When they were on the subject of income-tax they argued about pence in the pound, but when they came to rates they dealt with shillings in the pound. Who were the sufferers by the present state of things? They were the ratepayers; all those persons who happened to possess property which was not exempted from rateability, namely, persons occupying or owning land, houses, factories, coal mines, railways, etc. They were unjustly treated inasmuch as they had not only to pay their fair share of the rates, but to make up the money that was lacking owing to others, who were equally well able to pay, being exempted. If they passed this Act again he maintained that they would be repeating this great and gross injustice. His object in moving the omission of the Act was in order that they should not continue this injustice which he had shown was a very real and serious one. The present Government had announced that they had it in contemplation to deal with the question of rating, and the ratepayers naturally were very anxious to know on what lines Ministers were likely to proceed. They could not help feeling a certain amount of anxiety on the subject. A certain Valuation Bill which came under the notice of the House last year and again this year was introduced it was supposed as a basis of the new system of rating. If they took that Bill, along with the commentary upon it of the Solicitor-General for Scotland, they had forced upon them the unwelcome conclusion that the idea at the back of it was still further to narrow the already too narrow basis on which rates were now charged. They feared that it would mean narrowing the basis down to one kind of property alone and making that carry the whole burden, thus exempting large classes of property which were now liable to rating. He desired very strongly to urge the Government not to seek to commit Parliament to a proposal which would be so enormously unjust to a great number of persons in the country.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I must remind the hon. Member that he cannot now deal with other legislation. All that he can deal with is what is in this Bill. He is now discussing another Bill which has nothing to do with the Question before the Committee.

MR. EVERETT: I hope, Sir, you will allow me to make a passing reference to proposals which have been foreshadowed to us by the Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly not.

MR. EVERETT said in that case he would conclude what he had to say with the remark that the Government should have a studious regard for fair play and fair dealing all round.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, to leave out lines 7 and 8."—(*Mr. Everett.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said that his hon. friend had from some points of view justification for the Motion he had made. He emphasised the justification he had for moving the Motion by stating that no one in the House liked to pay rates, and if the hon. Member had added that no one cared to pay taxes he (Mr. Burns), believed he would have secured an equally hearty response. Rates and taxes would, however, have to be paid under present conditions until the Government redeemed its pledge, as he believed shortly it would be able to do, to inquire into the system of local taxation. He appealed to his hon. friend after the remarks made by the Prime Minister last year, and also in view of the fact that the question of local taxation was under the consideration of the Government, to realise that he had better not press his Motion that night. They were relatively small points that had been raised in the Motion, and to discontinue the Poor Law Exemption Act, 1840, would not put them much more forward on the road he desired to tread than if they were to allow this Act to be included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Act for one more year. The question had been before the House for sixty-seven years, and it raised a point which to the rural and agricultural Members was of some importance. The question it raised indicated that there was an inequality and some injustice, but every year during the past sixty-seven years the rural and agricultural Members had taken many opportunities of exacting from the Treasury a sum of money that had its advantage to the rural and agricultural districts in disproportion to the disadvantage which they under this Act might suffer. In consequence, the question had never been dealt with wholly as he believed it must be when this Act was expunged. He appealed to his hon. friend not to press his Motion, but to rest content with the assurance that when the Government dealt with the question of rating and valuation—both of which they intended to deal with in the next session—then, as the greater included the less, they would be compelled to deal with the subjects raised in the Act of 1840 which was covered by the Motion. After the assurance and guarantee that the Government intended to deal with the larger subject, of which this was a smaller issue, he begged his hon. friend not to press the Motion.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) remarked that the Government appeared to recognise the unfairness of the present system of local rating, because Lord Wolverhampton, speaking the other day in the House of Lords, said the Government had declared their intention to deal with the question this year. Then the noble Lord went on to say that the Prime

Minister had pledged himself to a reform of the Poor Law system, and that one of the first questions taken in hand would be the relations between local and Imperial taxation. It would be very satisfactory to all parties if something could be done to remedy the just grievance which existed as regards local taxation, but up to the present time the Government had not even brought in their promised Valuation Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The point is whether or not the Act of 1840 should be left out of the schedule. The hon. Member cannot discuss what action the Government should or should not take in regard to a Valuation Bill.

MR. HICKS BEACH said he agreed, but what he wanted to express was that the Government in refusing to agree to the Motion to exempt this Act from the schedule had given nothing but a vague promise to bring in a Valuation Bill by way of dealing with the subject. The point he put before the Committee was that there was small probability of the Government being able to bring in that Bill in the autumn.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member takes the view that the Government will not be likely to bring in their Bill he can use that as an argument, but he is not in order in discussing the question as he is doing.

MR. HICKS BEACH said he had no wish to go further. He had stated his ground in supporting the Amendment, which seemed to him the only way he could take at the present moment to enforce the view of several Members on that side of the House that local taxation was of the utmost importance to county boroughs. They wished to enter their protest against the Government for not having taken any serious action in regard to the matter.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) said the Act of 1840 imposed the heaviest burden the British agriculturist had to bear. It imposed a burden never intended when the Act was passed. He would explain in a few words what he meant. It was cited in the preamble that a person should pay for the relief of the poor out of the profits derived from his stock in trade or other property. But it was never intended that anything but profits should be rated. But the Act had the effect, especially in rural districts, of throwing the whole burden upon agricultural lands. Profits from agricultural lands, however, were insufficient; and, in the second place, the rate was levied not on the profits but on the land itself. For years agricultural land had been paying rates and yet very often the occupier had not been getting any profit at all. The burden had been heavy and increasing. It had been increased, as the hon. Member who moved the Amendment had stated, by various statutes which had been passed, and there was no doubt whatever that it would be increased as a result of recent legislation in the next few years. It would be increased next year through the legislation passed this year. The burden was really becoming intolerable, and it was quite time that those who were interested in agriculture should press for some relief from their oppression, the injustice of which was evident to anyone who considered the matter. The farmer was paying on his all, everything he possessed. It was all in the land on which he was rated so heavily. A banker who might be making enormous profits was rated only on the buildings which he occupied. He might be receiving an annual profit of many hundred pounds more than the poor farmer, yet he would be paying very much less rate. It was the same with other trades and professions. The burden was hardest for the agriculturist just because in paying on his stock in trade he paid on his all. For this reason, without at that late hour entering into the many arguments which might be adduced in support of the demand for the relief of the agricultural ratepayers, he would ask the right hon. Gentleman opposite to consider the question in a rather more sympathetic way than he had done. He did not mean o say the right hon. Gentleman did not wfsh well to the agriculturists, because he knew he did, but he really thought it was impossible for agricultural Members to allow that question to be indefinitely postponed in the hope that something might arise to help them in the dim future when unknown legislation which was only foreshadowed was brought in. He therefore would most urgently urge the Committee to support the Amendment.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY rose to ask if the Act applied to Ireland, in which case he would like to say something, as his constituency was very much like that of the hon. Member who had spoken.

MR. JOHN BURNS: No.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said he did not think that was how to approach the subject. No advantage was to be gained by leaving out that particular Bill. It would be impossible to overturn the whole system of local rating by simply exempting that one statute, and on that account he thought the Amendment futile, and urged that it should be withdrawn.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) moved to exempt the Militia Ballot Act. He was in hopes of getting a little information as to that Act, but when he looked at the Treasury Bench he did not see a single member of the Government representing the War Office from whom he was the least likely to get any information whatever. That was the sort of treatment to which the House was becoming somewhat used. As soon as the clock got past twelve, apparently the Government (who were paid to be in that Chamber) went to bed.

AN HON. MEMBER: A very sensible thing.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT said that in the circumstances, seeing that there was not a single representative of the Government from whom he could get any answer, he would move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir Samuel Scott.*)

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 32; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 227.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hill, Sir Clement
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Samuel Scott and Mr. Gretton.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S)
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Sir Francis (Randor)
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gulland. John W.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R L. (Caithn'ss-sh

Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Mond, A.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor,Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Ward, John(Stoke unpon Trent
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampton
Warner,Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, J. H (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT said he would not detain the House more than one or two minutes, but he would like to have some explanation as to why the particular Act they had been discussing was left in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. He was perfectly aware that the Act was somewhat different from the other Acts in the Bill, because instead of continuing an Act of Parliament it suspended an Act, namely, the Militia Ballot Act. He would like to hear from the hon. Member who represented the War Office what was the exact position at the present time with regard to that Act. The Secretary of State for War had said on 4th June of last year that the Territorial Army Bill did not kill the Act legally, so far as the Militia continued to exist, but the Militia in its present form had become obsolete, for it had been abolished by the Territorial Army Bill. The hon. Member representing the War Office shook his head, but it was a fact that, except as regards Ireland, the Militia was abolished.

MR. ACLAND said three options had been given to the Militia. They might come over to the Special Reserve, they might accept their discharge, or they might continue as Militia. Seeing that they were given the option of continuing as Militia, they had thought it right to keep that Act in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. Militiamen could serve out their term of service as Militiamen, and that being the case he hoped the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT said he could quite understand the reason for continuing the Act, for so long as Militia continued that Act ought to be continued. He asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock) said he wished to move an Amendment providing that certain powers given to the Commissioners under the Light Railways Act should be altered. He thought those provisions ought to be allowed to expire, for he would remind the Committee that when in 1896 the Bill passed through Committee there was a majority in favour in not allowing the Lands Clauses to apply to the making of light railways. This was altered at a later stage, and consequently the Lands Clauses were now incorporated. The effect of this was that under the Act they had to pay very much more for land which was wanted for railways than they ought to pay. If the landlord objected to the railway coming on his land, he was under that Act able to get a much higher price for his land. That was an encouragement to people who objected to railways being made, and he felt that it was the duty of the House of Commons to encourage the making of railways. It was a great hardship on the public that they should have to pay very much more, sometimes 10 per cent. more, than the value of the land.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member would not be in order in seeking to amend certain clauses of the Light Railways Act, but he would be in order in moving the Amendment which he had handed in to leave out the whole Bill.

MR. LUTTRELL said his proposal was to leave out part of the Bill.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the Amendment could only be against the Bill being continued. The elimination of the references to the Lands Clauses Acts would involve the amendment of several sections.

MR. LUTTRELL said he would under those circumstances move that the whole Bill should be left out.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that if the hon. Member moved to leave out the whole Bill he must apply himself to the whole Bill and not simply to the discussion of a part which ought to be dealt with by an amending Bill.

MR. LUTTRELL said he objected so strongly to that part of the Bill that he objected to the whole Bill.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said in that case the hon. Member should confine his observations to the whole Bill, giving reasons why the Bill ought not to be continued.

MR. LUTTRELL said he proposed to deal with the portion which he had mentioned. He objected to the whole Bill. It was a bad Bill because it had the portion which he referred to in it. He thought he was in order in saying that it was a bad Bill, that a Bill that had provisions such as those to which he had alluded which made it possible for the public to pay far in excess of the land, must be a bad Bill. He therefore wanted the Bill to expire; and another Bill should be substituted to take its place. It was extremely wrong that the public should have to pay far more than the value of the land.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 29 and 30."—(*Mr. Luttrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

MR. JOHN BURNS said the point raised by his hon. friend was, he gathered, that he objected to the method of procedure in acquiring land under that Bill. In the case of land the provisions of the Lands Clauses Act of 1845 were applied to land which was required for light railways. There was some force in what the hon. Member had said, but he could only inform the House that the Act in question had only been in operation for twelve years, and the time had now come when the Government and the Department responsible for the Act would have to deal with it in the light of experience acquired. He would ask his hon. friend to withdraw his Motion, and he trusted that when an opportunity came for simplifying the acquisition of land, something might be done to meet the hon. Member's views.

MR. LUTTRELL said he thanked the President of the Local Government Board for what he had said and readily withdrew his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury) moved to omit the Motor Car Act of 1903. He did not propose to make a long speech at that late hour, for he thought it would be admitted on both sides of the House that the present state of the law as to motor cars was perfectly inadequate both in town and country, and that some alteration was therefore most necessary. He need not go into the intolerable injury inflicted on people both in town and in country, but he wished to call the attention of the Government to the growing sense of injury which was being produced, and to appeal to the Home Secretary and the President of the Local Government Board, who, he thought, were both in sympathy to do something to improve the present state of affairs. He did not know that any of the replies of either the right hon. Gentleman had been very hopeful that anything would be done, and his object in moving the omission of the Act was to ascertain the intentions of the Government as to future legislation and to find out, if possible, in what way they proposed to alter the law.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out line 13."—(*Mr. Mackarness.*)

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said he desired to second the proposal of his hon. friend. He had not the least cause to complain of the action of his right hon. friend, the President of the Local Government Board, in regard to the administration of the Act while he had been in office. But the Act had not been carried out throughout the whole country as it ought to have been. It would be very much better if the Act were repealed and the President of the Local Government Board was compelled to bring forward another Act dealing with the question at the earliest possible opportunity. Those hon. Members who were in the House in 1902 knew perfectly well that the Act was the result of an arrangement entered into by general consent by a compromise on both sides. The proposals for further restrictions were largely supported by hon. Members now in opposition, but then on the Government side of the House. So far as they had seen the working of the Act throughout the country, he thought they would all, including the President of the Local Government Board, be prepared to admit that it was an absolute failure. He did not know whether he would be justified into going into the cause of the failure, but he thought a large section of the community had deliberately set itself against obeying the law as laid down by Parliament. He was very sure that all sections of the House would agree that the present state of affairs under which the law was broken by the very persons who ought to obey it, many of whom were themselves law-makers, could not go on. Members of that House were the very persons who ought to be most careful to set the example, and they ought not to be the persons to break and evade the Motor Car Act as they deliberately set out to do, setting on one side all questions of the welfare of the community. It would be difficult at that hour of the morning to go into the many defects both in the law and in its administration. After the very satisfactory answer the President of the Local Government Board had given them the other day in reference to that Act, he sincerely trusted that very soon they might see a better state of things arising. In the meantime, he was sure the House could not do better than enter its vigorous protest against the manner in which this Act had been deliberately set aside and evaded. It was in the hope that that protest would carry due weight that he seconded the Amendment of his hon. friend.

Mr. MARKHAM said the hon. Member who had just sat down was one of those very Members of Parliament of whom he had been speaking. He had taken the law into his own hand, he had disobeyed the law, and he had, he understood, also been fined for exceeding the speed limit. He did not intend at that late hour to speak at any length on that subject, but if he did not take that opportunity of speaking he would have to take some other, and he did not know that the next case would be any earlier than that. When the Motor Car Act of 1903 was introduced they had a specific pledge that that Bill should be in operation for a period of twelve months only, and that at the end of the twelve months it should come up for revision. There was a great deal of legislation by reference in the Act of 1903, but the law was quite clear in regard to the nuisance at present caused by motor cars. The responsibility was to a very large extent divided between the Home Secretary and the President of the Local Government Board. The Home Secretary in that House in answer to questions constantly told Members that those questions should be addressed to the President of the Local Government Board, but when they put them to the President of the Local Government Board he told them that they should be addressed to the Home Secretary. The duties of the two Departments were quite clearly defined. The Act said that the speed of motor 'buses must not exceed twelve miles an hour. He had asked questions about that in the House, and being unable to get satisfaction he had gone to the Chief Commissioner of Police and asked him how it was that motor 'buses travelled at eighteen miles an hour without being prosecuted.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN asked, would the hon. Member say which clause he was referring to?

MR. MARKHAM said he was referring to the whole Act, but more particularly to Clause 7. Subsection 4 of Clause 7 said that no person should in any instance drive a motor car at a speed exceeding twenty miles an hour, and contained numerous references to the Act of 1861, which laid down the speed of motor 'buses at ten miles an hour. As the Act was entirely by reference, he felt he was perfectly in order in showing that it had not been obeyed, but had been set openly at defiance. If ever there was a case where an Act had been flouted and was the proper subject for discussion it was there. The speed of motor 'buses was twelve miles an hour. That had been laid down by the President of the Local Government Board in his regulations under the provisions of that Act, and the Chief Commissioner of Police had informed him that no action had been taken though the law said the speed should not exceed twelve miles an hour, because it came under an Act of 1875 under which no locomotive was to exceed twelve miles an hour. The Chief Commissioner of Police told him that certain circumstances made it necessary for him to allow four miles an hour over the speed laid down by the regulations. It was intolerable that when that House laid down that the speed of these vehicles should be a definite one not exceeding twelve miles an hour the Home Office should vary that speed. It was the duty of the police to see that the law was enforced, and it was the duty of the Home Secretary to see that the Chief of the Police took action. Every street in the Metropolis was filled with the stink of petrol.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that had nothing to do with the Motor Car Act.

MR. MARKHAM said he felt it had.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that grievances with regard to the administration of the Motor Car Act could not be discussed

MR. MARKHAM pointed out that the Act provided that regulations should be laid down by the Department; he had not the reference there, but he would find it; it was in Clause 12, which defined that the Local Government Board should have power to make regulations under any section for dealing with motor cars on the highways. He was sorry the Deputy-Chairman was restricting him. If he had known that a point was to be raised in that way by the Chairman, he would have had all the Acts mentioned in the Motor Car Act and given each one of them.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member could not go over the terms of the Act; he could only tell the Committee in general terms the reasons why he thought the Act should not be renewed.

MR. MARKHAM said the Act of 1903 was a dead letter, so far as its operation was concerned. Was not that a problematic discussion on the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill?

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that if the hon. Member spoke in general terms that was a very different thing from giving every section of the various Acts.

The hon. Member would be perfectly in order in giving general grounds why the Act should not be renewed.

MR. MARKHAM said that his general statements were that motor cars were an intolerable nuisance. They were for the pleasure of the rich. They were run by speculative companies and no regard was paid to the protection of the public. That Bill had done a tremendous amount of harm if people only knew it. Many motorists showed an utterly callous disregard for the rights of their fellow citizens. They had only to go to the Great North Road to see that. Those cads on wheels went by making life intolerable for the people in the district, and though there were many motorists who acted in a moderate manner, a great many men seemed to lose all sense of right or wrong when they got into a motor car. Even the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland when he got into a motor car broke the law. He said in all sincerity that that was a question which must be dealt with. It was necessary not only in London, but throughout the country that the law should be altered and people suitably punished who put it at defiance. He might tell the Committee that the present Motor Car Act was openly set at defiance day after day with the greatest impunity, and he thought it was something like a farce that they should have an Act on the Statute-book which was openly disregarded by every motorist. He did not believe that there was a single owner of a motor car who did not openly disobey the law every time he went out. When he himself took his car out, he openly disobeyed the law, and he did not think that in this respect he was a bit worse than anyone else. He had found that it was possible to drive motor cars down the street in which he lived at a speed of thirty miles an hour, and he had regularly broken the law by following them to find out at what speed they were going. The law was openly flouted and he had broken it himself in order to show that this was done. The time had arrived when steps should be taken to put the law into effective operation. If the President of the Local Government Board did not introduce next session a Bill dealing with this question he would find that the people of the country would give a very strong expression of their intention not to sit quietly down and allow motor cars to be driven at any speed which the owners liked to the imminent danger of other people using the highway.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he was not a motorist, he had not been apprehended for driving at forty miles an hour, and he sincerely regretted that his hon. friend who had just spoken should have set such a bad example by showing how easy it was to break the law. As to the hon. Gentleman's statement that he had driven at the speed of thirty miles an hour to find out if other motorists were breaking the law, he (Mr. Burns) had no guarantee that all the other transgressors had not been doing precisely the same thing, and perhaps they might urge with more plausible reasons. He sincerely hoped that the hon. Member would discontinue that rather vicious practice and return to the ways of the law-abiding motorist. He had risen as one of the Ministers responsible for the administration of the Motor Car Act to reply for the hon. Member for Newbury and the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland. The hon. Member below the gangway said that the country would be much better without the Act than with it. He would remind the hon. Member, however, that if they were to carry out that night the object he had in view, and were to discontinue this particular Act, the registration of cars would be impossible, the licensing of drivers would be discontinued, the twenty-mile an hour speed-limit would be abolished, and reckless driving would not be punishable either by a penalty or in serious cases by imprisonment. The result would be that they would be in a worse condition than before. He could not too strongly impress upon the Committee that if this particular Act were repealed things would go from bad to worse. What he suggested was that they should continue this Act and make the best posible use of it until such time as they could seriously consider the existing legislation with a view to its proper emendment. If the Motion were carried, motor cars would still be used, but there would be no limit to speed, no registration, no licences, and penalties would be lessened. He would point out to the hon. Member that under Section 1 if any person drove a motor car on the public highway recklessly or negligently, or at a speed or in a manner dangerous to the public, having regard to the circumstances of the case, that person was guilty of an offence under the Act. The point he wished to make was that in that section there was no qualifying condition as to twenty, ten, five, or even two miles an hour. If on the evidence produced and facts shown a man was found to have been driving even at a mile an hour in a crowded place, and it was proved that he did it negligently, that man was liable to a fine, and in certain circumstances to imprisonment. If this Motion was carried, Clause 1 and the rest of the clauses of the Motor Car Act would be repealed, and their condition in the last case would be worse than in the first. The hon. Member for Mansfield had said that practically nothing had been done. He could assure the hon. Member that that was not so. If he looked at the number of summonses and the number of convictions he would find that as each quarter went on, the number of people who were summoned, the number of people who were fined, and the number of people who were convicted in the later quarters was immensely larger than in the preceding quarters. He was very glad to say that the police universally now were realising their responsibility in this matter, and that magistrates also were beginning to recognise that roads were intended for other people besides those who possessed motor cars. Also, he believed, that at last the local authorities whose duty it was to administer this Act, were becoming really alive to their responsibility in regard to the matter. He had already in answer to Questions in the House given some details as to the number of local authorities who had approached the Local Government Board on the matter, and he could only say that he was losing no opportunity of impressing upon them the necessity of discharging their duties to the full. The hon. Member had said that the Local Government Board was anxious to put the responsibility on the Home Office, and the Home Office had an opportunity of evading responsibility in the matter. He could assure the hon. Member that was not so. His right hon. friend the Home Secretary and himself had had frequent consultations on the matter, and they were prepared heartily to co-operate in order to make the legislation they had at present as effective as possible. The Home Secretary in his Department and he himself at the Local Government Board were tightening up the restrictions in order to make the legislation more severe than it had been. As regards the Local Government Board he might say that during the two and a half years during which he had had the honour of holding his present office, they had had forty applications only from local authorities for the prohibition or reduction of the speed limit, and in the overwhelming majority of those cases he had been glad to consider the reduction of speed asked for. In one case he had actually prohibited the use of motors altogether, namely, between Kingston Bridge and Hampton Court Bridge. Generally speaking, the Local Government Board had granted the applications, as was shown by the fact that out of the forty they had refused only four. He realised as fully as anyone could do that there was still a large number of motor drivers who used the roads for road racing and other purposes, that made the traffic dangerous to the public. He fully agreed with his hon. friend that it was desirable that the laws for the protection of innocent people should not be evaded. There were a number of people using motors with whom they had yet to deal, and he was anxious, as soon as he could do it, further to remedy matters. He intended to issue a circular to the local authorities setting before them their powers, duties, and liabilities under this particular Act with a view to securing from the local authorities a more vigorous supervision over those men who drove beyond the maximum speed of twenty miles an hour. There was, he would point out, an aspect of this question which they must consider in relation to any restrictive legislation that might be passed. He had, as an engineer, some knowledge with reference to the manufacture of motor cars, and he might say that whereas eight years ago this country made £70,000 worth of motor cars, this year we had made £7,000,000 worth of motor cars.

MR. MARKHAM: Does that justify the killing of children and the running down of pedestrians generally?

MR. JOHN BURNS said in no sense was he defending the recklessness of motorists on the road when driving at five, twenty, or thirty miles an hour. On the contrary, he deprecated as strongly as he could the driving of cars at these high speeds. What he wanted to point out as the Minister at the head of the Department curiously enough responsible for motor cars, as well as responsible for dealing with the question of unemployment, was that eight years ago we made only £70,000 worth of cars as compared with £7,000,000 worth to-day. We had displaced America from the third place, Germany from the second place, and we were now in the running with France for the supremacy of the industrial nations as regards the output and manufacture of motor cars. What we would like to see was that, consistent with maintaining that trade and supremacy which he hoped the old country would always have in the arts mechanical and peaceful, we should be able to keep the roads of our country in order and put "the motor cad" in his proper place, which, in many cases, ought to be in prison as a reward for his scandalous conduct in recklessly risking killing his fellow people. In so far as they had been able, his right hon. friend the Home Secretary and himself had done their duty cautiously yet boldly in endeavouring to suppress the motor nuisance. He must say this of the local authorities, that unless they showed greater enthusiasm in enforcing the law within their province, the Local Government Board would have to take more serious steps. The hon. Member had complained of motor 'buses in London, and expressed regret that the Home Office had not taken more serious steps in order to put a stop to the nuisance they caused. He would remind the hon. Member however that for four years the London County Council had not made a single representation to the Home Office or the Local Government Board for the restriction, reduction, or regulation of the speed of motor 'buses. The City Corporation, which was also an authority in London, had not made representations to the Local Government Board for nearly four years. With regard to the question of motor omnibuses they now had a maximum of twelve miles, and he believed his right hon. friend was considering the question as to whether that maximum should not be reduced to a lower figure. With regard to the question of petrol the streets did not bear witness to the use of petrol and the dropping of grease and lubricants to-day as they did six or twelve months ago. Manufacturers saw that it was wasteful to waste grease and petrol in that way and car makers were correcting their mistakes. If the local authorities did not do their duty after his Circular the Local Government Board would have to consider the question whether there should not be further legislation. They could not have a Motor Car Act Amendment Bill this year, and the passing of the present Motion would simply render the situation more intolerable to those who did not use motor cars. He appealed to his hon. friend not to press the Motion, but to rest assured that so far as a non-motoring President could keep these people in order and defend the public it would be done.

MR. CATHCART WASON expressed the hope that the Amendment would be withdrawn after the speech to which they had listened, but he could not allow the remarks which the right hon Gentleman had made with regard to local authorities to pass unchallenged. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to consider that local authorities had been much to blame and had been slack in this matter. He must direct their attention to the fact that before the right hon. Gentleman came into office there was a circular issued by the Local Government Board informing local authorities that there was no need for their applying for any speed limit because no application would be received with favour by the Board.

MR. JOHN BURNS said the only Circular he had issued was a Circular urging that the corners of roads and hedges should be seen to with a view to minimising the risk of accident, and that this should be done in co-operation with the Local Government Board.

MR. CATHCART WASON said that the Circular to which he referred was issued prior to the right hon. Gentleman coming into office, and that was one reason why the local authorities had not till now taken action. They had had a great grievance against the Motor Car Act from the time of its inception. It had not fulfilled anything like what was expected of it. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was in error in what he said about Clause 1. The effect of its deletion would simply be to go back to the common law of the country. He congratulated the President of the Local Government Board on his speech and upon the Circular to which he had alluded as being one which he intended to issue.

MR. MACKARNESS said he had moved the Amendment with the object of getting a declaration, and he thought after the declaration he had got that the present state of the law was unsatisfactory he did not require to press his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD moved to omit the Unemployed Workmen's Act from the schedule. He felt he ought to apologise to the House for raising such an important subject at that hour of the morning, but that was the fault of the Government and not his. The Labour Party did not intend to pass unchallenged any reference to the Unemployed Workmen's Act so long as the Government remained inactive on the subject as it had been since it came into office. He did not desire to go outside the scope and liberty which a Member was allowed in the discussion of that Bill. If they turned to the third subsection of the fourth clause of the Bill they would see that the whole administration of the Act was handed over to the Local Government Board, and that secondly, the Act being nothing but an administrative measure, it was absolutely impossible to discuss whether it should or should not remain on the Statute-book without referring to some extent to the way in which the administration of the section, which was the main section of the Act, had been carried out. They had heard several times that the Government could do nothing with the Act until a certain Commission had reported, and therefore the Act which automatically expired this year must find a place in that Bill. Nevertheless the Government had legislated on old-age pensions, which was a subject much more germane to the scope of the reference to the Poor Law Commission. Surely in that case the Government could not think that that was an adequate reason why they should refuse to deal with the problem of unemployment. The problem of unemployment had less to do with the Poor Law than old-age pensions. But that was not the only reason they had against the Government for refusing to legislate further. The Government themselve proposed in 1906 legislation on the sub ject and the Poor Law Commission was then sitting. The Government had not yet explained how it came that in the King's Speech of 1906 they proposed to legislate for the unemployed, and in 1908 said they could not legislate because the Poor Law Commisson was sitting.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is not in order to discuss upon the question whether this particular Bill should be left out or not pledges which the Government have given with regard to legislation. The only question which can be raised is whether or not this Act or some specific portion of the Act should be left out.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said he had no intention whatever of going outside the scope of the subject, but the point was that the Government gave that as a reason why the Bill should be included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill and not made a subject of fresh legislation. He had said all he wanted to say upon that point. What they had to deal with was that the present position should not be continued. There were a great many reasons for that, and he regretted exceedingly that it was at twenty-five minutes past two in the morning that they were asked to discuss them. He could not, therefore, go over all those reasons, but it would be absolutely necessary to go into them to some extent.

The Liberal Party might not consider it necessary, but the Labour Party considered it was, and that settled the matter so far as they were concerned. It would be quite justifiable even at that hour to go over all the reasons, but he did not propose to do it. There were, however, one or two reasons which must be dealt with. First of all, in the working out of that Act they had experienced that it did not impose upon the Local Government Board the necessity of being positive in its suggestions. The Act in its present form did not imply more than that local distress committees might present to the Local Government Board a scheme for work. All the Local Government Board needed to do under the Act was to say that the scheme could not be accepted by them, and the Local Government Board having come to that decision, all the efforts of the Local Distress Committee to put the Act into operation came to an end. They found that the Local Government Board worked this subsection which was the most important section of the Act in a strange way. There was a women's work committee in London. The Local Government Board sent samples of their work to an expert. The expert was of the character who did not know the difference between flannel and flannelette. He actually assumed that certain work supposed to have been done in flannelette was in that material when it actually was in flannel. Moreover, the Board and its expert did not seem to know the difference between 2s. 11d. and 2s. 1d. In answer to a Question he put that day as to certain prices quoted by this expert a price 2s. 11d. was given when it should have been 2s. 1d., and the difference which the expert tried to make out for the purpose of discrediting the work of the women's committee was altogether false. He did not propose to elaborate that point. He was speaking at a late hour.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I really must appeal to the hon. Member to apply himself to the Amendment. This is all criticism of the administration. So far the hon. Member has not really applied himself to the question whether the Bill should stand part of the Schedule or not.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said he did not desire to go beyond his privileges. If they turned to Section 4 of the Act they would see that that section was the most important section and that once they passed it they gave the whole Act away. It began with a statement that the Local Government Board might make regulations for carrying into effect the Act. That was the whole point, that was what he was criticising.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member desires to omit the Act from the Schedule. The whole Act must go if the Amendment he moves is carried. It does not seem to me to be competent in regard to this Bill under our rules of order to discuss the Bill in detail, and particularly the administration of the Bill. The hon. Member can state reasons against the Bill as a whole and as to why he desires it should be left out. He can say the administration is so bad that the Bill is utterly worthless and he desires it accordingly to be left out, but he cannot go into the question of administration in detail.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said the point he wished to make was that the Act contained provisions that the Local Government Board might make regulations, and he wished to show that Section 3 of Clause 4 was being put into operation in such a way as to make the Act of no effect in dealing with the problem. For that reason he was moving the deletion of the Act from the Schedule.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that any criticisms of the administration of the Act ought to be taken on the Vote for the President's salary.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said that he would not press the point. There was another reason, however, for his objection. There was a provision in the Act which, while it remained part of the law and was carried into effect, really meant that any attempt to deal with the unemployed by that Act was impossible. The conclusion he had come to, therefore, was that the Act had better go altogether. The Act gave distress committees power to register the unemployed, but did not impose on distress committees the duty of finding work for registered persons. The three years experiment which they had of the treatment of the unemployed problem under that Act had shown that anything which did not impose on distress committees the responsibility for finding work for the people they put on the register, must be a failure. They found, as a matter of experience, that only about thirty-six out of every sixty persons registered by the distress committees had work found for them by the distress committees, and that proportion was being diminished rather than increased. It was perfectly true that it was better than nothing, but thirty-six from sixty left a very large number for whom nothing was done, and they were not going to be content with that. When after three years experience it was shown they only found work for thirty-six out of every sixty people registered they were not going to stand by when the Government told them that the only treatment for that Act was to put it in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. This winter we are going to have more distress than ever. The President of the Local Government Board and his colleague, the hon. Member for North West Ham, had both confessed that the distress committees created by Clause 1 of the Act had broken down. The hon. Member for North West Ham had said so in a previous debate this session, and the President of the Local Government Board had made a similar statement last session. The distress committees created by Clause 1, according to the right hon. Gentleman and his colleague, the hon. Member for North West Ham, had broken down, and yet the proposal was to give these distress committees another twelve months, to show that they still remained of very little use. That was the only contribution the Government could make to the unemployed problem for the next twelve months. If the rules of the House had allowed it they would not have put down an Amendment for the omission of this Act for the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. The rules of the House, however, had compelled them to do so if they were to speak at all about the Act and make their protest. If they could have moved an Amendment to the Act they would have done so. The House knew that perfectly well, and it was only by putting down the Amendment which was in his name were they able to make the protest which they desired to make.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 41 and 42."—(*Mr. Ramsay Macdonald*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

MR. MADDISON (Burnley) hoped the hon. Member for Leicester would have the courage of his convictions and carry his Amendment to a division. If he did so he would promise to vote for him. He did not think there had been a motion made which might be more useful than that. The President of the Local Government Board proved himself a true prophet when that Act was introduced. He was convinced that the Act had done nothing vital or fundamental to assist the problem of dealing with the unemployed, and he would, therefore, willingly vote for its removal from the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. A distinguished Member of the House had told him that the distress committee of the constituency which he represented had complained that they could get no money under the Act, and had asked him to exert his influence to secure that there should be a proper distribution of the money. He had written for particulars, and had said that if they would make a case out he would do his best for them. Their reply was that they had no unemployed register, that they had no certainty that they would get any money, but that if he would assure them they would get the money, they would provide the unemployed.

Mr. JOHN BURNS sincerely trusted the House would not accept the motion which had been brought forward by the hon. Member for Leicester. There were several reasons why it should not be accepted. He did not intend to go into the criticism of the administration of the Act which the hon. Member had made, for that could be better dealt with when the Local Government Board Estimates came on later in the week. When they did come on he hoped to have an opportunity of correcting in the most courteous and frank way the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Leicester that the Local Government Board was responsible for certain defects in the Act. He could assure the hon. Member that the statement was not true. He did not think that the hon. Member for Leicester would, when those Estimates came up, repeat his statements. In the case of women's workrooms——

*The CHAIRMAN said he must ask the right hon. Gentleman to keep to the Amendment before the Committee.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said the hon. Member for Leicester had availed himself of the opportunity which he had had to make statements which he did not think he would attempt to sustain, but he would reserve his opportunity of replying to the hon. Member. He willingly accepted the ruling of the Chairman. He did not believe that the hon. Member for Leicester really thought it better that this Act should go altogether. If the Motion were carried and the Act were to go, the £200,000 grant would disappear. The hon. Member could rely on it that if the Act were repealed the grant of money which the Government substituted for the amendment of the Act would undoubtedly not be made, for they would not feel justified with the Unemployed Act removed from the Statute-Book and with the disappearance of all the regulations under which the £200,000 could be spent, in continuing the grant of money. He did not share the rather gloomy view of the writer of a letter in that day's *Times* that next winter was going to see distress of an unparelleled character. There were many people who took the contrary view, and he at least believed that whatever distress there was next year they would be able to cope with it, and that they would be able to meet the demands of the distress committees. In regard to the distress committees which applied to them for money, money was ready for them, and in nearly every case they were able to leave them in the hope of having a balance in hand. If this Motion was carried the unemployed in thirty or forty districts would have no reason to thank the hon. Member for Leicester for the plight in which they would find themselves. It was because he would have the duty of distributing this £200,000, and because he believed they had a right to spend that money till the Report of the Royal Commission on Poor Law was presented, that he appealed to all sections of the House, particularly to the Labour Members, not to support the hon. Member for Leicester in the Motion which he had made. In taking the line he had taken that night he was taking the same line as two and a half years ago, when he said that the Government did not intend to amend that Act, but to provide £200,000 in order to work the Act, until the Report of the Royal Commission on Poor Law Reform was received. That Commission was within a measurable distance of reporting. They wanted more scientific action than that Act enabled them to have.

*The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that had nothing to do with the Bill.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he presumed that on Wednesday the Local Government Board Vote would be challenged and he would then have an apportunity of speaking on the subject. He asked the House not to accept the Motion, for if it was carried it would be one of the most serious blows they could possibly have, and would greatly hinder them in dealing with the unemployed problem.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said the argument had been used against the Motion that if the Act were not renewed the grant of £200,000 would have to be withdrawn. This would not be the case. Before that Act was passed, borough councils, and other similar organisations, felt the obligation which was theirs, to make provision for the unemployed. The Act had done two things. It had dried up to a large extent the founts of charity from which funds used to be forthcoming to make provision for the unemployed. Those of the Labour Party who supported the Act during its passage through Parliament saw these things coming, and supported it only as a first step towards the State making adequate provision for the unemployed. The complaint of the Labour Party was that the Act had only made matters worse, and they contended that in these circumstances it would be better that it should drop, so that the old authorities who formerly dealt with the unemployed should have the responsibility placed upon them of again taking over the duty. One other reason why he supported the Motion was because the Act created false hopes. The fact that the Act had been placed upon the Statute-book created an expectation which its machinery had been totally unable to realise. He hoped that the optimism of the right hon. Gentleman was justified, but so far as he could see at the present time, not only from letters in the Press, but also from the Board of Trade Returns, and from speeches by the heads of great commercial firms, the coming winter promised to be one of exceptional trade severity. The Government knew that this might be the case, and there was reason to complain that they had done nothing to meet the situation by way of introducing a Bill to amend the Unemployed Workmen Act. What he feared was that if the Act was allowed to remain on the Statute-book with all its costly machinery—machinery that went on creating offices and paying out money for officials without doing anything really effective for the unemployed—it would have the effect of aggravating the problem during the coming winter. He said honestly that he would a thousand times rather face the approaching unemployed question without this Act than with it. Therefore, if his hon. friend went to a division on the matter he should certainly go into the lobby with him, and he hoped the Committee would realise that the Labour Party were registering their protest that night in the only way they could do, against the Government for not introducing fresh legislation on the subject.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said it was impossible for him not to sympathise with the speech delivered by the proposer of the Motion, though he did not in the least sympathise with the Motion itself. It was impossible to contemplate what had been going on with regard to this matter—and he spoke with some knowledge of the working of the Act in a large commercial centre—without realising that the Act was quite inadequate to deal with what was undoubtedly the greatest problem of the day. It was a matter which no Government, whether it called itself Liberal or Tory, ought to allow to remain undealt with, and he blamed the present Government for not having fulfilled its pledge to legislate on the subject.

However, even if it was admitted that the present Act was inadequate and that its administration was not all that could be wished, there were many Members who realised the serious consequences that would follow if it were suddenly struck out of the Statute-book. The effect would be most disastrous upon the people whom the Labour Members alleged that they particularly represented. He ventured to think, after the discussion they had heard that night, that his hon. friends below the gangway were not in earnest in moving that the Act should be omitted from the schedule of the Bill. He did not think they would dare to go into the lobby and vote in favour of such a Motion, and be believed they had taken the opportunity of moving an insincere Motion.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is not competent for the hon. Member to say that it was an insincere Motion.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that if it was an improper remark he would withdraw it.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) said that the hon. Member who last addressed the Committee probably hit the nail on the head when he declared that in his opinion the Act was a dead letter and was totally inadequate to deal with the unemployed question in any shape or form. One would expect that this would be the case with any Act of Parliament dealing with a problem of this description passed by the Party to which the hon. Member for Liverpool belonged. The hon. Member also said that he did not think the proposer and seconder of the Motion were really in earnest in moving that the Act should be excluded from the schedule of the Bill. It was, however, only fair to say that they did not themselves suggest that this was the case; on the contrary the mover stated that he did not wish the Act to be excluded from the schedule. The hon. Member for Leicester only moved his Motion for the purpose of bringing the question forward and eliciting a reply from the Government, because it was impossible to deal with the matter in any other way. The mover of the Motion having made that statement, he (Mr. Ward) was surprised to hear from the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil that he hoped his hon. friend the Member for Leicester would persist in his Motion, and that he would be only too delighted to vote in favour of excluding the Act from the schedule of the Bill. He almost felt inclined to risk his reputation and to support the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil in voting against the inclusion of the Act, because he well remembered the meeting which took place between the Labour Members of the different organisations in the country at which it was decided that the Bill, as it then was, was inadequate, utterly ridiculous, and absurd from beginning to end. He well remembered also the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil and the hon. Member for Woolwich breaking away from an agreement made at a conference in that House and deciding that the Bill should be supported without the Amendments which the Labour Members, in consultation with their colleagues in the trade unions, had deemed necessary to make it of any use whatever to deal with the question under discussion. He well remembered, too, that the President of the Local Government Board, who was not then a member of the Government, and probably had no thought that he was ever likely to be, was opposed to the Bill in its entirety, almost from beginning to end. They had private conversations and private conferences. The trade unionists of the country considered the question at Caxton Hall, and in Committee Room 15. He did not suppose, in fact, that many hon. Members knew the enormous amount of trouble that was taken over the measure before it was placed upon the Statute-book. From the very inception of the Bill up to the time it passed into law the President of the Local Government Board adopted precisely the same attitude towards it that was now taken up by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil. The strange thing was that the President of the Local Government Board now appeared to have changed places with the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, and while the latter was prepared to vote against the continuance of the Act the right hon. Gentleman appealed to the Committee to allow it to go on for another year.

MR. JOHN BURNS observed that the Government were pledged to spend £200,000 for three years on the unemployed. They considered that, apart from their actual views, sympathies, and prejudices, the responsibility for spending that money with a minimum amount of the harm which had been predicted would arise from its distribution should be carried out. They had been compelled to adhere to that mainly because the hon. Gentlemen who sat around him were in favour of putting the motor car on the legislative road without any petrol. He supplied the petrol, though he was a bit doubtful as to the destination.

MR. JOHN WARD said he could assure the President of the Local Government Board he did not object to reviving these reminiscences. He wished to refer particularly to one or two statements by those who were emphatically in favour of these measures when they stopped borough councils from doing their duty. It was now suggested that they should abolish the Act to give an opportunity to the borough councils of doing what they would have done if the Bill had not become law. That seemed to him peculiar. Then they were told that the Act went on paying officials who were doing nothing. He did not think that was quite right. In spite of the President of the Local Government Board he thought the mere placing of the matter on the Statute-book had recognised the *status* of the unemployed workmen, and until some better Act was placed on the Statute-book he would not vote for its being excluded.

***MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD** said he would not put the House to the trouble of a division, especially after the statement made by the President of the Local Government Board that he did not believe in the Act but that he would vote for it. He begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) said there were one or two points upon which he would like a statement from the Secretary to the Treasury. What Bills were omitted from the schedule of this year that were included in the schedule of last year? That was a somewhat important point, because they did not know what the Treasury clerks had done. He would take one case that occurred to his mind. A number of Acts affecting the Bank of England appeared in the schedule from year to year. It might be within the recollection of some Members of the House that he had put a few questions from time to time about unclaimed bank balances. He was rash enough to state upon one occasion that when the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill came up and these Bills conferring certain powers on the Bank of England were proposed to be renewed, he would draw attention to the fact of the Bank of England's annexing money which did not belong to them. What was the result? These Bills disappeared from the schedule. How did that happen? The matter was one in which they were entitled to have an explanation. The Bills had been included year after year for the past fifty years. Either that was a piece of tomfoolery——

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: Is the hon. Member entitled to discuss Acts which are not in the schedule?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but he was in order in putting the question he put.

MR. J. MACVEAGH said that what he wanted to know was why the Bills were omitted. What pressure was brought to bear to have them struck out? It was quite possible the Secretary to the Treasury knew nothing about it. Some well-paid and well-fed Treasury clerk might have performed this without his knowledge, but the House was entitled to know what had happened and why the Bills had disappeared. There was another point on which he would like to have a statement from the Secretary for the Treasury. There was in the schedule a Bill relating to sand grouse, entitled "The Sand Grouse Protection Bill." The Secretary to the Treasury, if he remembered right, made a most eloquent denunciation against the inclusion of this Bill in the schedule. Why did he introduce it now? He (Mr. MacVeagh) did not know anything about grouse. He had never been grouse shooting in his life, but he was assured there was no such thing as a sand grouse in this country. Why were they passing year after year a Bill to protect what did not exist? The Bill was intended to acclimatise sand grouse in the United Kingdom. This had been going on for twenty-three years, and the sand grouse was not acclimatised yet. Might he ask why the Secretary to the Treasury included that Bill? He could not put the responsibility on anybody else. He was told they should give the grouse a few years yet, but where were they coming from. He had looked up the Encyclopædia in the Library, and he found that they never came to this country at all. They only existed in Africa and Asia. The Financial Secretary once voted in protest for a certain Amendment which was moved by the President of the Board of Trade. That Amendment stated that in the view of the House it was inexpedient that when important Acts of Parliament had been passed for a limited period, such Acts should be included in a general Bill like the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill brought in at the close of the session, without any opportunity being afforded for discussion.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That does not arise on the schedule.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: It arises on the question whether the schedule should contain Bills which are notoriously obsolete or totally unnecessary.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think that would arise on the Second Reading rather than on the schedule.

MR. J. MACVEAGH asked whether it might arise on the Third Reading. He thought it would be more for the convenience of the House if he were allowed to finish the few words he had to say, rather than be put to the trouble of repeating it all. That Resolution was moved by the President of the Board of Trade, supported by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. J. MACVEAGH asked if the Secretary to the Treasury would give him an explanation as to whether he intended to give effect to the Resolution or would give an undertaking to give effect to the policy which he had advocated that the whole question of this schedule should be referred to a Select Committee to report what Bills were obsolete and what measures should be adopted in future years. He could make that promise with great safety.

It had been made by every Government and not a single Government had ever carried it out. He hoped for the sake of consistency the present Financial Secretary would give them the same pledge. He thought he would carry the sympathy of the House with him when he said that this method of piling all these Bills into one schedule, and coming to the House without giving it opportunity by means of a Select Committee or otherwise of including only those measures which were neither obsolete nor ridiculous was not a common-sense method. He would ask the Secretary to the Treasury—he did not want to put the House to the trouble of a division—to give him the benefit of his advice. Would he especially tell him why the Bank of England was to be left out of the schedule?

MR. HOBHOUSE said he had been reminded of a speech he made some years ago.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: A very good speech too.

MR. HOBHOUSE said he found himself unable to sustain the objection he made.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Not a bit of it.

MR. HOBHOUSE said that with regard to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman with reference to the Bank of England balances, if he had given him a little warning he would have looked very carefully with a view to discovering whether the hon. Gentleman was accurate or not.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I am absolutely accurate.

MR. HOBHOUSE said that that might be so. At all events he would look at the point and see whether there was anything in it. [Several MEMBERS: What about sand grouse?]

MR. MARKHAM: Can the hon. Member give us no reply on the question of sand grouse? Surely this Bill has some value, otherwise it would not be included in the schedule.

Schedule agreed to,

Bill reported to the House without Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

MR. J. MACVEAGH said he presumed that he might now be allowed to remind the Secretary to the Treasury of the fact that on a previous occasion he supported a Motion proposed by the President of the Board of Trade against the inclusion of Acts in the schedule of the Bill brought in at the end of every session for the continuance of expiring laws. That Motion, he saw, was supported by Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Causton, the Master of Elibank, Mr. J. M. Fuller, Mr. H. J. Gladstone, Mr. McKenna, Mr. J. A. Pease, Mr. H. M. Samuel, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Mr. Churchill, and Major Seely—a very respectable division list in favour of the principle of reform of this method of legislating by schedule. The names he had mentioned should be sufficient to convince the present Government that the argument he was now advancing was worthy of their serious consideration. He did not propose to go into the question of all the Bills contained in the schedule, but he submitted that it was really absurd in the twentieth century that year after year they should go on re-enacting the Ballot Act, which no one would ever think of enforcing. He suggested to the Government that a Select Committee ought to be set up to go through the schedule, picking out the Acts which were obsolete, and arranging to include in one Bill such Acts as it was desirable to make permanent. He was only asking the Secretary to the Treasury to induce the Government to undertake to carry out views which the hon. Gentleman himself had put before the House on previous occasions, and which no one supported more vigorously than the hon. Gentleman sitting on his right (Mr. Whitley). He hoped they would have an undertaking that this question would be seriously considered by the Government, and that a Committee would be set up with the object of removing anomalies from the schedule, thus putting the legislation with respect to the continuance of expiring laws on a common-sense basis.

Mr. HOBHOUSE said that no doubt there was a good deal to be said in support of the contention advanced by the hon. Gentleman that there should be a revision of the schedule, but as the hon. Gentleman realised it was necessary that even an Act like the Ballot Act should be continued. If that Bill fell to the ground a great deal of Parliamentary machinery would fall with it, and therefore it was clearly necessary that it should be re-enacted. While he would undertake to look into the schedule very carefully, and to strike out anything that was undesirable, he took it that no Government would be prepared on the recommendation of a Select Committee to embark hastily on a proceeding of that sort.

Mr. JOHN WARD hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not on the mere statement of another hon. Member decide to strike out of the schedule an Act relating to sand grouse. He knew nothing himself about the habits of this bird, but it might be hoped that the continuance of the Act would have the effect of inducing it to visit our shores in larger numbers than it had done hitherto.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.
Mr. J. MacVeagh.

NAVAL MARRIAGES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1:

Mr. CARLILE said he believed an arrangement was come to between the two Front Benches as to the Bills to be taken, and this Bill was not among them.

Mr. FLAVIN asked if the right hon. Gentleman was in order in stating that an arrangement was come to between the two Front Benches when the Opposition Front Bench was absolutely empty.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2:

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that they had got through a great deal of work that night. They had gone along very well up to that point and dealt with a number of important questions. But now they were all very tired and as this Bill raised important questions he moved to report progress.

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that he could not take the Motion at that stage. The Committee had recently rejected a similar Motion.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. J. A. Pease, Essex, Saffron Walden) said that perhaps he might be allowed to state that no definite arrangement was made as to which Bills the Government were going to take that night or in regard to the number. What he said to the right hon. Gentleman for the Wellington Division of Somersetshire was that the Government proposed to take a certain number of Bills appearing first on the Paper and the last item. Last week he pointed out to the right hon. Gentleman that there were a number of Bills that it was absolutely essential the Government should take before the recess, and the right hon. Gentleman agreed with him as to the number of those Bills, included among which was the Naval Marriages Bill.

MR. CARLILE said it appeared to him that the privilege of having the banns read on board ship in the Navy was a very desirable one, and he did not see why it should not be extended to the mercantile marine.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: This is the Naval Marriages Bill. The hon. Member cannot discuss extension to the mercantile marine.

MR. CARLILE merely wished to make the suggestion to the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. The privilege should not be confined to sailors of the Royal Navy. Why was it not proposed that the same privilege should be enjoyed by the sailors of the mercantile marine?

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: That question cannot be raised upon this Bill.

MR. CARLILE: Am I not at liberty to ask the Minister in charge of the Bill why certain sailors are to have this privilege and other sailors are not?

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: We are on Clause 2, and on that clause the question is not relevant.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Dr. MACNAMARA, Camberwell, N.) said the Bill was a very necessary little Bill which he might mention to hon. Members opposite was recommended two years ago by the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was to enable officers and bluejackets and marines, to secure that the preliminaries to marriage might be taken on board a ship at sea. Under it the banns could be called, and the men interested, if they had made due declaration, could receive a certificate from the commanding officer corresponding to the registrar's certificate on land. The effect of striking out the clause would be that sailors could not get this certificate. The Bill, as he said, simply enabled sailors to take the proper preliminaries to marriage in the absence of domicile. In every case with the exception of an Archbishop's licence, which was a very costly affair, prohibitive to officers, to say nothing of bluejackets, domicile was required of seven or fifteen days in the case of one of the parties, at any rate, and in some cases both persons had to be living in the country on the day when notice was given. The Bill enabled bluejackets and marines to take the preliminary steps without such necessity of domicile. It was entirely non-controversial and it did not alter the law in any respect whatever, except in regard to that one matter.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said it was not his intention to obstruct the passing of the Bill. It seemed to him, however, that the title was a misnomer, that it really ought to be called the Naval Banns Bill.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: We are not on the title of the Bill. We are on Clause 2.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said the effect of the Bill, particularly of that section, was to allow not naval marriages but naval banns. There was nothing about marriages in the clause.

DR. MACNAMARA said the clause provided that where a marriage was not intended to be solemnised by banns the commanding officer was empowered to take the declaration which would be made before the registrar.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment to the House, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1:

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that this was a very big Bill with a tremendous number of clauses. Was it right and fair to take a matter of that sort at that time in the morning? Of course, if it was to go on he dared say some of them could get a copy of the Bill before they got through its many clauses. He hoped the Government would consent to report progress, taking instead of it Navy and Army Expenditure, 1906–7, Committee.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.) urged the hon. Member not to press his objection. The Bill was a purely consolidation Bill, which was desired by agriculturists on both sides of the House. There was one Amendment to make matters clear.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 41 agreed to.

Clause 42:

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 41, at end, to insert the words 'Provided that where such a tenancy was a tenancy from year to year the compensation payable in respect of an improvement comprised in the Third Schedule to this Act shall be such (if any) as could have been claimed if this Act had not been passed."—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CARLILE asked whether the Amendment removed words put in in the other House in order to reinstate the Bill in the condition in which it left the House of Commons.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said the only object of the Amendment was to make it quite clear that the law was not altered.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

Bill reported with an Amendment; as amended to be considered to-morrow.

TUBERCULOSIS PREVENTION (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Committee read and discharged. Bill committed to a Standing Committee.—(*Mr. J. A. Pease.*)

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1906–7.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

I. Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Navy Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses -	1,041,698	8	7
Total Deficits -	644,285	12	7
Net Surplus -	£397,412	16	0

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services be sanctioned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Schedule.

Number of Vote.	Navy Services, 1906-07. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure. Surpluses.				Deficits.		
		£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
1	Wages, &c., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines - - - -	—				254,136	17	1
2	Victualling and Clothing for the Navy - - - - -	187,206	2	8		—		
3	Medical Establishments & Services	22,225	13	8		—		
4	Martial Law - - - - -	1,842	18	0		—		
5	Educational Services - - -	9,894	19	7		—		
6	Scientific Services - - - -	2,771	14	8		—		
7	Royal Naval Reserves - - -	80,309	1	6		—		
8	Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c.:							
	I. Personnel - -	—				82,848	1	11
	II. Matériel - - -	—				264,933	12	10
	III. Contract Work -	199,886	1	10		—		
9	Naval Armaments - - -	260,541	17	5		—		
10	Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad - - -	194,528	0	11		—		
11	Miscellaneous Effective Services -	78,025	9	9		—		
12	Admiralty Office - - - -	4,465	8	7		—		
13	Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay	—				20,078	19	7
14	Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances - - - - - -	—				19,838	9	4
15	Civil Pensions and Gratuities -	—				895	11	4
	Amount written off as irrecoverable	—				1,554	0	6
	Total - - -	1,041,698	8	7		644,285	12	7

Net Surplus - £397,412 16 0

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he wished to call attention to the scandalous state of affairs disclosed in the Resolution. It was not so much that a million of money voted for certain purposes had not been spent, because that they might reasonably expect; but that other items of expenditure had been greatly in excess of the amounts voted to the extent of £644,285. It was proposed by the Resolution that the shortcomings of the Navy Department should be covered up by the appropriation of the surpluses to meet the deficits. This kind of thing happened every year, but he doubted whether there had ever been a more flagrant instance of it than was disclosed on the present occasion. It showed the way in which a Government which was supposed to have a great care for the finances of the country really looked after matters, and was an extraordinary commentary on the manner in which the Estimates were made up. It was a matter which ought not to be passed by without a serious protest.

*DR. MACNAMARA remarked that the hon. Member had said that this was a flagrant case, but as a matter of fact the thing was usual. They took power under the Appropriation Act to transfer sums from one Vote on which money had been saved, to another Vote on which the estimated expenditure had been exceeded. There had been a saving altogether of over £1,000,000, and against that had to be placed a deficit on other Votes of £644,000, which meant that the Admiralty had required nearly £400,000 less than was allowed. If the hon. Gentleman wanted particular information on any one point he would be glad to give it to him.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that he did not desire information on any particular point, but it seemed a scandalous way of meeting outlay. When the Estimates were under consideration the Committee were asked to vote certain sums for specific purposes. He noticed that on the wages of officers, seamen, and boys, there had been £254,136 more spent than the Admiralty got the authority of Parliament to spend. On shipbuilding, repairs, and maintenance, there was an excess expenditure of £82,848, and in the same way £264,933 extra had been spent for materials. On the other hand, the Admiralty had not spent £199,886 on contract work, which they had asked Parliament to sanction, but while this work had not been done, the money had been utilised to help towards meeting the over-expenditure in other directions. The proceeding he had described reflected no credit on the present management of the Department.

MR. JOHN WARD believed that the Admiralty took credit for £200,000 to be expended on Rosyth. He wished to know whether any part of the surplus was due to money saved from the expenditure at Rosyth.

*DR. MACNAMARA: I do not think offhand that any of this saving is due to money estimated for Rosyth, which was not spent.

Question put, and agreed to.

II. Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Army Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses -	1,336,708	4	1
Total Deficits -	42,029	13	4
Net Surplus	£1,294,678	10	9

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services be sanctioned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

Schedule.

Number of Vote.	Army Services, 1906–7. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1	Pay, &c., of Army - - -	358,433	12	9	—		
2	Medical Establishment: Pay, &c. -	44,876	13	4	—		
3	Militia: Pay, Bounty, &c. - -	41,127	7	2	—		
4	Imperial Yeomanry: Pay and Allowances - - - - -	16,943	14	7	—		
5	Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances - - - - -	30,198	4	1	—		
6	Quarterings, Transport, and Remounts - - - - -	107,764	3	7	—		
7	Supplies and Clothing - - -	105,665	13	2	—		
8	Ordnance Department Establishments and General Stores - -	128,775	0	10	—		
9	Armaments and Engineer Stores -	366,429	11	4	—		
10	Works and Buildings - - -	87,310	0	6	—		
11	Establishments for Military Education - - - - - - -	—			2,323	6	8
12	Miscellaneous Effective Services -	24,390	16	4	—		
13	War Office and Army Accounts Department - - - -	4,229	10	11	—		
14	Non-effective Charges for Officers, &c. - - - - - - -	20,563	15	6	—		
15	Non-effective Charges for Men, &c.	—			32,744	16	2
16	Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities - - - - - -	—			2,855	2	7
—	Balances irrecoverable - - -	—			4,106	7	11
	Total - - - -	1,336,708	4	1	42,029	13	4
	Net Surplus -	£1,294,678	10	9			

MR. CARLILE said that if his hon. friend's criticisms upon the previous Resolution were warranted, as he certainly thought they were, the statement now under discussion deserved still more severe censure. He could not look at it without realising that the cheeseparing policy of the present Government in dealing with the Army was clearly brought before them by these figures. The Government asked for considerable sums and then did not spend them. The Army was cut down in numbers and consequently the Government were able to show a large surplus, upon which he supposed they would consider themselves entitled to congratulation. There was a great surplus under the heading of pay, and it was evident from the figures that the Army stores had not been kept up to the right level. It was evident that the Government were starving the Army. The only excuse that they could offer was that they had miscalculated their requirements, and he thought it was a grievous thing that this should be the case in regard to every one of the sixteen items in the schedule. He hoped the Government would not think that it could take any credit to itself for a state of things under which the Army was bound to suffer. Besides that it was to be feared that the cheeseparing policy of the Government would expose the country to great national risks which ought never to have been encountered.

MR. JOHN WARD noticed that the amount written off in the schedule as irrecoverable was only £4,106 7s. 11d. He would like to know whether that was lost on canteens.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. ACLAND) said that the amounts irrecoverable were the remains of claims arising out of the South African war. It was rather remarkable that the sums were so small, but they had fought a great many claims and had got back a good deal of money, though sometimes there were no assets. What the hon. Member for Hertfordshire called a starving and cheeseparing policy the Government called economy. They were quite pleased that they had been able to spend this large amount less on the Army than they calculated upon doing when the Estimates were framed.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD asked the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill if he would tell them how many officers and men were represented in free medical establishments and so on. That would give them a better idea of what the surplus really meant.

MR. ACLAND said they took the number of men authorised at the beginning of the year, and therefore the sum was not so large. The matter ought to have been raised on the Estimates on which the House had spent five days.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow.

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after
Four o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 28th July, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dover Graving Docks Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported with Amendments.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House forthwith.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House forthwith.

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [H.L.]; Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway Bill [H.L.]; Keighley Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [H.L.]; Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered and agreed to.

South West Suburban Water Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments to be considered To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3^{a} To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived The Report of Amendments to be received to-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3^{a} To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received to-morrow, and Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2.) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3.) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendment considered (according to order) and agreed to.

PETITIONS.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Petition against proceeding with until the Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law has been issued; of person signing; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.

Petition against: Of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Councillors of the City of Westminster; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LOSS OF LIFE).

Return showing the lives lost by wreck, drowning, or other accident in British sea-going merchant ships registered in the United Kingdom during the years 1891 to 1907 inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 3695.).

COMMERCIAL, No. 5 (1908) (SUEZ CANAL).

Returns of shipping and tonnage, 1905, 1906, and 1907 (in continuation of Commerical, [No. 6. (1907)].

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Annual Report for the year ended 31st March, 1908.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Report of the Commissioners for the period from 1st April, 1907, to 31st March, 1908.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901 (ACCOUNT 1907–1908).

Account showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and the money received, expended, and borrowed, and securities created under the said Act, to 31st March, 1908; together with report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BATTLESHIPS, ARMOURED CRUISERS AND DESTROYERS.

Moved, that there be laid before the House a Return showing the comparative strength in First Class battleships less than twenty-five years old; armoured cruisers less than twenty years old; and destroyers built and building of Great Britain, the United States of America, France, Germany, and Japan, on 1st April, 1908, (*The Earl of Cawdor*); agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

COMPANIES BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Thursday next.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Brought from the Commons, and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} To-morrow (*The Earl of Crewe*). [No. 187.]

NAVAL MARRIAGES BILL.

Brought from the Commons, and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} To-morrow (The Lord Granard (*E. Granard*)). [No. 188.]

PUBLIC OFFICES SITES (EXTENSION) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. Then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order) and dispensed with. Amendments reported; Bill read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: My Lords, on that Motion I wish to submit to the consideration of the House whether it is wise, or, indeed, worth while to proceed with the Amendments which are being moved from many parts of the House, except the front bench opposite. It seems to me that there were two courses open to the House wth regard to this measure. One was to reject it on Second Reading, either by a direct negative or by an Amendment which was equivalent to a direct negative. Your Lordships, very wisely I think, refused to negative this Bill. If I had moved the Amendment which would have most recommended itself to my mind I should have moved that this Bill be made the subject of a *referendum* to the country at large, because we know from the express announcement of the Prime Minister that it was no part of the programme on which the Government consulted the country at the last election. I think, therefore, that such a proposal could have been justified, and that the country was entitled to be consulted before so grave an operation was entered upon. But I reflected that the *referendum* was a new measure in this country, that there was no machinery to carry it out, though such machinery might easily be found, and that in any case so great an innovation on our constitutional practice should not be introduced in an indirect manner in the House of Lords. Well, your Lordships decided neither to adopt any rejecting Amendment nor to reject the Bill. Now the question I have to ask is this: Do you think it worth while, by inserting Amendments which are not likely to be accepted by the House of Commons, and which in any case cannot very considerably limit the operation of the principle, to share any part of the responsibility for this great measure? I for my part do not. I do not doubt that the Government have at their disposal plans and schemes of finance which they rightly do not communicate to the public, at this time, and which will cover without injustice to other classes, and without compromising our means of national defence, all the cost of this vast operation. They may even possess means of limiting its future extension—means of which I am not aware, and which will prevent its increasing to the enormous amount to which it is likely to increase under the operation of electoral necessities.

This is a vast policy, it is not an ordinary Bill; and those who are willing to touch this Bill must be ready to undertake their share of the responsibility. Some of us objected to the Bill on the ground that it was non-contributory. No Amendment making it contributory can be inserted by this House. Some of us objected to it on the ground that it was inopportune, that with everything falling and shrinking—revenue, commerce, all except unemployment, which already in the summer has reached dangerous proportions—it was not an opportune moment to add enormously to the burden of taxation. I know very well—I think it was expressed crudely by a Member in the other House—that there is a rough and ready policy at work which finds some not insignificant favour elsewhere, that the great object of all government now must be to make the rich poorer and the poor richer. It is easy to make the rich poorer, but there is a long interval between that and making the poor richer.

The surplus of income which I presume you propose now to devote to one helpless class in the community is a surplus income largely given in the payment of wages and in employment, both of which may shrink largely, if not nearly disappear, under the operation of this measure. But financial opportuneness is not a ground which this House can take in opposition to the other House, which has unanimously declared that it is financially opportune. That we may gather from their vote. The third ground on which some of us objected to it, or doubted with regard to it—because none of us, I think, either felt or expressed any objection to its benevolent aim—the third ground was this, that it compromised our means of national defence. We have to find men, we have to find ships, and soon, it appears, we shall have to find an aerial armament—all imposing a vast and increasing burden on the community. One of the greatest resources of Great Britain in all our wars, as everybody who has read history with even the most careless eye must know, has been the great reserve of national wealth which enabled us to wear out some of the greatest of our foes. That reserve of the national wealth this Bill proposes seriously to tap, because we are living under war taxation now, and this Bill must indefinitely increase that war taxation in the time of profound peace. But that, again, is a ground on which the House of Lords has no standing as against the other House. The other House that finds the funds, that provides the money, is the guardian of our national defence; and there is no resolution that I can see which could be brought within the limits of the privileges of this House which would enable us to put that consideration into the Bill, if indeed any practical form could be found of doing so. I say, then, that according to all the doubts which I have been able to ascertain with regard to this Bill on its Second Reading you can do nothing effectually, you can do no good, but you will assume some share of the responsibility that attaches to His Majesty's Government and the other House in this matter.

There is one Amendment, I confess, which I view with some sympathy, which is that of my noble friend on the cross benches (Earl Cromer). That is a limiting Amendment which is in the nature of a Second Reading Amendment, and which I think, if it were practicable, might have some influence on the future. But I greatly doubt if it be practicable, and if it would be found binding when the limit of time had been arrived at. I do not myself think that the House of Commons for a moment would adopt that limit, and I do not suppose that this House is disposed to enter into serious conflict with the other House with regard to such a question as that.

May I put one point to my noble friend, and only one? It is this. If this old-age pension scheme is ever to be limited in its operations, if it is ever to be put a stop to, and put on a different or contributory footing, if in any sense it is to be reversed or amended, that, it seems to me, can only be one by the full action of Parliament after experience of the working in a certain definite time. If the country finds that it compromises its means of national defence in such conjuncture as that portrayed in vivid colours by my noble friend the other day, it will retrace its steps without any limit of the kind which he seeks to impose. On the other hand, the limitation that he seeks to impose by the Amendment is one of a paper description, which, though I admit it was adopted in the case of the Ballot Act by the other House by way of compromise, I do not think they would take as a limit to a financial Bill of their own. It is quite easy to imagine a position of affairs when the country will find itself unequal to the task of national defence, and may say that, great as this scheme of benevolence was, we were not able to afford it, and, while respecting existing beneficiaries, we were obliged to retrace our steps.

May I say in passing that I do not consider as altogether justified the lurid colours in which the noble Lord painted the general situation? But I do share his views to this extent, that the situation would become quite as alarming as he described it if we were found to be weak or unequal to the task of the responsibility of the armaments that encumber us. That would be a dangerous moment, and that may be a dangerous moment if our finances are unequal to the demand. I have nothing further to say. I have delivered my soul, and have washed my hands free so far as I can from any responsibility for this vast measure of policy, which must rest on the responsibility of His Majesty's Government alone. I do not doubt that they welcome and rejoice in that responsibility with the means and information at their disposal. But we have not those means. We have not, in my judgment, any adequate means for practically or largely improving this Bill as a measure, and yet we are about, by tinkering with it, to assume a share of the responsibility which, in my judgment, we should be most reluctant to take on our shoulders.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, before the Amendment of the noble Earl (Earl Cromer) is considered, I shall ask your Lordships' leave in accordance with precedent to make a very few observations on the occasion of this Committee entering on these Amendments. I need not dwell on the nature and extent of the privilege always claimed by the House of Commons which is embodied in the well-known Resolution of 1678—a Resolution which has been repeatedly affirmed by the action of the other House and is now a part of the Constitution. I wish merely to refer to the particular application of that Resolution and of the privilege to these Amendments. This is a Bill which orignated with a financial Resolution in the House of Commons, and was throughout treated in the House of Commons as a part of the Budget of the year, and it is in the strictest possible sense a money Bill. It is a Bill which deals almost entirely with the application of public money to a specified purpose. I believe it will appear that the House of Commons will regard as an interference with their privileges any Amendments which in substance either increase or diminish the charge or which affect the conditions upon which the money is to be spent. It may be, of course, that the House of Commons may take a different view from the view which I take, but it is my duty, I think, to tell your Lordships that, in my belief, that House will take that view, for I know, and we all know, how jealous they are of any encroachment upon their privilege. There is one part of the Bill, that relating to machinery, on which no doubt, there may be a different opinion. It stands somewhat apart from the clauses relating to the application of the money, and I do not think that Amendments relating to machinery would be treated as coming within the privilege. But as regards the Amendment which is in the name of the noble Earl, Lord Cromer, I think it is my duty, in accordance with precedent, to state to your Lordships that, in my opinion, that Amendment will be certainly regarded as a violation of their privileges by the House of Commons.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I am sure the House will not take amiss the friendly warning, if I may so call it, given to us by the noble and learned Lord; and I entertain so much respect for his high authority that I hesitate very much to suggest anything to your Lordships which might seem not in accordance with his advice. But the matter is a very grave one for this House. We have to think, not only of the privilege of the House of Commons. but of the rights of the House of Lords. And I must say that there seems to me to be a tendency to restrict those rights in a manner dangerous to the public interest. These restrictions are particularly dangerous at the present time because, owing to the arrangements under which business is conducted in the House of Commons, it happens again and again that important measures pass through that House without discussion of some of their most important clauses. It comes then to this, that you may have a Bill of first-rate importance, of which a large part is not discussed in the House of Commons, because no room is left for that discussion under the guillotine arrangements now so much in vogue, and which is not discussed in the House of Lords because we are brought up short by a reference to the privilege of the House of Commons. That seems to me to disclose a very serious danger.

Now this question of House of Commons privilege has been not unfrequently discussed in this House. We have the right—I believe that is not contested—to reject a Money Bill altogether, but there seems to be a very considerable difference of opinion as to the extent to which we are free to deal with Amendments to a Money Bill, particularly if it is not a Money Bill pure and simple, but one of those Bills which, dealing with financial questions, also involve important legislative issues. The noble and learned Lord told us a moment ago that this was a Money Bill in the strictest sense of the word, because it was introduced after a Resolution passed by the House of Commons. I shall be able, I think, to show presently that there have been other Bills introduced in an exactly similar manner under cover of an exactly similar resolution which the House of Lords has been allowed to amend.

I am tempted, and I am afraid I shall have to ask the patience of the House while I cite one or two authorities in support of my view. The matter is so important and is one that cannot be hurriedly passed over. I shall endeavour to show to your Lordships that there has been in the past a reasonable interpretation of the rule of privilege as well as an unreasonable interpretation of that rule, under which it is sought to deny to this House all opportunity of dealing with Bills of this class. So far as I am able to gather from the precedents to which I have referred, it has been on previous occasions admitted that this House did not encroach on the privilege of the other House if its Amendments were distinctly within the scope and intention of the Bill under discussion, and, in support of that view, I should like to cite to your Lordships the following cases. One of them arose as long age as the year 1838, and I find that Mr. Speaker Abercromby used these words. Dealing with the Lords' Amendments to the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill, he said—

> "As the Bill was one of a very peculiar character, affecting not only the proprietors of the land, but the great mass of the people of Ireland, and, as the principle of rating was necessarily incidental to such a measure, he considered that, if the privileges of this House were strictly pressed in such a case, they would almost tend to prevent the House of Peers from taking such a measure into its consideration in a way that might be on all grounds advisable."

He then gave this remarkable advice to the House—

> "He thought the privileges of this House would be best secured by being not too far pressed."

That was the view of the Speaker, and, upon that, Lord John Russell made the following comment—

> "He hoped, therefore, that the House would enter upon the consideration of these Amendments, which were doubtless framed with the view rather of forwarding the objects of the Bill than otherwise."

I find that the subject arose again in the year 1847, when somewhat similar language was used, which I will not trouble your Lordships by reading, and again in the year 1849 in connection with another Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill. Upon that occasion Lord John Russell said this—

> "I own it appears to me that, so long as the House of Lords confine themselves to amending the Poor Law, with a view to effect better legislation on the subject of a legal provision for the poor, and not for the sake of increasing the amount of rates, or with the especial view of imposing a tax upon the subject, it is not expedient that we should assert our privileges in that respect. With regard to legislation in reference to the condition of the poor, it must be acknowledged by all to be a subject of very great importance, and one concerning which both Houses of Parliament should be entitled to give an opinion. I think legislation is likely to proceed more harmoniously between the two Houses of Parliament if we do not assert our privileges on an occasion of this kind."

I cannot conceive language more exactly fitted to the circumstances through which we are passing at the present time. Lord John Russell went on—

> "I believe that the Amendments have been introduced by the House of Lords with a view to amend, in their opinion, the law relating the poor in Ireland. That I conceive to be a subject upon which they are fairly entitled to give an opinion, and respecting which they have a right to propose such Amendments as they think would conduce to the better management of the poor in Ireland."

Those are, no doubt, comparatively remote cases, and I wish to mention one or two of more recent date.

I come to the Free Education Bill of 1891. That Bill, like the Bill upon the Table, was a Money Bill in the sense that it began with a Resolution in the House of Commons. The Resolution with which the Free Education Bill of 1891 began was really word for word the same as the Resolution upon which this Bill is framed. The two Resolutions are in precisely similar terms. The House of Lords amended the Free Education Bill of 1891, and some of the Amendments were accepted by the House of Commons. With others the House did not agree, and the Speaker advised the House not to accept them. The House of Lords did not accept that decision of the Speaker without demur, for I find that the late Lord Salisbury drew attention to the matter in this House and made a very remarkable statement. Lord Salisbury said—

> "It appears to me the claim set up in the reasons sent by the House of Commons is an excessive claim, and much in advance of any that has been made before, and I do not think the decision of the Speaker is tenable. . . . I think, in assenting to this Amendment, we ought to indicate that, though we do so for the sake of the Bill being passed, we cannot consent to the doctrine stated in the reasons sent up by the House of Commons being made a precedent hereafter, that anything which may indirectly lead to an increase in the public charge is outside the competence of this House."

Lord Salisbury then moved, and the House accepted, the following Resolution—

> "That this House, in agreeing to the said Amendment, makes no admission in respect of any deduction which may be made from the reasons offered by the House of Commons, and does not consent that the said reasons should hereafter be drawn into a precedent."

That shows that this House guarded itself against accepting what I ventured to call just now the extreme interpretation of the privilege of the House of Commons.

I am afraid that I must trouble your Lordships with one more case. It is a case of recent date that appears to me to go even further in support of the view that I have ventured to maintain. In 1906, when we sent down the Education Bill of that year to the House of Commons with a very large number of Amendments, a Member of the House of Commons suggested that the whole of those Amendments were an encroachment on the privilege of the House and should therefore be rejected *en bloc*. I want your Lordships to consider what was said on that by the present Speaker of the House of Commons. He said—

> "The hon. Member asks me to rule that all the Amendments are infringements of the privileges of this House. In asking me to do that I think he is asking me to press the position which this House has taken up on questions of privilege far beyond the rule which has hitherto obtained. If the argument of the hon. Member were pressed to its logical conclusion it would prevent the House of Lords from dealing with any question which affected the Army, or the Navy, or the Civil service, or with any object whatever for which any grant is voted by this House. I do not think that that is the intention of the Resolution which he cited, and it certainly has not been. up to the present time. the practice of this House to press its privileges so far. Therefore, I am driven to the conclusion that the hon. Member has asked me to lay down a rule which has never hitherto been adopted by this House, for which he himself said he was unable to find any direct precedent, and for that reason I cannot accede to the view he has put forward."

Well, my Lords, these cases seem to me to show that it has been again and again conceded that this House is within its rights when it amends a Bill which, although in a sense a Money Bill, deals with matters which are not mere financial matters, but go a great deal beyond mere question of finance. I will go further and say that it is the duty of this House, if it considers that a Bill coming from the House of Commons is capable of useful amendment and that the Amendments are not inconsistent with the general scope and effect of the Bill, to suggest those Amendments even if they touch the border of privilege and leave to the House of Commons the responsibility of rejecting them.

The matter is one of very great difficulty and delicacy, because it involves the relations of the two Houses of Parliament. I am almost disposed to think that it is a matter that deserves to be thoroughly inquired into with a view to the establishment of some rules more distinct than any which can be gathered from the text-books; but in the meanwhile I humbly suggest that the opinion expressed by Mr. Speaker Abercromby that the privilege of the House of Commons can be best secured by not pressing it too hard, is a reasonable and statesmanlike view. For that reason I trust that your Lordships will not be deterred from discussing the Amendment of my noble friend on the cross benches, or, indeed, any of the Amendments on the Paper, merely because we are to be told that this is a money Bill and that, therefore, the House of Lords has not a right to lay a finger upon any one of its provisions.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I do not rise for the purpose of entering into a general controversy on the subject of privilege, and I do not find anything in what was said by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack with which I can specifically disagree. But I wish, in the first place, to point out that the discussion is in one sense inopportune. No one has ever doubted for a moment the right of this House to discuss at any length all the provisions of any Bill, whether a money Bill or otherwise. The House of Commons has repeatedly adopted suggestions intended to promote the general object of a Bill, without considering whether they were or were not an infringement of their privileges. The question, therefore, would only arise after Amendments had been made by your Lordships, and when the Bill as amended was presented to the House of Commons for its assent. Another proposition has also been repeatedly pointed out in the House of Commons. That is that, even assuming, in the strictest sense, that it is an invasion of privilege, an Amendment moved by your Lordships might, nevertheless, be such an improvement to the Bill that the House of Commons were quite prepared to accept it and make it part of the Bill. Those two propositions appear to me to show that a discussion at present makes it inopportune to determine what should or should not be the course of proceeding with regard to Amendments. I may say, in passing, that the noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, if he will forgive me for saying so, assumed a contradictory position. If these Amendments, such as they are, are rejected by the House of Commons as not being within the competence of this House to insert, where is the responsibility for the Bill hereafter when that which we have suggested in the way of Amendment has been rejected by the House of Commons? It appears to me that that is an argument which defeats itself. The only mode in which we could be supposed to be responsible for the consequences of this Bill would be by the adoption on the part of the House of Commons of any of our Amendments.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I did not say that all the Amendments were against the privilege of the House of Commons.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: Then that restricts my observations to the particular Amendments to which the noble Earl did refer. No responsibility on our part can be involved if our Amendments are rejected, but it seems to me that it is our duty to try and make the Bill, if it is to pass, as good as it can be made. Apart from the merely technical question of privilege, there are cases which might be quoted which show that other questions arise. I remember that on one occasion, when the House of Commons had passed a provision appointing certain agents in Jamaica to hold office for three years, this House altered the period to five years, thereby adding another two years salary; and that Amendment was accepted. But the technical question is not just now before us. Nothing could be more true or more absolutely pertinent to the position than what the noble Earl Lord Rosebery said when he spoke of the vast change in public policy involved in this Bill, and is it to be said that this House alone is to be silent in such a case? I should be very sorry, indeed, if any technical rules of privilege prevented the fullest and amplest discussion of the various provisions of this Bill. If it ever were true that we ought to assert the right of discussion, at all events, it is certainly true at a time when some of the most important provisions of this Bill have been passed over without discussion at all, at the instance of the Ministry for the time being. It appears to me that it is time for us to assert our right of discussion, and that one of our institutions, at all events, should insist upon the right of free discussion, and not be entirely controlled by the Ministry for the time being.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I have indeed very little to add to what has been said by my noble and learned friend. He said with perfect truth that we are not the guardians of the privileges of the House of Commons, but in saying what he did he acted according to many precedents in drawing attention to certain Amendments on the Paper which, in his opinion and in the opinion of others, might, if adopted by this House, be regarded by the House of Commons as a breach of privilege.

That has happened before. The noble and learned Lord opposite will very well remember what happened on the Voluntary Schools Bill in 1897. On that occasion an Amendment was moved by my noble friend Lord Spencer, the effect of which would undoubtedly have been somewhat to diminish the charge under the Bill; and the noble and learned Lord opposite, then upon the Woolsack, drew attention to the fact that this proposed Amendment was in contravention of the famous Resolution of the House of Commons. He considered it his duty, with, I think, the general agreement of the House, to call attention to the fact. That is what my noble and learned friend behind me has done on this occasion. The noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, adduced various precedents of varying age, and also, if I may say so, of varying value. I do not think that he added much to the strength of his position by alluding to the Motion which was made by Mr. Paul, the Member for Northampton, in respect to the Education Bill of 1906, or to the observations which at that time fell from Mr. Speaker. Mr. Paul's contention was that because the Bill in certain repects dealt with money it should in no way be touched or amended by your Lordships; that is to say, that, supposing your Lordships had inserted an Amendment that one of the managers should be a woman, it would be a breach of privilege of the House of Commons. I think it would be generally agreed that that was straining the theory of privilege beyond anything that has ever been attempted before, and the hon. Member himself fully admitted that that was the case.

On the other hand, it seemed to me that in the observations which he made the noble Marquess opposite took a line in the other direction, which, so far as I can understand, this House has not previously attempted to take. I understood him to say that, although an Amendment affected the charges either in the way of increase or diminution, as long as it was within the scope and purpose of the Bill it ought not to be considered a breach of privilege. I ask the noble Marquess whether the House of Commons would not consider it to be outside the province of this House to double or halve the charges connected with a Bill. It could not be said that to do that would be foreign to the whole scope and purpose of the Bill, but I think it must be generally agreed that that would be regarded by the other House as a very distinct breach of privilege.

The noble and learned Lord who has just sat down said that this was a great change of public policy, and the House of Lords ought not to be debarred from considering it. There I fully agree with him, but I do not think that because a change of policy is important a breach of privilege becomes more venial. The other House might be prepared in a particular case to waive their privileges, or might not consider the matter of sufficient importance to call for the assertion of them; but it certainly would not be on account of the magnitude of the interests involved that that course would be taken. The object of my noble friend was, as I think the object of us all ought to be, to avoid anything in the nature of a collision of opinion between the two Houses if it can be reasonably avoided. My noble friend simply uttered a warning, as I think he was not only entitled but bound to do in the position which he holds.

*EARL CROMER moved to amend Clause 1 (right to receive old-age pension) by inserting at the beginning the words: "until the 31st day of December, 1915." He said he was unable to respond to the appeal which Lord Rosebery had made to him. His noble friend's argument appeared to be that their Lordships would be less responsible for this measure if they did not attempt to amend it than if they did amend it. Personally he would feel much less responsible if he had done his best to amend the Bill than if he had taken no step in that direction. The Bill, as the noble Earl the Leader of the House had remarked on a former occasion, was not a long one, but it was one of very great importance. It was scarcely an exaggeration to say that not only every clause, but every line of each clause bristled with difficulties. The Bill had been in their Lordships' hands for little more than a week, and he submitted that that was far too short a time for the proper study of a matter of such importance.

He wished to draw attention to the very great difficulties under which private Members of their Lordships' House laboured in dealing with a question of this sort. They could, indeed, through the medium of the reports, necessarily abridged, which were published of the proceedings in the other House, gain some imperfect knowledge of the arguments advanced for and against the various provisions contained in the Bill, but they could not apply themselves seriously to the work of amendment until the Bill, in the form in which it finally left the other House, was in their hands. Then some of their Lordships would, he had no doubt, like to consult the many authorities outside the House who had made a special study of the questions with which the Bill dealt. Finally, when any individual Member had made up his mind as to the nature of the Amendment he would like to propose, he generally had to get it put into proper form by some one versed in the somewhat abstruse science of drafting. A month or six weeks would not have been too long for the study of this question before the Committee stage was taken. In the course of the last few days he had received a great many letters on the subject of the Bill. He would like to read an extract from one of them. It was from a working man. In the course of a somewhat lengthy letter he wrote—

> "I can assure you that there are some even among working men who endorse your views, and I exceedingly regret that greater opportunities for discussion were not allowed. I heartily wish you success in your Amendment. The limited experience it would impose would, I am sure, be sufficient to convince even ardent supporters of the measure of the grave mistake they are so cheerfully making."

Many suggestions had been made to him by persons whose opinions were entitled to respect, as to how the Bill could be amended, and he had not the least doubt that if time were available for further discussion some very useful Amendments in detail might be made without in any way striking a blow at the principle of the Bill. All Amendments of this nature, however, required careful consideration before they were brought forward, and the time for adequate consideration had not been given to them. He need hardly say that he was far from blaming any individuals for that state of things. He was aware that they owed it to the unfailing courtesy displayed by the noble Earl the Leader of the House that a few days' grace had been accorded to them, and that the Committee Stage was adjourned from last Thursday till that day.

The system was at fault, and he must say that anything more unsatisfactory than the practical working of the legislative machinery of this country at present could scarcely be conceived. In the first stage of any important legislation there was generally what would seem to be almost a plethora of talk. Then they rushed from the extreme of procrastination to the other extreme of precipitation. The guillotine was ruthlessly applied and the measure reached their Lordships' House without any adequate discussion having taken place in the other House on some of its most important provisions. In the House of Lords they were, fortunately, free from the operation of any guillotine, but he submitted that a moral pressure was put upon them which produced a very similar effect. They were hustled into precipitate legislation, and thus became in some degree responsible for measures which all were fully aware might be greatly improved if time for improvement had been allowed. So fully convinced was he of the unwisdom of haste in dealing with the Bill before them, that it was with great reluctance that he abandoned a proposal which at one time he had thought of submitting to their Lordships to the effect that the Committee stage should be adjourned till the Autumn Session. He was aware that the adoption of that course would have postponed by a few months the passing of the Bill, but that would not have been too high a price to pay for eventually producing a measure which would have been well-considered, instead of one which bore throughout the stamp of undue haste and want of foresight. He trusted their Lordships would pardon him for this digression. He had wished, however, to enter a further protest, in addition to those which had frequently been made on former occasions, against the legislative procedure now in vogue.

Of the two Amendments to the clause standing in his name the second was merely a natural consequence of the first, and he would deal with them together.

Under the Bill as it now stood, not only every person now living, but everyone born hereafter would, on attaining the age of seventy years, be entitled to receive a pension if he or she fulfilled the conditions laid down in the Act. His proposal was that the obligation to give pensions on attaining the age of seventy under the conditions of the Bill should expire on 31st December, 1915, but that no person in receipt of a pension under the Act on that date should be deprived of his pension by the expiry of the Act. He need hardly say that this did not mean that the system of granting old-age pensions would cease and determine in 1915. Far from it. All that the Amendment provided was that at some time prior to the close of 1915 the subject must again come before Parliament, with a view to the introduction of a new and probably more complete system based on the experience which by that time would have been gained.

The Amendment was not conceived in any spirit of hostility to the Bill. It was in no sense what was generally called a wrecking Amendment. On the occasion of the Second Reading, he spoke somewhat strongly against the Bill as a whole, on the ground that no adequate provision was made for the heavy expenditure which would be incurred. But he had never in the least doubted the desirability of making better provision than now existed for the aged poor, and, moreover, even if this were not the case, he would consider that now that the principle had been affirmed by both Houses of Parliament, it was far too late to call it in question. Nor did the Amendment contain any covert attack on a non-contributory system. Whatever might be said for and against that system, the Bill was based upon the principle that a non-contributory system was to be recognised by the law of this country. He therefore wished to say that he accepted that principle loyally. But this did not imply the absolute negation of some sort of contributory scheme for all time.

In the course of the debates which had taken place in this and the other House, it had been fully recognised by Members of His Majesty's Government that the plan embodied in the Bill was of a provisional, and not of a permanent nature. The Prime Minister, speaking in the other House on June 17th, distinctly said—

> "The Bill does not prejudice any action Parliament may see proper to take in the years to come"—

and he thought he was also right in stating that in a speech made to a meeting held in London the Prime Minister said that the Government Bill would not prevent the enactment of a contributory measure hereafter. What he wanted to see was the essentially provisional character of the measure stamped upon the face of the Bill. If once a distinct promise was given, not only to the present but future generations, that all were to be entitled to a pension who fulfilled the conditions set forth in the Bill, it would, he conceived, be very difficult to do anything which would render the Government of the day open to the charge that the promise had been broken. He wanted, therefore, to limit the liability of the Government.

One of the main objections to a contributory scheme was that it would be a great many years before it would come into operation. Under the Amendment which he proposed this difficulty disappeared. To use a term which had been frequently employed in these debates, it enabled the transitionary period before a more thorough scheme could be devised, to be bridged over. He did not hesitate to say that he would like to see some sort of contributory scheme grafted on to the present measure. Neither was he at all convinced that such a process would be impossible, though he did not in the least say that he was prepared to bring forward a cut-and-dried scheme at present for effecting this object. But the Amendment did not pledge the Government to the adoption of a contributory scheme. On the contrary, it left the field quite clear. All it did, in effect, was to say—This is a temporary measure; we provide by this Bill for people who are already advanced in life, and we await the Report of the Poor Law Commission and the experience which will be gained by the practical working of this temporary measure, in order to reconsider the matter and bring forward some more thorough measure for dealing with the whole of this important question.

There could not be any doubt that the Bill as it stands would strike a very serious blow to the operations of the friendly societies. Under his Amendment the effect of this blow would be very much mitigated. There would still be a strong inducement to all persons under sixty-three years of age to make provision for themselves, with the result that thrift would not be discouraged.

After the discussion that had taken place he could hardly hope that His Majesty's Government would accept the Amendment, which had been brought forward after consultation with many who had devoted their lives to the consideration of this important question, and which would be very warmly received by the very numerous classes who viewed with much alarm the very sweeping nature of the scheme involved in the Bill. The date of 31st December, 1915, had been mentioned because, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, the noble Viscount (Lord Wolverhampton) stated that probably Lord George Hamilton's Commission would report in the autumn, and that then it might take four or five years to frame a Bill for the reform of the administration of the Poor Law. He did not hold any strong opinion as to the date which should be mentioned in the Amendment; but for purposes of discussion, he had given six years, or one more year than the maximum period named by the noble Viscount.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, line 5, to insert at the beginning of the clause the words 'Until the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fifteen.' "—(*Earl Cromer.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said he did not quite see what advantage would accrue by the adoption of this Amendment. The Amendment proceeded on the assumption that Parliament would, on the passing of the Bill, lose its power for so many years. But the Bill could not bind a succeeding Parliament as to the duration of the Act, and it could be repealed by any future Parliament whenever it thought fit so to do. Referring to the question of privilege as between the two Houses, he quite agreed that there were Amendments in regard to which the House of Commons wisely waived the question of privilege. It had been done in a great many cases. He reminded the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition that there was one precedent which he did not quote, and that, he thought, was the most recent of all. That was the precedent of the Voluntary Schools Bill of 1897 when Lord Halsbury, then Lord Chancellor, called attention to the position in which an Amendment moved by Lord Spencer stood. The noble and learned Lord said—

> "He called attention to the matter at once for the sake of saving time, for he thought the same question would arise on most, if not all, of the Amendments proposed to be moved."

He thought that, so far as he could forecast the future, the same state of things would be repeated on this occasion. Lord Halsbury continued——

> "The Bill was for the purpose of making certain grants-in-aid to voluntary schools. The rule—he called it a rule, for, although it was originally a protest and a Resolution of the other House, it had, as Sir Thomas May said in his book, been acted upon as a rule of Parliamentary procedure for some 300 years—was: 'That all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons, and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords."

Lord Halsbury then quoted Sir Thomas May's comment upon this, which was—

> "It is upon this latter Resolution that all proceedings between the two Houses in matters of Supply are now founded."

The noble and learned Lord continued—

> "Upon this Parliament had acted ever since, and in the circumstances he put it to the noble and learned Lord opposite whether he agreed with him in the construction to be put upon the words. He had no authority, although Speaker of the House, to decide questions of order. Had he that right, he should decide that the Amendment standing in the name of Earl Spencer was out of order, but he now only put it to the noble Earl and the noble and learned Lord beside him whether it was possible, in the face of the authority he had quoted, to say that the Amendment was in order? If it were not in order then it would be hardly respectful to the House to discuss the matter and to come to a decision to which their Lordships could give no practical effect, because if

the Amendment were passed it would, as a privileged Amendment, have to be again struck out of the Bill."

That was exactly the position which His Majesty's Government took up with regard to the Amendment now moved by Earl Cromer. It was an Amendment which they certainly could not, and should not, accept, because, in their opinion, it would be a violation of the privileges of the other House.

On Question, "That these words be here inserted,"

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 77; Not Contents, 45.

CONTENTS.

Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Rutland, D.
Wellington, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.

Carnwath, E.
Cawdor, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cromer, E.
Denbigh, E.
Eldon, E.
Haddington, E.
Halsbury, E.
Lovelace, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mar, E.
Mayo, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcombe, E.
Orford, E.
Plymouth, E.
Powis, E.
Stamford, E.
Verulam, E.

Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Goschen, V.
Hill, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Knutsford, V.
St. Aldwyn, V.
Lichfield, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.

Abinger, L.
Addington, L.
Allerton, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Avebury, L.
Basing, L.
Biddulph, L.
Borthwick, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colchester, L.
Cottesloe, L.
De Mauley, L.
Digby, L.
Ebury, L.

Ellenborough, L.
Estcourt, L.
Faber, L.
Forester, L.
Hindlip, L.
Hylton, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kinnaird, L.
Lamington, L.
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway.*)
Monk Bretton, L.
Muskerry, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
St. Oswald, L.
Sanderson, L.
Sinclair, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Tweeddale, L. (*M. Tweeddale.*)
Willoughby de Broke, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Ripon, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Northampton, M.

Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Craven, E.
Crewe, E.
Jersey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Northbrook, E.
Russell, E.

Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)

Morley of Blackburn, V.
Ridley, V.
Wolverhampton, V.

Bangor, L. Bp.

Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Boston, L.
Clinton, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Eversley, L.
Farrer, L.
Fitzmaurice, L
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]

Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Headley, L.
Hemphill, L.
Herschell, L.
Joicey, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lyveden, L.
Macdonnell, L.
Marchamley, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
St. Davids, L.
Sandys, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Tenterden, L.
Welby, L.
Wrottesley, L.

EARL CROMER explained that his second Amendment was consequential upon the one which their Lordships had just adopted.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 10, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'the person who is in receipt of a pension on the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fifteen shall not be deprived of that pension by reason of the expiry of this Act.'"—(*Earl Cromer.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE moved to insert three new subsections in

Clause 1. The noble Duke expressed his confidence that their Lordships would extend to him the indulgence which was always given to one who, however practised a speaker, addressed their Lordships for the first time. He had put down the Amendment in the hope that it would elicit from the Government an explanation of how it was proposed to carry the Bill into effect. Machinery would have to be devised by which a sum, at the very lowest computation, of £150,000 a week would have to be distributed in pensions, ranging from the maximum of £13 a year to the minimum of £2 10s. a year, in all parts of the United Kingdom. At present the machinery in the Bill consisted of a Central Pensions Board, which was to have power to delegate its authority to any committee or individual. It seemed to him that the President of the Local Government Board for the time being would be the central pensions authority. The other machinery was the local pensions committee and the pensions officer. The last-named was a Treasury official, and upon him to a great extent would depend the success or failure of the Act. The Government had left it to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Postmaster-General, and the President of the Local Government Board to devise schemes as to how this Act was to be carried into effect. They were taking a very great step in delegating what were really the functions of the Imperial Parliament to the Ministerial officials for the time being. Very many of the difficulties in putting the Territorial Forces Act into operation were due to the uncertainty of the Act itself, and to the fact that the country had to wait to see what the orders of the Army Council would be. In this Pensions Act they were dealing with a very large sum of money, and there was no information in the Bill itself as to how that money was to be brought down to the pockets of those whom Parliament intended to receive that money. He understood the agency to be employed would be the Post Office, but what authority would the Post Office require in disbursing these monies ? What were the rules and regulations which would deal with the distribution of this large and increasing sum of money ? The whole system of the machinery in the Bill was vague and loose. Those of their Lordships, who, like himself, had been connected with the Public Accounts Committee in the House of Commons would know how essential it was that Parliament should clearly and distinctly lay down the source by which money was to flow from the Treasury. That was the only way in which an effective control could be maintained. He did not pretend that in the face of the somewhat vague and faulty machinery in the Bill his Amendment would convert it into a satisfactory machinery ; but he had adopted practically the same phraseology as was to be found in the Small Holdings Act. If his Amendment were accepted it would enable Parliament to be placed in receipt of the necessary accounts to enable a thorough and systematic audit to take place. At the present time there was no provision in the Bill for any audit at all.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 15, after subsection (3) to insert the following new subsections: '(4) For the purposes of this Act there shall be opened an account at the Bank of England called "The Old-Age Pensions Account," and there shall be paid to this account such money as may from time to time be provided by Parliament towards defraying the costs and expenses incurred in Great Britain in the execution of this Act, and all other sums received in respect of old-age pensions under this Act, and directed by regulations under this Act to be paid into the Old-Age Pensions Account. (5) The costs and expenses incurred in Great Britain in the execution of this Act shall be paid by the Local Government Board subject to regulations to be made by the Treasury out of the money standing to that account. (6) At the end of every financial year, accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Old-Age Pensions Account shall be made up in such form and with such particulars as may be directed by the Treasury, and shall be audited by the Comptroller and Auditor-General as public accounts in accordance with such regulations as the Treasury may make, and shall be laid before Parliament together with his report thereon.' "—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON expressed his pleasure at hearing again the voice of the noble Duke, opposite to whom he had sat for many years in the other House. He regretted that the Government could not accept the Amendment. The regulations for the distribution of the money would be laid before Parliament as soon as possible. The schemes and the details of the schemes had been prepared and considered by the Treasury officials, to whom the finances of this country had been entrusted for so many years and with so much success. There were reasons, which the noble Duke would appreciate, why it would be most unwise to put a great deal of the machinery into an Act of Parliament, because it could not then be altered or amended without going through all the various stages of passing a Bill through both Houses of Parliament. The machinery for distribution would have to be carefully tested under the supervision of the Ministers of the Crown, and when the defects had been ascertained then those defects could be administratively altered without delay. It was desirable to avoid having separate Acts of Parliament for these Amendments in machinery. He could assure the noble Duke that his fears in the matter were groundless.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said their Lordships were indebted to the noble Duke for having called attention to the deficiency in the Bill in the most important matter to which he had alluded. What had been the answer of the noble Viscount? It was merely that regulations would be made and would be presented to Parliament. He was quite aware that it would be impossible to insert all the necessary regulations in an Act of Parliament. The noble Duke had explained that in the Small Holdings Act there were certain definite principles laid down with regard to the expenditure of money which it would be perfectly possible, *mutatis mutandis,* for His Majesty's Government to have embodied in this Bill. But that was not done. Would it not have been very much better, considering how long this matter had occupied the attention of the Government, and that they must have arrived at certain conclusions upon it by this time, that those regulations should have been laid before Parliament before they were asked to vote upon the matter, so that they might know exactly what they were doing? He thought, however, after what had been said that his noble friend would probably not desire to press the Amendment, although he had done a public service in moving it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved the insertion of a new clause which, he said, raised the whole question as between a contributory and a non-contributory scheme. The price of an ounce of tobacco or a glass of beer a week when a man entered life would find the money. He had shown in the debate on Second Reading, and His Majesty's Government had not attempted to controvert it, that with a few exceptions our workmen could easily provide themselves with pensions. Some 250,000, indeed, had done so already. The Board of Trade had shown that German workmen had lower wages, longer hours, dearer food, and dearer clothes than our people. They could and did provide themselves with pensions, and yet they were told that Englishmen could not. The Government had stated that contributory pensions were impossible in England. They had given no reason, except that Mr. Chamberlain once said so. Mr. Chamberlain, however, said they were impossible because you could not bridge over the interval. But the Germans had bridged over the interval, and the Bill with their Amendments would do so. True charity would promote independence and encourage thrift. The Bill as it stood would increase dependence and discourage thrift. Thomas Tucker long ago said that husbandry (by which he meant thrift) was not an English virtue. They were doing their best to prevent its ever being so. They were penalising prudence, and subsidising self-indulgence. The advocates of a contributory scheme said to the workman, "If you will save something the State will double it." The Government said to the workmen: "If you spend your savings in beer and tobacco we will give you a pension; but if you are fool enough to put it by for old age we will do nothing for you." And yet the Government professed to be, and he knew really were, in favour of temperance. The expenses of the Bill would be enormous, but that was not, to his mind, the great objection. If their Lordships rejected the Amendment the Bill would seriously lower the character and independence of the people, but if they passed it they would really confer a boon on the working classes.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 1, to insert the following new clause: '(1) A person born after the first day of January nineteen hundred and nine and a person who on that day is under sixty-five years of age shall not be entitled to a pension under this Act. (2) The Treasury may make regulations enabling persons not entitled to pensions under this Act to provide the like pensions for themselves, and shall cause tables to be constructed for that purpose in which interest shall be calculated at the rate of four per cent. per annum. (3) Where a person, who on the first day of January nineteen hundred and nine is above the age of forty-one and under the age of sixty-five desires to provide a pension for himself as aforesaid, but is unable to pay the full contribution that is required by the tables from a person of his age, the Treasury may pay for him so much of that contribution as exceeds the contribution that is required by the tables from a person of the age of forty-one.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said the proposal of the noble Lord reopened the whole controversy about contributory schemes. The Amendment could not be accepted, because the decision of both Houses of Parliament and of the country had been given against a contributory scheme. The question, so far as the Government were concerned, was a *chose jugee.*

VISCOUNT RIDLEY hoped the noble Lord would not press the Amendment at this moment. If he did he would be reluctantly compelled to vote against it, not because there were not merits in the proposal, but because there had been no time properly to consider it, and because, though many people for many years had been endeavouring to arrive at a satisfactory contributory scheme, there was no great body of opinion behind any particular scheme of that kind.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN associated himself with the appeal of the noble Viscount behind him, not so much for the reason his noble friend had given, but because the Amendment seemed to be a clear breach of privilege since it proposed a grant from the taxpayers for a purpose for which the House of Commons had voted nothing at all. Although he could not see that the Amendment moved by the noble Earl on the cross benches, Lord Cromer, necessarily raised the question of privilege, yet this Amendment did raise it in so clear a way that he submitted it should be withdrawn.

LORD AVEBURY, while he did not understand how an Amendment that would effect a great saving to the Exchequer would be a breach of privilege, in deference to the noble Viscount's opinion, asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 2:

VISCOUNT MIDLETON moved an Amendment to Clause 2 ("Statutory conditions for receipt of old-age pensions") which would add to the condition as to recipients of pensions having attained the age of seventy the words "as verified by certificates of birth or baptism, or, in the absence of such certificates, by census returns or other official documents." He apprehended that this Amendment would not come under the ban of privilege. If it were contended for a moment that it was improper for their Lordships to attempt to lay down how the age of seventy should be arrived at, then he thought the question of privilege would invade almost every measure which came before their Lordships' House. This was an Amendment which merely attempted to secure the fair administration of the Bill, if it became an Act, in a particular as to which at the moment there was no regulation at all. This particular provision of the Bill contained nothing but uncertainties. There was no method in it whatever. They could not doubt that, as the Bill stood, the door was open to a distribution which had not got solid foundations, and in which naturally the impulse of every man would be on the side of liberality, especially in the poorer districts. In Ireland there were the fewest records, and there was also a traditional open-handedness and a very wide and hearty appreciation of the depth of the public purse. He did not think his Amendment would in any way add difficulties to the scheme. In England there were registers of births going back to the year 1837. In Ireland the registers only went back to the year 1866. There were, however, marriage registers, and a married man who did not know the place of his birth would certainly remember the place of his marriage. There were also other official statistics. Every man who had served the Crown in any capacity had to state his age, and was officially accepted as being of a certain age. Those who had passed through the various forces of the Crown must number several millions, all of whose ages could be ascertained from the records. Where there were no other records, he relied on the Census Returns. He did not think it was asking too much to say that only cases which could be verified in this way should be dealt with by the Pensions Committee, and that where there was difficulty in verification of any kind the matter should be dealt with by a separate and special body. Many anomalies would arise unless some such provision were inserted. He thought it would be evident to their Lordships that this was a case in which some concession should be made.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 21, after the word 'seventy,' to insert the words 'as verified by certificates of birth or baptism, or in the absence of such certificates by census returns or other official documents."—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said that the practice in the Colonies where pensions had been established was that the Court were not bound to require legal evidence in this matter. Of course people would endeavour to get pensions to which they were not entitled, but the pension officer was a representative of the Exchequer, and he could be trusted to be a very favourable watchdog for the Treasury. There might be unjustified generosity in the local pension committees, but there was an appeal to the Local Government Board. The Government had given attention to this point. They had not thrown this Bill upon the Table absolutely ignorant of all its difficulties, but they were confronting them and doing their best to conquer them.

LORD ATKINSON suggested that Viscount Midleton's Amendment might fairly be accepted if the words "wherever practicable" were inserted after the word "verified." In many cases in Ireland there would be no official evidence available beyond the census returns, except in the case of men who had served the Crown. A great many of the parish priests, however, had kept registers which might be available, and he therefore suggested the insertion in the Amendment of words to include true copies of any register of births or marriages kept by a clergyman of any religious persuasion in connection with any office he might have held.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To insert, after the words 'as verified,' the words 'wherever practicable.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I hope that either with or without the Amendment His Majesty's Government will accept some such words as my noble friend has suggested. It is abundantly clear that, unless this clause is fortified in some way, the taxpayers of this country will be exposed to wholesale fraud. The noble Viscount in charge of the Bill tells us that we need have no misgivings lest this difficulty should have been ignored by His Majesty's Government, and that these matters are to be provided for in rules and regulations. But we have to take all these things upon trust. I do not want to be told exactly what the letter of the rules and regulations is to be, but I want to know on what general lines it is intended to ascertain whether these claims are genuine or not. Upon whom, for example, is the burden of proof to lie? Has the claimant to prove to the satisfaction of the authority that he is seventy? I do not find that in the Bill as it stands, but unless there is some official evidence to support the pensioner's claim, the door is wide open to fraud. Something has been said as to evidence of age in the case of recruits. My noble friend and I well remember what took place in that matter. There was a great difficulty in getting recruits of full age, and many of them were entirely without the means of satisfying the War Office what their age was. Thereupon the military authorities invented the ingenious plan of directing the recruiting officers to be content with what used to be called the "physical equivalents" of the age of eighteen. We had no idea what those physical equivalents were, but we knew that a great number of youths of sixteen and seventeen and even younger were considered to possess those equivalents. In this case you have to produce the physical equivalents, not of eighteen, but of seventy. What are the physical equivalents of seventy? We know that a great many people resort to ingenious plans for making themselves appear younger than they really are, but I am afraid you will have a regular industry for the purpose of making people appear a great deal older than they are in order to obtain these pensions. The risk is a serious one, and I hope, in spite of what fell just now from the noble Viscount in charge of the Bill, that His Majesty's Government will accept some form of words, either that suggested by my noble friend behind me, or another form of words in order to make it clear that there really is to be full and adequate proof that the claimant has reached the age entitling him to be pensioned.

*Viscount **WOLVERHAMPTON** pointed out that the Bill provided that the Treasury should make regulations for prescribing the manner in which claims to pensions might be made and the procedure to be followed to secure the fulfilment of the statutory conditions. But he had no objection to accepting the Amendment with the insertion of the words "wherever practicable" after the word "verified," as suggested by Lord Atkinson.

Lord **ATKINSON** inquired whether the noble Viscount would also accept his suggestion as to inserting words with regard to true copies of any register of births or marriages kept by a clergyman of any religious persuasion.

*Viscount **WOLVERHAMPTON** thought this would be introducing a religious element, and might give rise to a good deal of dispute. Moreover, he

saw no necessity for the addition of those words. If the registers were official documents they would be got at. There would be no difficulty in the way of the pension committee or the pension officer asking for these documents.

Viscount St. **ALDWYN** sympathised with the view taken by the noble Viscount. The object of Lord Midleton's Amendment was to give a preference to the utmost extent to official documents, but if they specified in the Bill something which the noble and learned Lord had said was not official at all, would it not rather suggest that evidence could be taken which was not of the character indicated by Lord Midleton? He thought it would be better to amend the Amendment by inserting the words "wherever practicable," and confine themselves to that.

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Lord **AVEBURY** moved to amend Clause 2 so as to provide that a person applying for an old-age pension must "satisfy the local authority" as to his residential qualifications. He argued that this would throw the onus of proof upon the person applying for the pension and make it quite secure that he had to satisfy the pension authority. He hoped to have the support of Viscount St. Aldwyn, because in the debate on the Second Reading the noble Viscount distinctly laid it down that in his judgment the onus of proof should not rest with the pension authority as in the Bill, but on the applicant. He gathered that that was also the opinion of the Marquess of Lansdowne, and he hoped His Majesty's Government might accept the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'must,' to insert the words 'satisfy the local pension committee that.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*Viscount **WOLVERHAMPTON** pointed out that the Amendment assumed that the local pension committee was the solitary and final authority, whereas under Clause 7 the claim first of all went to the pension officer, then to the local pension committee, and possibly, on appeal, to the Local Government Board. Those three authorities had to be satisfied, and the Bill was drawn upon that basis.

LORD **AVEBURY** said the point he wished to raise was that the *onus probandi* should rest on the person applying. The word "local" was, however, not wanted, and he would delete it.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

*VISCOUNT **WOLVERHAMPTON** moved an Amendment to add to sub-section 2 that the twenty years residential qualification, should be subject to any exceptions provided by the regulations under the Act.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and subject to any exceptions provided by these regulations.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

VISCOUNT ST. **ALDWYN** hoped their Lordships might have some statement as to what exceptions were intended. The noble Viscount proposed to amend the Bill so as to enable the pension authority to do what certainly it always must have intended to do—to make certain exceptions, which he hoped would not be very wide exceptions, to the provision of residence. He thought they ought to know precisely what was intended by the exceptions. Was it merely intended that, for example, persons in the Army and Navy abroad on this duty should be excepted from the term of residence, or was it intended to go very much wider than that and exempt persons who spent the whole, or nearly the whole, of the term abroad on their own private avocations, and pension them even if they had not really done any work in this country during the twenty years? He did not think the Government could intend to go as far as that, but meant to maintain the spirit of the residential qualification while allowing some reasonable exceptions in cases where those exceptions ought to be made.

*VISCOUNT **WOLVERHAMPTON** explained that a legal objection had been taken. The Government themselves were perfectly satisfied with the Bill as it was drawn, but the Law Officers of the Crown raised the doubt whether the provision was enough to enable regulations defining residence to include that which was not "residence" in the ordinary sense of the term. Personally he thought there would be no object in the provision unless it had that effect and he did not think the Amendment necessary. On the other hand very distinguished lawyers had taken the point, and it might be well to make it clear in order that people who were abroad in the Army, Navy, or merchant service might be duly protected. The intention of the Government was to prevent a dispute arising as to the true meaning of the section.

*THE MARQUESS OF **LANSDOWNE**: It is quite clear that if this Amendment is adopted, a very considerable latitude of interpretation would be given to the authorities which they would not possess under the Bill as it now stands. I desire, in passing, to call the attention of the House to the fact that according to the rendering of the privilege doctrine to which we listened early in the evening this Amendment would appear to be an invasion of the privileges of the House of Commons, because it is intended to widen the scope of the clause and to throw an increased burden upon the Exchequer. But I gather that what is desired is that the Department that administers this Act is to have the right of ruling that the word "residence," which I have always understood was a legal expression with a very strict interpretation, is to be considered in a sense not at present known to the law. The matter, however, does seem to be rather a serious one, and I am very glad that my hon. friend beside me called the attention of the House to it.

VISCOUNT ST. **ALDWYN** again asked for some answer from the noble Viscount as to the exceptions which it was intended to make.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said the question was as to how they were to define the word "residence." It was a very difficult word to define in regard to people who spent the great portion of their time abroad. There were a large number of cases—men in public works in the Colonies and in European countries, although practically their residence was in England. If they had a wife and children at home that would be their residence, but there was no reason why men should be deprived of their pensions, who had not homes in England, but had gone out from England to do work and then come back. The intention of the Government was that Englishmen, Scotsmen, and Irishmen should not be disqualified simply because they had not continuously resided in England during the twenty years. They would do great injury by raising legal points which might deprive some deserving people of their pensions. The Law Officers thought it was a desirable thing that the words in the Amendment should be put in.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said the two Amendments which stood next upon the Order Paper in the hands of Lord Clinton and Lord Muskerry had the same object as that of the noble Viscount. They were agreed that certain exceptions ought to be made, but what the noble Viscount suggested to the House was that it should be within the power of the Government to dispense entirely with residence or with anything corresponding to it, because the words were absolutely wide. Any exceptions which the pension authorities chose to lay down were to have the same force as if they were enacted in the Act. The noble Viscount who was in charge of the Bill asked them to trust the Government. He was making a very large demand upon their confidence, and although they had great respect for him and for those whom he represented they hardly thought he was quite fair to them. The exceptions ought to be defined so that the House should know what they were, and not be asked to give an absolutely blank cheque to the Government to make any exceptions they pleased to send up. It seemed hardly necessary to discuss the Bill at all.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: The Government do not make the regulations, but the pension officer, the pension committee, and the Local Government Board.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Of course, it is quite clear; they are going to be made by a Department of the Government.

LORD FITZMAURICE said that the two Amendments next in order on the Paper, to which the noble Marquess had referred, answered his own arguments. Those two Amendments dealt with certain classes of exceptions to the general rule, and had occurred not at all unnaturally to the minds of those two noble Lords, thereby showing that there were certain classes of cases which might give rise to considerable hardship if not dealt with. They were agreed that those cases ought to be dealt with in some way or another, and the only question was whether the rules should be embodied in the body of the statute, or whether they were to trust the regulations made by a Government Department. He ventured to ask the noble Lords opposite to carry their minds back to a few of the recent statutes for which they were responsible. Were there no regulations, for example, under such Acts as the Workmen's Compensation Act with which the name of Mr. Chamberlain was so honourably associated? Were there no regulations dealing with questions just as complicated as that before the House? It was a matter of common knowledge to every man who had a seat in Parliament or who practised at the Bar that they were thrown back more and more in these days—and, in a way, it was a source of regret—upon the action of Government Departments, because the burden of legislation and of administration was becoming so onerous that the legislative machinery of Parliament was likely to begin to break down under it. If they tried to embody in the Act all those things which might be dealt with by regulations they would be sitting through the whole of the months of August and September. Further, if they once began placing limited classes of exceptions in the Act they would immediately be deemed by a Court of law to have practically determined that those cases, and those cases only, should be dealt with by way of exception. The Government claimed that their machinery, by regulation, would meet all the views and objects of noble Lords opposite and with which they entirely agreed. There ought to be a method of dealing with exceptional cases, and that being so he hoped noble Lords opposite would see that the Government had not, for a moment, overlooked the importance of the matter; it had been most carefully considered by them.

*Lord MAYO suggested that the Law Officers of the Crown might define the word "residence," in order to assist His Majesty's Government in the passage of the Bill.

Lord FITZMAURICE said there was no more intricate or difficult subject in English law than that of domicile. Practically what they were asked to do in defining "residence" in the Act of Parliament was to touch on the fringe of that most difficult and dangerous law. That would really be a most unwise thing for the Committee to do.

Lord ASHBOURNE asked whether the noble Lord meant to convey that it was the opinion of the Law Officers that it could be held that if a man had retained, not abandoned, his domicile in the United Kingdom he had retained his residence.

Lord FITZMAURICE replied that that was a good instance of the sort of conundrum that the Government thought they ought to avoid in an Act of Parliament.

Lord ASHBOURNE said that everyone knew that "domicile" depended upon intention. A man might live for the best part of his life out of England, but if he had left the country without the intention of abandoning his domicile he would be held to have retained it. Did the noble Lord say that one of the points submitted for the decision of the law officers was that if a man retained his domicile he was held to have retained his rights to a pension?

Lord FITZMAURICE replied that that was the sort of point that could only be dealt with effectually by regulation.

Lord ASHBOURNE said they were entitled to know the result of whatever consideration had been given to the subject, before they gave a blank cheque. The debate would also be somewhat illuminated if they knew how the House were going to deal with the next two Amendments, in which they represented specific points. They had a right to know what was in the minds of the Government as to the nature of the exceptions that would be put into the regulations, so that they could see how the Government would fill up their blank cheque. He did not unduly press the point of domicile, which was, however, a legitimate one.

*Viscount St. ALDWYN said the House had great cause to complain of the answer they had received from the Government on the matter. Noble Lords had realised the hardships that might arise under the Bill as it now stood. The Government, while asking for general power to make exceptions, said they could not tell the House what the exceptions would be. He confessed that what he was afraid of was that in attempting to remedy hardships in that general way the exceptions which might be forced upon the Government by their supporters elsewhere might be so numerous that practically the requirements of residence would be altogether done away with. From the point of view of the British taxpayer there was much to be said on the subject, because it would be quite unreasonable that a mere retention of a domicile in England should entitle a person who had spent his twenty years abroad to receive a pension at the cost of the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. That would be obviously unfair unless a certain part of that time had been spent in service rendered to the country, either in the Army or the Navy. There was danger that the Amendment might enable large additional burdens to be imposed on the British taxpayer by persons who were certainly not entitled to receive pensions.

*Viscount WOLVERHAMPTON attached no importance personally to the Amendment and was quite willing to withdraw it if the House was against it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD CLINTON moved to add that the regulations should provide that a person should not be disqualified by reason only of absence beyond the seas during the whole or part of the qualifying period, either in actual naval or military service on behalf of the Crown, or where his domicile in the United Kingdom was continuously retained in the performance of any duty arising from, or incidental to, any office, trade, service or employment. He welcomed very much the announcement that soldiers, sailors, and men of the merchant service ought not to be subject to disqualification, yet it seemed a matter of very sincere regret that the Government had refused in this particular instance to include actually in the Bill itself the terms which would appear in the regulations. In regard to cases coming under the statutory conditions it seemed obvious that the mind of the Government was made up, and if that was so he saw no reason why it should not appear in the Bill. The second part of his Amendment was tolerably widely drawn and should include almost all cases where hardship could arise out of any construction put upon the word "residence." But after the assurance of the noble Viscount it was unnecessary that he should include the cases of soldiers and sailors. He gathered that their case was admitted and that it was an overwhelmingly strong one. He believed, however, that the cases of many people who had to go abroad in the ordinary course of their employment, always with the intention of coming home again, was scarcely less strong. They were told that pensions under the Bill were to be given not as a charity but as a matter of right, that they were to be a sort of deferred pay for veterans of industry, and a man was no less a veteran of industry if, during the course of his life and of his employment, he had had to spend a year or two abroad, possibly for the very purpose of pushing forward some English trade or business in a foreign country. There were, for instance, the cases of men, and even of women, who, in the course of their ordinary employment as domestic servants, went out in the households of Ambassadors or of any other person who was bound to be abroad. It would be a hardship if such people, when they came home, should find themselves in an intolerably worse position in regard to these pensions than the men in exactly the same class of employment who had remained at home during the whole qualifying period. There was another instance which was a very common one in country districts. A man, in order to escape unemployment, and to endeavour to prevent himself becoming a burden upon the rates, accepted the offer of an emigration society, or by other means went to Canada or some other part of the world. When he arrived he found, as so many did, particularly those of mature age, that work was not so easily obtainable as he had supposed and he was driven to accept the inevitable and return home again. When he returned home he found he had got to live and to work in this country another twenty years before he could qualify for a pension. Such a man had, it was true, failed, but he had made a really great and supreme effort to achieve success. Why should he be in a worse position than the man who had remained at home and who had equally failed but who had not made the same effort? He thought that would be a case of very real hardship. It was quite unnecessary for him to multiply instances, which would occur very readily to their Lordships, but he would like to make a comparison of the disqualification which came under the condition of "residence." In subsection (2) of Clause 3 it was provided that a person who was convicted of any offence and ordered to be imprisoned was disqualified during the time of his imprisonment, and for a further period of ten years, from receiving an old-age pension. In the same way an habitual drunkard who was liable to have a detention order made under the provisions of the Inebriates Act, 1898, might be disqualified for ten years, but a man who went abroad for one year might be disqualified for twenty years. Taking a concrete case, a man at the age of fifty-nine was, perhaps, convicted of a crime and was sentenced to one year's imprisonment. He came out at sixty but his disqualifying period was no disqualification to him, because he had worked it out before he had reached the age of seventy. But a man of the same age, fifty-nine, who went abroad for a year and returned at the age of sixty, was disqualified for twenty years—that was until he had reached the age of eighty, which amounted practically to permanent disqualification. Therefore they discovered at once a really serious case of hardship which ought to be considered and which he had no doubt was being considered by the Government. He thought, however, that there should be in the wording of the Bill some recognition of the fact that such cases of hardship were prevented.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 26, after the word 'Kingdom,' to insert the words 'and such regulation shall provide that a person shall not be disqualified by reason only of absence beyond the seas during the whole or part of the qualifying period, either on actual naval or military service on behalf of the Crown, or where his domicile in the United Kingdom is continuously retained in the performance of any duty arising from, or incidental to, any office, trade, service, or employment.' "—(*Lord Clinton.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON declared that they must either throw regulations overboard altogether or stand by regulations. If they commenced putting classes of exceptions and conditions into the Bill it would be fatal to the carrying out of any satisfactory legislation on the subject. He agreed with almost every word the noble Lord had said, but he could not consent to the Amendment, simply because if they began defining in the Bill the question would arise as to what had been left out. That would create the presumption that every case not mentioned was not intended to be included. The Government knew their own intentions as to what they would put into the regulations. Those regulations would be submitted to Parliament and possibly disapproved of, but it was impossible now for them to take item by item the classes of people who under certain conditions ought to be entitled to pensions. It would be better to leave the whole question in the hands of the framers of the regulations. He was confident that there would be an opportunity in Parliament to discuss the regulations. The desire of both Houses would be that while all economy should be exercised, nobody being allowed to have a pension who was not properly entitled to it, yet, at the same time, nobody who was justly and fairly entitled to it should be shut out by any technicality.

LORD AVEBURY said that the Amendment went very far indeed. A man for instance, might be engaged in the service of a foreign railway or firm, be away for years, and get an English pension.

*LORD ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH suggested that the mover of the Amendment should consider the advisability of dividing it into two parts, leaving out that relating to "domicile." There would naturally be much doubt as to whether domicile were "continuously retained in the performance of any duty, etc." It was rather difficult to define exactly what that meant. The Bill related practically to poor men of small means and such men would hardly retain continuously a domicile in the United Kingdom if they went abroad for any length of time for the purpose of working. The first part of the Amendment was open to very little objection, and it was just possible that the Government might see their way to adopt those or some similar words.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I do not think there is any difference between both sides of the House as to the necessity of providing in some measure for the class of cases covered by my noble friend's Amendment. I am under the impression that a distinct promise was given in another place that the case of sailors, sailing in registered vessels, was to be expressly provided for. What many of us feel is that some means or other should be found of making that appear upon the surface of the Bill. The matter is so important that it is not one that can be left to the chapter of accidents. The noble Viscount has told us that the matter will be dealt with in the regulations, and he laid stress upon the fact that the regulations will come before Parliament. I should have been disposed to accept that as a sufficient explanation, but the ground has been cut from under that argument because earlier in the evening we were told that the law officers of the Crown had advised that unless something was put into the Bill on this point, it might be found impossible to deal with the cases of sailors and others whom we desire to protect.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: The noble Marquess quite misunderstood me. The law officers advised that litigation might arise as to what was the true meaning of the clause as it stood, whereas the non-professional advisers thought the clause was sufficient, and the House thought it sufficient. I myself have considered the words of no importance or value whatever. We thought the classes we wished to include were safe, but the law officers thought it might stop any possibility of argument if these words were put in.

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said that after what had been said it was clear that the scope of the Amendment was too wide, particularly when they took into account the difficulty in introducing anything about domicile. If the noble Lord would consent to leave out the words after "Crown" and to insert the words "or seamen in the British merchant service or others engaged in some temporary service," he thought it would cover all the cases desired to be covered.

LORD CLINTON was very certain that a large number of persons would be abroad for quite a short time, and would suffer a very serious hardship if there were not some further exceptions made in the Act.

THE EARL OF MOUNT EDGCUMBE asked whether the noble Lord would have any objection to widening the first portion of thee Amendment to include all those actually in the service of the Crown, not merely specifying the Army and the Navy.

*VISCOUNT KNUTSFORD suggested the withdrawal of the Amendment, in view of the statement of the Government that they would be prepared to accept Lord Camperdown's Amendment that the regulations should be submitted to Parliament. That undertaking had not been given when Lord Clinton's Amendment was prepared, and there was, therefore, good reason for pointing out some exceptions; but he must admit that there was a considerable danger in picking out specific cases and dealing with them. That might mean the exclusion of cases that did not come within the exceptions, and he ventured to suggest that the best course would be to withdraw the Amendment.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY affirmed that the fact was the Government had consulted their own law officers and their own law officers thought that what the House wanted to be done could not be done by regulation.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: We said that doubts might be raised.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said it would be a most unfortunate thing if, in consequence of their not dealing with the matter when before the House, doubts were afterwards raised, and it might turn out to be impossible by regulation to confer pensions upon the two classes—those who served the State and those who went abroad for purely temporary purposes. That would be a most unfortunate result, and he could not help thinking that his noble friend would be unwise to press his Amendment at the present moment, but they could not allow the Bill to go back to the House of Commons without making it absolutely certain that seamen and those who went abroad for purely temporary purposes were not prevented from getting a pension. If there was really a doubt it ought to be cleared up.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): I have not the faintest doubt that under the regulations we can provide for the things desired.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: In confirmation of that I am given to understand that the expression of the Law Officers applied to what might happen in the case of individuals, and not in the case of classes of persons. That, I suppose, would equally hold good whether the provision appeared in the Act or in the regulations.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: After the very categorical statement made by the Lord Chancellor, and considering that we have received an asurance that these regulations will be laid before Parliament, and that a full opportunity of considering them will be given, I suggest that the Amendment should not be pressed.

LORD CLINTON: Is it the intention that the classes to whom I have referred should be provided for not in the Bill but in the regulations?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: There is not the least doubt that anyone who wishes for fair play would desire to include the persons referred to.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD MUSKERRY proposed to insert that in the case of masters and seamen of British nationality service at sea should be deemed sufficient to constitute a residence. He argued that under the Act a master was not a seaman and therefore it was absolutely necessary to make it clear that masters were provided for.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 26, after the word 'Kingdom,' to insert the words 'in the case of all masters and seamen of British nationality, service at sea shall be deemed sufficient to constitute a residence under the terms of this Act.'"—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON assured the noble Lord that the Government would do their best to meet his views. There would be an opportunity for the noble Lord to raise the question if he thought the regulations defective, but he did not think it would be necessary.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON moved to amend the statutory condition for receipt of a pension by providing that the "yearly" means of the persons as calculated under the Act must not exceed £31 10s.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 1, after the first 'the,' to insert the word 'yearly.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved to provide that the person applying for a pension must satisfy the local pensions authority that his means as calculated under the Bill do not exceed £31 10s. He explained that his Amendment was really consequential upon the one just accepted.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 1, to leave out the words 'means of the,' and after the word 'person,' to insert the words 'must satisfy the local pension committee that his means.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES pointed out that having inserted the word "yearly" the Committee could not now leave out the word "means" without making the clause ungrammatical.

LORD AVEBURY accordingly altered his Amendment to enable the provision to read "That the person must satisfy the pension authorities that his yearly means, etc."

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3:

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN moved to omit the words "the thirty-first day of December, 1910 unless," so that the disqualification for a pension should apply to a person "While he is in receipt of any poor relief (other than relief excepted under this provision) and until Parliament otherwise determines, if he has at any time since the first day of January, 1908, received, or hereafter receives, any such relief." He said that this was the disqualifying clause by which a person who was in receipt of relief on 1st January last, or might be in receipt of such relief in future, would be disqualified from a pension "until 31st December, 1910, unless Parliament otherwise determines." He supposed it was common ground to all that outdoor relief of the ordinary kind and pensions should not go together, and he imagined that His Majesty's Government had inserted this disqualification in order to prevent any sudden transfer of persons now in receipt of out-relief by the boards of guardians in different districts to the old-age pensions list. There was no doubt whatever that there were a great many persons over seventy years of age in receipt of out-relief, especially in country unions, who would be more properly the recipients of old-age pensions, and whom the boards of guardians would be likely to transfer at the earliest opportunity. He imagined, therefore, that this disqualification had been inserted with a view to preventing anything of that kind. But he did not understand what was the object of the particular words "31st December, 1910, unless," which he was moving to omit. He could quite understand that a person who had been since 1st January last in receipt of such relief, or might hereafter receive it, should not be qualified for a pension, and that such disqualification should last until Parliament otherwise determined, because he understood it was the intention of the Government to connect this Bill with an alteration and reform of the Poor Law by which Poor Law relief would be subject to a better classification than was the case at present, and that pending the passage of such a Bill it was not desired that any persons in receipt of Poor Law relief should be qualified for pensions. The clause as he proposed to amend it would carry out that intention completely The disqualification would last until an Act was passed which would deal with the matter; but why the disqualification should cease on 31st December, 1910, whether such an Act were passed or not, he did not understand. These words, he believed, were not in the Bill at the time of its introduction, but were inserted in another place, for what reason he did not know, unless it was considered to be perfectly certain that a Poor Law Reform Bill would pass before the date named. Nothing of the kind could be certain in Parliamentary proceedings. The time of Parliament was already mortgaged by His Majesty's Government with proposals for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Wales, for a great Reform Bill, and for other smaller matters which he need not enumerate, but which would quite take up the time of Parliament without any measure of Poor Law reform. No Government, therefore, could be certain that by 31st December, 1910, any measure of the kind would be passed. He wanted to ask the noble Viscount what was the reason for these words and what they meant. Was it in contemplation that Parliament might remove this disqualification before 31st December, 1910, if it so chose, or was it in contemplation that Parliament should extend the term of disqualification in the event of no Poor Law Reform Bill passing? He submitted that it must be intended that the disqualification should last until Poor Law reform was an accomplished fact, and that being so it would be very much better that the clause should so provide.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 7, to leave out the words 'the 31st day of December, 1910, unless.'"—(*Viscount St. Aldwyn.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said the noble Viscount had correctly described the intentions of the Government at the present time. The words were inserted in the House of Commons to give effect to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's pledge that the Poor Law question would dealt be with before the end of the year 1910. It was clear that these words were a pledge given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in order to make it binding upon him they were inserted. He perceived the objection of the noble Lord, but the answer was that any Government that was in power would take care to deal with this question in order to prevent a large number of people being made pensioners so as to relieve the rates. The majority in the House of Commons were of opinion that these words ought to be inserted so that there would be no chance in the meantime of Poor Law reform being put on one side. He quite appreciated the noble Viscount's point as to the impossibility of making these pledges binding as events might alter them, but that was the sole explanation why the Government pledged themselves to take that view, and these words were simply put in as a record of the pledge.

THE EARL OF CROMER asked if the noble Viscount could say what would be the complete cost if the Poor Law disqualification were removed on 31st December, 1910.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said he had no figures which would justify him in making such a statement, but it would be a very serious increase on the Exchequer.

THE EARL OF CROMER: It has been stated to be £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 sterling.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: I am not responsible for that.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: It has certainly been stated that the removal of this disqualification would involve a loss of £3,000,000 to the public, and that figure still holds the field.

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said he was anxious to save the £3,000,000 if possible. He quite accepted what the noble Viscount had said as to the reason for the insertion of these words. It was a pledge on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that Poor Law reform should be carried before the date named, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not omnipotent in such matters. He might find it impossible to carry anything of the kind. What would happen then? As the clause now stood, all these people would come upon the old-age pension list, unless the Government of the day brought in a Bill to provide that they should not. Was it likely that the Government, not having had time to pass a Poor Law Reform Bill, would take up again so difficult and controversial a question as to how and when persons in receipt of Poor Law relief should come on to the old-age pension list? He was afraid if these words remained in the Bill the Government would not be able to carry out their pledge for Poor Law reform by the date named, and they would not bring in a Bill for disqualifying all these people though, their coming into the old-age pension list would increase the cost by some £3,000,000. The very thing that the Government did not wish to do would be done by the retention of these words. That was why he ventured to move their omission.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN believed he was correct in his recollection that on the Second Reading of the Bill the noble Viscount said that the Poor Law Reform Bill could not be passed for four or five years.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: I did not say that.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN asked if the noble Viscount would explain the difference of opinion which appeared to exist between him and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Supposing for the moment that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was wrong, and, what was much more likely, the noble Viscount was right, what would happen?

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said he quite agreed with the noble Lord that it was impossible for the Government to give a binding pledge of this sort which under all circumstances they would carry out. His individual opinion was that this was the first question with which the Government ought to deal, as soon as the Report was presented by the Royal Commission, no matter what Government was in power. The House of Commons were very anxious that that should be secured, and the pledge was given by the Government to comply with that request. What he had said was that when that Report was presented it would require the most careful consideration by the Government, who would have to construct a scheme, and before it could be brought into actual working it would take probably four or five years. That would not at all interfere with the pledge the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given. He was quite sure that if the noble Viscount opposite were at the head of the Treasury the pressure which would result from this sum coming out of the Exchequer would make him insist on this pledge being carried out. It was not an individual pledge in that sense, but an official one.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Whose pledge is going to be carried out?

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said the pledge of the existing Chancellor of the Exchequer to the existing House of Commons.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: But the noble Viscount speaking from his own judgment says that is impossible.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: No.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Viscount could not have put it more fairly to the House. These words were a pledge given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the present House of Commons. That is a very interesting historical fact which it is well to have on record. But I submit that this is not the kind of thing that we want to put into an Act of Parliament. Here is a disqualification which affects the taxpayers of this country to the extent of about £3,500,000 a year. I desire that that disqualification should hold until Parliament otherwise determines. That is a perfectly simple and clear-cut issue, and I submit that it is not wise to complicate it by such personal matters as the pledges given by Ministers.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD CLINTON moved to amend the second proviso in paragraph (a) subsection (1) for the purpose of ascertaining whether the medical or surgical assistance, the receipt of which would not disqualify a person from receiving an old-age pension, would cover a case like the following: a person was suffering from a complaint or the effects of some accident, and could not be treated at home, possibly on account of the unsuitable accommodation or because of the nature of his complaint, or it might be because of the impossibility of getting proper attendance. In those cases the ordinary course was to remove the person to some charitable institution—a cottage hospital or a free infirmary, but in the event of such charitable institutions not being available there was no course left open but to take the person to the workhouse infirmary. That was a case very closely allied to the case of those who received free surgical assistance. The only difference was that in the one case the persons could be treated outside, but in the other, owing to limitations perhaps in accommodation, they could only be treated inside, and it was something of a hardship that those who were slightly better off in their house accommodation should not be disqualified while those who were worse off in that respect should be disqualified. He would like to know if this point had been considered or would be covered by the section.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 17, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'the temporary or occasional maintenance of that person or by means of.'"—(*Lord Clinton.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said that this was clearly a matter of privilege, as the Amendment would add to the cost, and the Government took their stand upon that ground.

LORD CLINTON said he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN moved to omit the words which disqualified a person for receiving an old-age pension, if he had habitually failed to work "according to his ability, opportunity, and need," and to substitute the word "diligently." He said that the Amendment was not hostile to the Bill, but its intention was rather to make the section plainer in its working. He thought that whatever opinion might be held with regard to the form or nature of a pension Bill, they would probably all be agreed that, provided the statutory conditions were fulfilled, the Bill should be drawn sufficiently wide to admit within its scope the hard-working and deserving without difficulty, while, at the same time, there should be sufficient restriction to keep out the idle and undeserving who might be ingenious enough to find a hole in the Bill by means of which they might derive some benefit. Surely this could only be done by making the language as simple as possible, and equally intelligible to those who had to administer the Act and those for whom it was administered. He ventured to think the word "diligently" would be sufficiently understood by all and would be intelligible to all, but he could not imagine three words about which there was more likely to be contention than "ability, opportunity, and need." They had to recollect that the onus of proof lay with the pension officer and the pension committee. If there were any case in dispute, it was not the claimant who had to prove that he had habitually worked according to his ability, opportunity, or need, but the pension officer had to prove that he had failed so to work, which would be much harder to prove. He doubted if there was any quality about which there would be more difference of opinion than with regard to a man's ability, either mentally or physically, to work. It would be extremely difficult to prove that a man had not worked according to his ability, or to prove what ability a man had to work. He supposed the word "opportunity" meant the means or the chance of working. It could be proved whether a man had worked or not, and whether he had worked diligently or not, but surely there would be extreme difficulty during the course of a man's life in finding out whether he had had the opportunity of working or not, if he said he had not. With regard to the third word, what was a man's "need"? He supposed it was what a man liked to make it. There were many cases of men who preferred to do quite casual labour and earn a very precarious means of livelihood in order that they might only work a few days in the week and have a holiday during the rest. Surely they would not be deserving of a pension, and yet they would be able to assert that they had worked from their view according to their need. By this Bill very heavy responsibilities and a great burden would be placed upon the pension officers and those who were responsible for the administration of the Act. Surely, therefore, they ought to make their duties as light as possible, and he believed they could only do this by lessening the opportutities for friction, dispute, and discussion, and it was because he believed that this Amendment went somewhere in that direction, while at the same time it assisted the deserving and lessened the opportunities of misuse of the Act by the undeserving, that he ventured to submit it to their Lordships.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 30, to leave out the words 'according to his ability, opportunity, and need, in order to insert the word 'diligently'."—(*Viscount Goschen.*)

LORD FITZMAURICE said he was advised that this Amendment, as qualifying the conditions upon which a pension could be granted, was inadmissible on the ground of privilege, but apart from that, he could not help thinking that the noble Lord would see there were grave objections on the merits of the proposal. The aim of this subsection was to attain an object which he thought the whole Committee would agree in considering desirable, that was to say, to hit heavily the person who was popularly known as the wastrel. None of their Lordships, whatever their ideas might be about old-age pensions in general, would hesitate to say that an habitual wastrel was a person who at the end of a dishonourable career, as it would have been, ought not to receive a pension. That was the object of the clause, and the words "according to his ability, opportunity, and need," had been considered by those upon whom for the purpose of drafting the Government had to rely as being the words best calculated to describe the sort of person with whom they had to deal. But the words which the noble Viscount wished to introduce did not affect the person, but the character of work, and they opened up a very difficult and, it seemed to him, almost impossible set of considerations; that was to say, they were to consider whether a man had or had not for a long period of years been working diligently. That struck him as being almost impossible. In addition, it would in many cases land them in a position to a certain extent of absurdity, because these words would be open to the obvious objection that a man who up to the age of, say, sixty or sixty-five years, had had the means to live without working hard, or perhaps without working at all, and then, through misfortune, had lost his money, would lose his pension because he had not diligently worked in the period during which he was able to live in the capacity of a gentleman at large, if he might use the expression. He did not think it could have occurred to the noble Lord that the words he had put on the Paper would have that effect. Therefore, for the whole of these reasons, but especially the first, he hoped the noble Lord would not press the Amendment.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The suspicion with which we regard this formula arises from a certain humility of mind which is perhaps peculiar to us on this side of the House, because when we examine ourselves, we come to the conclusion that there are few of us, if any, who can really say with confidence that we always work according to our ability, opportunity, or need, and therefore we desire, if possible, to find some formula of a more precise description. My noble friend suggests the substitution of the word "diligently." It seems to us a very sensible and easily understood expression, but my noble friend who spoke for the Government objected to the substitution of the word on the ground of privilege, and on the contention that it qualifies the financial effect of the clause. I should like to have it from His Majesty's Government in what sense they qualify it. Do they mean that a man can have worked according to his ability, opportunity, and need, and yet, nevertheless, has not worked diligently? That seems to me rather a difficult position to assume. What we feel throughout these discussions is that we are unable really to grasp the first principle upon which this proposal is based. Is it your object in this Bill to relieve poverty or to reward industry? Which principle is it you are working upon? You profess that there are many clauses in the Bill which are intended to reward industry, and your idea apparently is to leave the relief of poverty to the Poor Law. When it comes to defining what you mean by industry, you are compelled to fall back upon these extremely woolly formulas which no persons in the House interpret alike, and which it would be absolutely impossible for the pension authorities to interpret. I take it that the object of my noble friend was to elicit from His Majesty's Government some idea of the spirit in which these regulations are to be interpreted, and I am afraid he has failed altogether in his object.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN moved an Amendment with the object of obtaining an interpretation of the proviso that a person should not be disqualified "If he has continuously for ten years up to attaining the age of sixty, by means of payments to friendly, provident, or other societies, or trade unions, or other approved steps, made such provision against old-age, sickness, infirmity, or want or loss of employment as may be recognised as proper provision for the purpose by regulations under this Act." He believed the words in regard to the ten years meant what his Amendment expressed, namely, during the last ten years immediately preceding the attainment of the age of sixty, but as they stood they seemed liable to be construed to mean continuously for any ten years up to attaining the age of sixty. As the clause was framed to favour thrift he presumed that it would naturally be drawn to favour the man who during the last years of his life had made some provision for his old age; but as the clause stood it seemed liable to either construction being placed upon it.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 34, to leave out the word 'for,' and to insert the words 'during the last.'"—(*Viscount Goschen.*)

LORD FITZMAURICE said that, sympathising as he did with the wish of the noble Viscount that this clause should be clear, he could not help thinking that the words were sufficiently clear as they stood. The matter was very fully gone into in the House of Commons, and there was a general agreement that these words on the whole expressed the view intended.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Oh, no.

LORD FITZMAURICE said that, by agreement he did not mean that there was no difference of opinion expressed in the House of Commons on the subject, but that eventually these words were accepted as the words which expressed the general feeling, and he believed that if their Lordships sent them back again they would only involve themselves in a minute verbal discussion without any object sufficiently great to warrant an alteration leading to a great deal of discussion between the two Houses. He was not saying that there was any objection on the merits of the words of the noble Viscount, or that it was not conceivable that his words were slightly better than those in the Bill, but, bearing in mind that on the whole there was agreement that these words expressed the very meaning which the noble Viscount himself desired should be in the Bill, he could not help thinking that they had better be kept as they were.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said the noble Lord had been misinformed if he thought there had been a general agreement in the House of Commons on this point.

LORD FITZMAURICE: I did not say there had been no discussion, but eventually there was agreement.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said his information was rather different. During the debate in the other House there was great doubt as to the meaning of these words, and a large section of Members interpreted them just as his noble friend thought they might be interpreted, namely, that all that was exacted was that for any ten years before the age of sixty a person was to subscribe to one of the friendly societies. A large section of the House of Commons took that view, and he could not conceive why the Government should resist words which clearly expressed what they said was their intention. Being rather interested in this matter he took the precaution of consulting good legal opinion as to the meaning of these words, and the gentleman who advised him at once said that he thought it meant any ten years before reaching the age of sixty. Under those circumstances it was hardly worth arguing the case. The Government wanted it, and his noble friend suggested it, and of course they ought to accept it.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved —

"In page 2, lines 34 and 35, to leave out the words 'up to attaining,' and to insert the words 'immediately his attainment of.'"—(*Viscount Goschen.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES pointed out that an Amendment in the name of Lord Saltoun had been handed in, but had been omitted from the list of marshalled Amendments, and it would be necessary to take it.

LORD SALTOUN moved an Amendment providing that a person sent to prison without the option of a fine should only be disqualified for a pension for a further period of ten years after the date on which he is released from prison, "if the Court before whom he is convicted so orders." He said that there were crimes and crimes. Of course, a very serious crime might be committed, and then probably the imprisonment might be of greater duration; but if they took the case of an old man, say, who had gone to sleep while driving a cart, he might be fined for such an offence on more than one occasion by the Justices. If he continued to do it he might be put in prison for a week perhaps. For that he was penalised to the extent of ten years, and if he were a man of over sixty years of age, it would naturally put him out of court altogether. That seemed to him to be a very serious hardship, and he wished to draw attention to the subsection which gave the protection of His Majesty's Government to the drunkard, who, under the Inebriates' Act, was not to be disqualified. He thought a distinction should be drawn between trifling offences and serious crimes, and to secure that he begged to move the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 17, to insert the following words, 'If the Court before whom he is convicted so orders."—(*Lord Saltoun.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said the objection to the principle of this Amendment was that it was introducing an option, so to speak, in this matter to the Court. He thought there was a good deal of force in what the noble Lord had said, and that there were occasions when offences which were punished by a short term of imprisonment—perhaps for a day, as sometimes in a bigamy case the person convicted was sentenced to imprisonment only until the rising of the Court. That, he thought, would be a very hard case, and the words that he would suggest to meet it would be words providing that the imprisonment which was to act as a disqualification should be "for any period not less than one month."

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES hoped the noble Viscount would not object to his pointing out that the line in question had been passed, and as they had not left much over to a later stage, he suggested this might be left to the Report.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: I am quite agreeable to that.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4:

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN moved an Amendment to provide that in calculating the means of a person for the purpose of the Act, account should be taken of the yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property belonging to that person, "if such property being at the time capable of realisation were realised and invested in the purchase of a Government annuity for the life of such a person. Provided that the house in which such person resides, and any furniture or effects necessary for its occupation, shall not be considered as property that could be realised for the purchase of such annuity." He said this was a very important point which was raised in another place on the Third Reading, but to which, so far as he was aware, no answer had been given by His Majesty's Government. By an Amendment already inserted in the Bill the means of a claimant for a pension were interpreted to be a yearly means; in other words, the income derived from any source of labour or property. The fourth clause laid down a rule for calculating the yearly means of a person for the purposes of the Act. Subsection (*a*) of the clause said that in the absence of other means for ascertaining the income the income might be taken to be that actually received during the preceding year, and then subsection (*c*), on which he was raising this question, said the yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property belonging to that person which, though capable of investment or profitable use, was not so invested or profitably used by him. The Committee would see that under those words the income derived from any form of investment would be calculated as the yearly income. The result might be that, supposing a person invested a certain sum in Consols, returning an income of not more than 2½ per cent., he might possess as much as £1,200 in Consols and yet be the recipient of a pension of 1s. a week under the Bill. That was of course an extreme case, but it was a case that ought not to occur. It would be ridiculous to say that a person possessed of that kind of property should be entitled to the benefit of a pension under the Bill. These old-age pensions were not intended for any case of that kind, yet as the Bill stood it would be possible. If a husband and wife lived together, each of them possessing the amount of Consols he had mentioned, they might each get 1s. a week under the provisions of the Bill as it now stood. If they possessed about £800 each in Consols, each might obtain the full pension of 5s. a week. It could not be the intention of His Majesty's Government, yet that was what would result from the provisions of this Bill. This matter was called attention to by Sir Henry Norman, a supporter of the Government in another place, on the Third Reading of the Bill. Clearly there ought to be some kind of limit as to the amount of realisable property which a person might own who was coming under the provisions of the Old-age Pensions Bill. In New Zealand, which he understood from a speech of the Prime Minister on the Budget had been rather a model to His Majesty's Government in framing this Bill, the limit was £200. What he suggested by this Amendment was that where a person possessing property which, if realised and invested in a Government annuity, would produce £31 10s., which was the income debarring a person from receiving a pension under this Bill, such a person should not be the recipient of a pension. That appeared to be perfectly fair because he had added the proviso that it should not apply to the house in which any pensioner resided, or to the furniture or effects necessary for its occupation. If the Government thought that too hard a condition—and he would say that it did not compel the realisation of the property for that purpose, but simply related to the income which might be derived from the property if realised—would they insert in this clause something to show that at any rate the claimant for a pension was bound to make the best he could reasonably make by way of income from any property which he possessed? The words as they now stood did not carry that out. For example, a man who possessed £1,200 in Consols could with perfect safety transfer his investment to East India 3½ per cent. and he would get a much larger income in that way. There ought to be some kind of rule laid down in the Bill to prevent the abuse of giving old-age pensions at the cost of the taxpayers to people who did not need them. That was why he placed the Amendment upon the Paper, and he hoped the noble Viscount opposite would be able to give some satisfactory assurance that he would insert words to carry out the principle he had mentioned.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 40, to leave out the words 'which, though capable of investment or profitable use, is not so invested or profitably used by him,' and to insert the words 'if such property, being at the time capable of realisation, were realised and invested in the purchase of a Government annuity for the life of such person. Provided that the house in which such person resides, and any furniture or effects necessary for its occupation, shall not be considered as property that could be realised for the purchase of such annuity.' "—(*Viscount St. Aldwyn.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said that this was a question on which there was a good deal to be said on both sides. The noble Viscount had put a case of the claimant to a pension with £1,200 invested in Consols. That was an extreme case, and he quite agreed that such a man ought not to have an old-age pension. A more likely case was that of a man of seventy who had accumulated, say, £300, and who had carefully husbanded that amount to provide for his widow or child. According to the noble Viscount's Amendment, as it appeared on the Paper, he would be bound to invest that sum in the purchase of a Government annuity.

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: He would not be bound to do it. His income would be calculated as if he had done so.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said the man might live only a year, and the Government annuity would be calculated upon his expectation for life. They might almost call it a gamble with his money. The man had to risk at once the sacrifice of his capital in order to increase his income. He thought that would be discouraging thrift to a very great extent. He thought there ought to be some mode of dealing with the point, but he did not like the noble Viscount's proposition, and he did not like his own. He had, however, great confidence in the noble Viscount's fairness, justice, and ability, and perhaps he would bring up at the next stage of the Bill an Amendment, and then the Government could see if they could carry out something that would be fair and just in all the circumstances of the case. He thought they ought, as far as they could, to encourage thrift, but this Amendment would shut the door against it.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: No.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said he was afraid it would, but he was quite sure that His Majesty's Government would be willing to co-operate with the noble Viscount in anything reasonable and fair in the matter.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said the noble Viscount had met the principle he wanted to establish to some extent, though he had not made any definite suggestion. Would the noble Viscount insert in place of the Amendment words which would establish the same principle and which would make the section run: "The yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property belonging to that person which, though capable of investment or profitable use, is not so invested or profitably used by him so as to insure the largest income which might be reasonably derived from it"?

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said that this suggestion commended itself much more to him, but he would like to consult the Treasury officials upon it, because, after all, it might involve more than he saw at the moment. He quite sympathised with the noble Viscount's views that the income should be calculated upon the largest sum the claimant could safely expect to get for his money, but if they allowed an annuity principle to come in they were dealing with part of his capital. Of course, as the noble Viscount said, a man could get 4 per cent. with perfect safety.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said that if, as he understood, the noble Viscount would consult the Treasury, he would not press the Amendment now.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY asked the Government to explain the meaning of paragraph (*d*), which ran:—"The yearly value of any benefit or privilege enjoyed by that person." The object of the clause was to provide that in calculating the needs of the applicant for a pension, any benefit or privilege he enjoyed was to be taken into account, and he wanted to know from the Government how they would apply that principle in the case, say, of a cottager whose house was worth 2s. a week. That would be all right if the house were worth £100, as the 2s. would fairly correspond to its value. But many landlords would not be satisfied with a cottage on their property worth only £100. They might be persons interested in the proper housing of the working classes, and they might put up cottages worth £200 each. That would be a benefit or privilege to the occupier. There might be two old labourers, each seventy years of age, receiving equal wages or no wages at all, both paying a rent of 2s. a week, but one occupying a house worth £100 and the other occupying one worth £200. In all other respects they were in exactly the same position. Was the proper interpretation of the Bill that the means of the man who lived in the more expensive cottage were higher than the means of the man who lived in the less expensive cottage? In that case the man who lived in the better cottage might get the worse pension. He did not know whether that was the interpretation the Government put upon the Bill, but if so it was a very unfortunate result. What it came to was that in order to get the highest possible pension the man would prefer to live in the bad cottage rather than the good cottage. The whole effect of that would be that the labourer would be in favour of bad houses rather than good houses in order to get the largest amount of pension under the scale. It all turned on the words "the yearly value of any benefit or privilege enjoyed by that person," and if that value varied according to the value of the house the result would be very unfortunate. He would, however, like the Government themselves to explain what they conceived to be the interpretation of their own clause.

LORD FITZMAURICE said his noble friend had put a number of conceivable cases, and he had asked the Government whether they could lay down any general rule and standard such as could be stated then and there as to how the different pension authorities would deal with each one of the different cases he had put. No doubt it would have been very easy for each one of their Lordships to have mentioned cases out of his own experience, where circumstances varied and difficulties could be put in the way, as the noble Marquess had done. His answer to his noble friend was that the points that would arise in this case were questions of fact of which the pension officer and the pension committee, and, in the last resort, the Local

Government Board, would have to judge. He was not saying that difficult cases would not arise, and the noble Marquess had put an exceedingly fair instance of the sort of difficulty that might be expected. The noble Marquess started by taking the case of a cottager living rent free. What, he asked, would be the manner in which the pension officer would judge a case of that kind? He (Lord Fitzmaurice) should say that the pension officer, being a local man who would be cognisant to a certain extent of the value of the house, would judge the value of it to the neighbourhood, and so on, in every case where cottages were let, as they often were, at a comparatively low rent, upon the estates of a large landowner who very often built exceedingly good cottages and let them at low rates. Those cases, no doubt, would have to be judged one by one as part of the very arduous task of the pension officer. He could not in reply to the noble Marquess lay down any general rule to show how these difficulties would be solved. They would have to be solved on the principle of *solvitur ambulando*. Beyond that he really did not think he could go.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY asked whether it was not a marvellous state of things that the noble Lord, who was one of the most intelligent Members of their Lordships' House, explained that he was unable to solve these great difficulties, but said: "Do not distress yourselves, there is always the exciseman in every county who is qualified to so ve all these difficulties." This wonderful Imperial officer, whom the noble Lord, speaking with great humility, credited with far more intelligence than himself, was going to solve all the difficulties which the noble Lord could not approach. Was it not perfectly clear that the Government had not thought out what the provisions of this Bill were? Notwithstanding the assurance of the noble Viscount that these things had been thought out for the last twelve months, he thought the Government really had not fathomed the effects of the Bill, and were absolutely unable to give any answer to this simple conundrum. He ventured to say that the points he had raised had not occurred to the Government until he spoke. The Bill had gone right through the House of Commons—very ill-discussed, he admitted—and it came up to their Lordships' House at the end of July, and then the most simple question put to the Government could not be answered by them.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The noble Marquess has paid my noble friend the compliment of having one of the finest minds in the House. I think we should pay the noble Marquess the compliment of having one of the most ingenious. In this particular instance I can assure him he is wrong. This question was very carefully considered indeed. The noble Marquess thinks that he has put us into a difficulty by mentioning the case of a house worth £100 and one worth £200. But the difficulty does not stop there. It is quite conceivable under any old-age pension scheme that an inmate of the noble Marquess' house at Hatfield might be perfectly competent to receive an old age pension. Conceive the possibility of some aged retainer of the noble Marquess who did not receive from him or from any other source an income of £30 a year. He or she would undoubtedly be qualified to receive an old-age pension, even though inhabiting the residence of the noble Marquess, which is worth a great deal more than £100 or £200.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY moved an Amendment with the object of discovering whether the sum paid by a son or daughter towards the support of a parent by an order of a board of guardians was to be counted in the income of a pensioner.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 6, after the word 'person,' to insert the words 'but this provision shall not include the value of the maintenance of a person by relatives who are by law compellable to maintain that person.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

LORD FITZMAURICE said the Amendment on the Paper went a great deal beyond the point the noble Viscount said he wished to raise, which, if he followed him correctly, was that he wished to inquire what would happen in the case of a certain amount of poor relief finding its way into a household. The

Amendment went a good deal beyond that and said that the yearly value of any benefit or privilege enjoyed by the person whose case was under consideration should count towards his income. That would cover a great number of cases. A man, whom he would call William Smith for the purpose of argument, might have a relative living with him who paid something towards the household expenses. That went into William Smith's pocket. As the Amendment stood it would not count in the calculation of William Smith's income, and the noble Viscount was getting distinctly within the meshes of the question of privilege, because if the Amendment were carried it was quite clear that one of the safeguards of the Bill would be knocked away, and though there might not be a great increase of expenditure it would arise in a certain number of cases. Then there was the more limited class of cases where a certain amount of money would come in from certain members of the household for payment which went, so to speak, into the common pot, and therefore went to the help of the household. He understood the noble Viscount to ask what was the intention of the Government with regard to sums of that kind. He (Lord Fitzmaurice) desired to speak rather under correction, and possibly it might be desirable that this point should be gone into on Report, but as the words stood at present he thought there could be no doubt at all that any sum of that kind would come within the meaning of the word "benefit" and would count towards income. Some people might think that hard, but no doubt the Government had had to hedge round the granting of these pensions with a great deal of precautions and limitations. Hitherto the Government in this House and elsewhere had chiefly been attacked for not having put in safeguards enough, but now and again criticism was directed against them from an exactly opposite point of view, and noble Lords wanted to knock away some of the safeguards the Government had erected.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY said the noble Lord had certainly misunderstood the object of his Amendment. This case of William Smith, so far as he could understand it, certainly would not come under his Amendment, because the Amendment suggested the maintenance of a person by relatives who were by law compellable to maintain that person, whereas William Smith was being maintained voluntarily.

LORD FITZMAURICE: But they might be persons compellable by law to make the payment though they were making it voluntarily.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY said the case he wished to put before their Lordships was that of poor people who, by order of the guardians, had their support helped by sons or daughters with whom they lived. They might perhaps have a small income of their own, and the board of guardians might make an order for the payment of more, and he could not help thinking that it was not the intention of the Government that such sums when so ordered should count as part of the regular income.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said he certainly interpreted his noble friend's Amendment in that way, though he did not think it would carry it out as it was at present worded. If it read, "shall not include any sum paid for the maintenance of a person by relatives who are by law compelled to maintain him," that would probably meet the case. He thought it would be better to postpone the point until the Report stage, because he would be sorry, and he thought his noble friend would be sorry, to include such cases as those to which the noble Lord referred.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY said he would withdraw his Amendment and bring the matter up on Report.

LORD FITZMAURICE said that before the Amendment was withdrawn he desired on the part of the Government to reserve the question of privilege on this point, because although the amount affected was not large, there would be some increase, and therefore the question of privilege could be raised.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said he could not help thinking that if the Amendment were altered in the way he suggested there would be no question of privilege at all, because it could not be intended by the Bill that orders of the kind referred to should be included in the income.

LORD FITZMAURICE said that that was not quite the point. There might be some person at the head of a household receiving sums from persons in the house which would go into the common pot, and practically be part of the income of the head of the household.

LORD AVEBURY asked whether there was not a danger of a person having an income being handed over to his children who were compelled to maintain him.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY asked the meaning of subsection (2) of the clause which provides that in calculating the means of a person being one of a married couple living together in the same house, the means shall not in any case be taken to be a less amount than half the total means of the couple. He asked what was the object of the provision. It might lead to very considerable hardship in certain cases. When the Bill was originally brought in, the idea was that persons entitled to pensions should not receive more than 3s. 9d. a week if they lived together, and it was altered on its being pointed out that a husband and wife would be penalised. But the effect of this would be that if they took two old people of seventy who were sisters or brothers, or no relations at all, and A had £21 a year and B £29, A would get 5s. a week and B 1s. a week, but in the case of a married couple enjoying the same respective incomes A would only receive 3s. and B 1s. If that was the effect of those words it would in certain circumstances penalise old married couples who lived together.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said that if the noble Viscount would put down an Amendment to express his views the Government would give it consideration. They could not answer off-hand what construction could be put upon it.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY said he did not desire so much to put down an Amendment, because he fully agreed that the Government could not meet every possible case arising under the Bill, but he would be satisfied if a member of the Government could tell him what the object of this particular subsection was. If the noble Viscount wished time, he would raise the question on Report.

LORD FITZMAURICE said that perhaps the noble Viscount would refer to it on the Report stage.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said he was sorry that the Government took that line, because he wished to ask a question on the subsection. How were married couples going to be treated under the Bill? He took the case of an old man of seventy who had an income of £32 a year, while his wife of seventy had nothing. He would get nothing, while presumably his wife would get 5s. a week. But if each had £16 a year, making the total income of the same amount, both would come in on the lowest limit and would be entitled to the highest pension, and the household would get 10s. a week. Did the Government defend that the two households should be treated so differently in the same circumstances?

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said he must enter his protest against the noble Lord's question, as to what the Government intended. They had put all they intended into a clause and if the noble Lord was dissatisfied with their wording the legitimate mode of proceeding was for him to put down an Amendment. He had had as much experience as the noble Marquess in Parliamentary history and never heard of such a thing as being cross-examined.

*LORD SANDERSON asked if the noble Viscount would not say what was the meaning of the subsection. It provided that the means of one of a married couple should not be taken at less than half the total means of that couple, yet there was no provision that the means of the other one might in certain cases be taken at less than the full amount belonging to that individual.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: It means what it says.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said he was sorry he should have incurred the rebuke of the noble Viscount. He had had the honour of sitting opposite to him for many years, and had watched his conduct of important measures, including the Local Government Bill, through the other House. In the House of Commons the noble Viscount would no more have thought of refusing to answer a question put by one of his opponents than he would have thought of flying. It was reserved for their Lordships' House to be treated in that way by the Government. He asked a perfectly respectful question. He took a perfectly simple instance and wanted to know the meaning of the Bill. If the noble Viscount objected to the point being put in the form of a question, he would make it in the form of an assertion. His point was that in precisely similar cases the pension in one would be 5s. a week and in the other double that amount. Whatever their opinion might be as to the policy of old-age pensions all would agree that the Bill ought to be a fair one. That was why he did not very much care for the Bill, though he had done his best in anything he had said to put the Bill into proper shape.

LORD FITZMAURICE said that nobody had complained of the way in which the question was put or of his noble friend illustrating his view by stating a concrete case. His noble friend had said that, as there was no Amendment on the Paper, his attention had not been specially drawn to the concrete case which had been put forward, and, therefore, he asked that he might be allowed to give an answer on the Report stage. That was all. The case stated by his noble friend was a reasonable one, so far as he had been able to follow his argument. He must confess he was not aware that on this subsection these points were going to be raised, and, therefore, he was not so fully prepared on these points as on others. All these points, the Committee would agree, especially when they worked them out by mathematical calculation, were extremely complicated, and it would be fairer to his noble friend to give his answers on the Report stage, when they would be able, he had no doubt, to give complete answers to the perfectly legitimate points raised by the noble Lord.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY said that so far as he was concerned, he would be perectly satisfied to defer the Amendment to the Report stage, but he would point out the extreme difficulty in which the House was placed. The Bill was only brought into their Lordships' House a few days ago and there had been very little time to put down Amendments, and he desired to ask for information concerning rather an important subsection in order that, if he thought fit, he might put down an Amendment before the Report stage was reached. That would be impossible if he did not get the information until then. Considering the amount of time the Government spokesmen had been giving to the details of the Bill, he could not help feeling sorry that they had not been able to give him information upon a subsection which at any rate, needed explanation.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 a d 6 agreed to.

Clause 7:

LORD ATKINSON moved to add that if the pension committee, after the receipt of the report of the pension officer upon a claim or question referred to him, do not, within the time prescribed, proceed to give their decision on the matter, the recommendation or opinion of the pension officer shall, as far as practicable, be treated as a decision of the pension committee. They wished, he said, that the pension committee, when application was made either for the granting of a pension or the forfeiting of a pension that had been already granted, should not put it aside and do nothing. It was possible that the pension officer's report might not contain anything like a decision either in favour of or against the applicant or claim. Therefore, there might not be any decision. He admitted that his Amendment was not perfect, but it was lucidity itself compared to the Amendment next on the

Paper in the name of the noble Viscount. There were complaints that the pension committee would do nothing, but the noble Viscount proposed that there should be an appeal against their decision. That was exactly the defect. The Bill provided that when they came to a decision the pension officer and any person aggrieved might appeal to the central pension authority against the decision of the local committee. It seemed to be a strange misapplication of language to say that they were also to appeal when there was no decision. He did not understand how any human being could perform the operation of appealing against a blank. What the noble Viscount and he himself both desired was that when a pension committee did nothing the central authority should be in a position to hear the question and to decide it, putting the pension committee entirely aside when that committee refused to do its duty. He suggested that if the noble Viscount would leave out all the words from the word "may" and insert "apply to the central pension authority to consider and finally decide such claim or question which the said last-mentioned authority shall have power to do," that would meet the case. He would withdraw his Amendment if the noble Viscount would say he would consider the matter so that on the Report stage they might decide as to the form of words whic wouldh carry out the common intention they both entertained.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 11, after the word 'question,' to insert the following new subsection: '( ) If the pension committee after the receipt of the aforesaid report do not within the time prescribed proceed to give their decision on the claim or question so reported upon, the recommendation or opinion of the pension officer as expressed in his report shall, as far as practicable, be deemed and taken to be a decision of the pensions committee upon the same, and shall be acted upon and treated accordingly.' "—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON was glad the noble Lord had understood his meaning in the clause which had been drafted and put down. They were perfectly agreed as to what the evil was which the noble Lord feared, and perfectly agreed also that it should be checked. It was a question simply of which machinery was the best. He would adopt the suggestion of the noble Lord and hoped that before the Report stage they would have arrived at the best means of dealing with what would be a very serious evil unless dealt with.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 20, after the word 'them,' to insert, 'If a local pension committee refuse or neglect to consider any claim for a pension or to determine any question within a reasonable time, any person who would have the right under this provision to appeal against the decision of the local pension committee may appeal as if the pension committee had given such a decision.' "—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD ATKINSON moved to provide that a member of the committee who disapproved of the decision should be deemed to be a party aggrieved. The object was, he said, to make it clear what was meant by the words "person aggrieved." Apparently the appeal was practically confined to the pension officer and to the applicant whose claim was refused or who was held to be disqualified. That was a most unsatisfactory position. He did not want to go into the position which the pension officer would have to occupy in very many parts of Ireland. Viscount St. Aldwyn had said that the pension officer would be the watchdog of the Treasury. In the West of Ireland he wished no dog an unhappier fate than would be the fate of a pension officer who decided against a popular man or in favour of an unpopular man. He should think the famous "dirty dog," or a dog sent out into a street filled with his enemies, and with a tin-kettle on his tail, would have a peaceful, dignified, and happy life compared with that of the pension officer who decided on the lines of which he had spoken. He thought the member of a committee who disapproved of the decision at which the committee had arrived should be deemed to be a person aggrieved within the meaning of the section, and should have a right to appeal to the central authority against their decision. Everyone desired to have an administration of the Act which was pure, efficient, and carried on with ordinary celerity. To expect a pension officer to appeal against a popular decision, however unjust, was absurd.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 20, to add the words, "That a member of the committee who disapproves of the decision shall be deemed to be a party aggrieved within the meaning of the Act.' "—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON thought the Amendment would require a little consideration and might be allowed to stand over. He would like to know what the Irish Office thought of it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

On Question, clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8:

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE moved an Amendment to provide that the majority of the local pension committee (appointed by the council of the borough, district, or county, and, according to the clause, the persons appointed need not be members of the council) should consist of members of the appointing council. The clause was, he said, an important one, as he understood that, although practically the local pension committee would not have the means of administering any public funds, it would practically be on their advice that the lists of those to whom pensions were ultimately given would be compiled. He understood, however, that the ultimate decision on the matter was still in the hands of the Government so far as the regulations were concerned. The point he wished to raise was this: Under the clause as it now stood the councils, either borough, urban or district, were placed in a position of trust, and had to act with the Government in finding out who were eligible for the pensions. At one time it was an axiom of the Liberal Party that taxation and representation should go together. By the present Act they were placing the control of vast sums of money in the hands of individuals who certainly had not been elected by any constituency of any description for the purpose of administering those funds. All he asked was that the authority to which they gave these far-reaching extensive powers should have some responsibility cast upon them and should not, in the words of the Act, have the power of delegating the whole of their authority to some committee of whose constitution they had no knowledge whatever. Therefore he made the suggestion that any committee which might be appointed by those different authorities should have at any rate a majority of the appointing committee serving on it.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 30, after the word 'county' to insert the words 'and shall consist either wholly or partly of members of the appointing council, but the members of such council shall be a majority of the whole committee.' "—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

LORD FITZMAURICE said he could quite realise that when his noble friend moved the Amendment he had perhaps some feelings running in his mind similar to those which animated Mr. Pitt when, on a celebrated occasion, thinking that his great rival, Mr. Fox, had made a mistake, he said he would "un-Whig" him. He quite felt that it was difficult for them on the Liberal side of the House to appear to resist an Amendment of the kind moved, even if it were moved from the Opposition side of the House, based as it was upon an appeal to the great canons of popular representation, and indeed to a strict application of what he might call democratic doctrine. The noble Duke objected to the Bill as it stood because the pension committee might consist of outsiders, and was in no manner compelled to have upon it a majority of members of the actual appointing authority, the county council, and no doubt he would say that there he was standing upon essentially Liberal ground, a strong Liberal foundation, and he (the speaker) was the very last person to regret seeing the noble Duke standing on those grounds. But, notwithstanding, he could not help thinking that there were some reasons for leaving the Bill as it stood. The other day the noble Viscount, Viscount St. Aldwyn, dwelt upon what he thought was the great difficulty and future danger of county government, namely, that year after year Parliament went on piling new duties upon those bodies until they were almost breaking down under the burden. That was most true. Not a year passed by without very complicated duties of a burdensome character being put upon the county councils, and all that work had to be done by committees. They had to man their committees, and must man them with men who were able to attend, for it was essential to have continuity of policy, and, therefore, the presence of people who were able to give their time to the work. He could not help fearing that, bearing in mind the enormous increase of work placed in recent years upon county councils, if they were to throw upon those bodies the duty of finding the greater portion of the members of these committees they might be getting into a very considerable practical difficulty. He might perhaps point out to the Committee that there was a very great difference between this committee and many other committees of local bodies such as county and borough councils that had been appointed, because in all those other committees Parliament had very wisely insisted upon a majority of the members of a committee consisting of members of the council. The county council had been administering funds which, if not wholly, had in any case in part come out of the local rates, but that was not at all so in the present case. The county council would be administering Imperial funds, and he took it that what a county council ought really to try to do was to pick out men who were skilled administrators. They ought to look a great deal towards the example of the German municipalities. A very great portion of local administration in Germany was carried out by experts, appointed and selected by the local authority, but not necessarily members of the appointing body. They were a mixture of the permanent official such as was known in this country and of the local member, because they were selected from persons living in the areas in which the committee had to act. Therefore, he was not inclined to think that he was really offending against sound Liberal doctrines when he said that in this case the balance of argument was contrary to the proposal of his noble friend, although he thought it was not at all an unnatural thing to consider or to discuss, and he hoped, whatever the decision of the Committee might be, it would see that the Government, in making this proposal, had been animated, not by distrust of popular representation, but simply by the desire to obtain the best practical machinery for carrying out the exceedingly difficult and important duties it would have to perform.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON moved an Amendment to make a Metropolitan borough and the City of London the authority under the section by which the local pension committee is appointed. The Amendment, was, he said, one of those that had the misfortune to come under the guillotine in another place, and he imagined the Government would be prepared to accept it. He believed the intention was that the London County Council should nominate all these pension committees, and he submitted it was highly desirable over so great an area that the committees should be nominated by the borough councils which were representative of very large masses of the inhabitants, and had a much greater local knowledge as well as being the authorities for such business as appointing distress committees. The committees ought to deal with the present matter, which involved Imperial and not local funds, direct with the controlling body and not through the machinery of the county council. He suggested that the present system could only result in the whole work being done by inter-communication between them.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 30, after the word 'county' to insert the words 'for the purpose of this subsection the expression "borough" means and includes a metropolitan borough and the City of London.'"—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

* VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said that in London there was a strong difference of opinion, and so far as the Government were able to form any impression of what the view of Parliament was it seemed to be most decidedly in favour of the county council being the authority in London. So far as efficiency of administration was concerned in London, he certainly thought it would be better

—it had proved to be so in educational matters—that the county council should be supreme and not the borough council. Therefore the Government could not assent to the Amendment.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON thought it was laying upon the County Council of London a duty which they could not hope to perform satisfactorily. They could not force the borough councils to undertake the duties, and if they themselves had throughout this vast area to find local pension committees where they themselves had not the local acquaintance which the borough council had, it would really mean putting upon them not only a duty which they could not satisfactorily discharge, but an amount of correspondence and work which they would be most unwilling to undertake. Certainly in a matter of this magnitude he should have thought the Corporation of the City of London would have been the proper authority within the boundaries of the City. He asked the House to consider the Amendment further.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE moved to insert a new subsection providing that the Local Government Board should have power to appoint such persons as they should select not exceeding three in number to serve as *ex-officio* members of any local pension committee. He understood that these committees were at present capable of being entirely appointed by the different county authorities, but the Amendment in his name simply gave the power of appointing to serve on those committees two or three gentlemen whom the Local Government Board thought fit. They had but little experience as to what these pension committees might lead them into, and the Amendment was a safeguard against either mal-administration or failure on the part of these nominated bodies to carry out the intentions of the Act.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, to leave out lines 31, 32, and 33, and to insert the following new subsection: 'The Local Government Board may have power to appoint such persons as they shall select, not exceeding three in number, to serve as *ex-officio* members of any local pension committee.' "—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

LORD ATKINSON said he had on the Paper an Amendment which had the same object. Probably this was the first time in the course of English legislation that a body that did not represent those who supplied the funds were given the power to spend them in the way the pension committees were in this Bill. He had no doubt that the committees would be most generous in the expenditure of these funds. It was absolutely necessary that experts should be employed, and in that he agreed with the noble Viscount, Viscount Wolverhampton. Where they differed was as to the person who was to nominate the expert. The noble Viscount had said that the expert ought to be nominated by the pension committee, whilst he suggested that he should be nominated by a Government Department in some way representing the taxpayer who would really have the paying for all the operations carried on by the pension committee over which that taxpayer had no control whatever. It would also ensure that there would be somebody on the committee to stand up for the pension officer; to argue and support his report and to defend his action if necessary. If that was not done no person outside would know why a report was ignored. In addition to that there would be somebody who would be able to bring the proceedings in committee on appeal to the central authority. He could see no reasonable objection that could be urged against the Amendment. It was not opposed to any principle of taxation and representation. On the contrary, it carried out that principle, for an expert appointed by the Local Government Board would more truly represent the Imperial taxpayer than the members of the county council who represented the ratepayer, and in no way represented the Imperial taxpayer whose money they had to spend.

LORD FITZMAURICE thought the Committee would have come to the conclusion that this particular question was really an Irish question. They had had put before them by the noble Lord, Lord Atkinson, certain special dangers which might arise in certain districts in

Ireland in regard to the conduct of the pension committees. Assuming that those arguments were sound, that those kinds of difficulties might arise in particular places owing to party, local, religious, or personal feelings, he was bound to think that that difficulty was really met by giving a claimant to a pension the right of going on appeal to the Local Government Board, if the pension committee refused, for instance, to meet and thereby to do justice to the individual. But while such a course as that proposed by the noble Duke and the noble Lord might be desirable in some parts of the West of Ireland, to give this really gigantic power to the Local Government Board all over the country would be an exceedingly difficult and invidious power to exercise. If the Local Government Board exercised it generally a great cry would arise that the Government were not trusting the local committees, and if they did not trust the local committees on the ground that those committees were not fit to deal with Imperial funds they had better not have appointed them at all, but simply have put the matter into the hands of officers—Excise officers or other officers who might be appointed. Then, on the other hand, if they picked out particular places—he was speaking generally, in the light of English experience—it would still be an exceedingly difficult thing, because it would give rise to great controversy and comment, to complaints that different places were being treated in different ways, and the Local Government Board would be called upon to justify the appointment of the representatives. They would be asked, for example, if something had gone wrong, or whether they suspected something wrong or improper was going to be done in particular districts. The Local Government Board would be brought into constant collision with the county authorities. He did not see that there was any halfway house between appointing these county councils and trusting them or doing what would have been a perfectly conceivable alternative, namely, saying that as these funds were Imperial funds they were to be entirely administered by Imperial officers. The Bill was, he admitted, to a certain extent, a compromise, because they had brought in an Imperial officer in the shape of an Excise officer. On the other hand, the noble Duke and the noble Lord wished to go further in bringing in the Imperial element, not in the representative of the Treasury alone, in the person of the Excise officer, but also the Local Government Board. That, he was inclined to think, was pushing things rather too far. In any case the Government, having made up their minds to start by giving the full confidence, subject to the control in the Bill, to the county and borough committees, were not in a position to accept these two Amendments or either of them. At the same time, if there were districts in Ireland where the difficulties described might arise, that would be met by the provision giving the claimant power to go by the pension committee and appeal to the Local Government Board. He hoped that in any case at starting the pensions that would be sufficient to remedy any difficulty that might arise in the West of Ireland.

LORD ATKINSON said the noble Lord had misunderstood the Amendment. Its object was to protect the Imperial taxpayer. There was no difficulty whatever in carrying out the administration of Ireland, in the Local Government Board appointing as their officer a Poor Law inspector who did exactly for every Board of Guardians in Ireland what he would be asked to do under the Amendment, namely, to attend to give the people the benefit of his advice and to prevent abuses, corruption and extravagance.

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said they did not consider that this was purely an Irish question. It was a question of importance to Imperial taxpayers in England, Scotland, and Ireland. The proposal under the Bill was the strange one of allowing local committees appointed by local authorities full scope in the expenditure of Imperial funds. He looked upon that as a dangerous proposition, especially when they all knew that it would be to the interest of these local authorities to transfer certain Poor Law charges from the rates to the Exchequer. The Government had thought fit to empower county and borough councils to appoint these committees. What had the county and borough councils to do with the matter at all? They did not find the funds. The only reason was that they possessed the local knowledge which would enable them to choose more easily the pension committees than the Local Government Board could do. What was asked now was that the Local Government Board which represented the taxpayer should have some voice on these pension committees in defence of the taxpayer. They were to appoint not more than three members of such committees. This was characterised as a gigantic power on the part of the Local Government Board. He had really never heard an assertion which appeared to him more absurd, because all that it would involve was that there should be some representation of the taxpayer on bodies which almost naturally would be rather antagonistic to the interests of the taxpayer. He hoped that one of the Amendments would be pressed to a division, because he was quite sure something of the sort ought to be embodied in the Bill.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Two entirely separate questions are involved in this Amendment. What is spoken of as the Irish side of the question appears to us to depend upon the possibility that some person might be deprived of a pension because for some reason or other he was locally unpopular, and that the pension officer would be debarred by threats from doing his part in representing the case. The other side of the case is the one which has been alluded to by the noble Viscount, Viscount St. Aldwyn, who feared that pension officers would be too easy-going, and that being local people their tendency would be to transfer charges where they could from the rates to the taxes. I admit at once that the county council, as such, have no *locus standi* in this matter at all. They have no more power to decide the allocation of this money than any other body of taxpayers. They are selected to choose these committees because they have local knowledge and a very real and substantial position in a particular locality. The committees, it is hoped, will be composed of what are sometimes called people of "good-will," people who are willing to give their time and trouble without remuneration to the service of local duties in their own neighbourhood. It is perfectly true, as the noble Viscount has said, that there may be a temptation on the part of those people to be too easy-going in admitting cases, but when the noble Viscount said that they have an unrestricted power of allocating public money he cannot have read the Bill. The allocation in every case is subject to the consent of the pension officer, who, of course, represents the taxpayer. It is perfectly arguable that the pension officer by himself may not be strong enough to resist the committee, and ought to be strengthened. The noble and learned Lord suggested that the Local Government Board would put its inspectors on these committees. There are, of course, not enough inspectors of the Local Government Board to go round to all the committees to the number of three in each, so you come to this difficulty, that the only people the Local Government Board could nominate are people who will be subject to precisely the same limitations as members of the pensions committee. They could not all be officers, because the officers do not exist, but they will have to be some nominated people in the neighbourhood. Those people will be subject to exactly the same temptation to save the rates and impose on the taxes. The mere fact that they are nominated by the Local Government Board will not remove that.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD CLINTON moved an Amendment to provide that the local pension committees should be so constituted as to contain representatives of the other local authorities within their area. He said that the object of the Amendment was that certain members of the pension committees should be men of local knowledge and men belonging to the minor order of local authorities. This part of the clause appeared to him to be so widely drawn that it might result in the whole local pension committee being appointed from outside the areas of the pension committee. Consequently, no member of the committee would be in any way acquainted with the locality or its people. Personally, he would have preferred that a very large number of these committees should have been members of local authorities, but he had contented himself with suggesting that some, at all events, of the minor local authorities should be represented on the committees. It was true that any county council would probably wish to appoint such men, but the second part of the clause said that they need not do so, and in fact appeared to imply that it would be better if they did not do so at all. He knew that was not the intention of the Government, because although the clause was not discussed in another place, yet in answer to a deputation the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed himself as being entirely in sympathy with the idea that members of the guardians should be unofficially upon these committees. He went as far as that with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but also one step farther, when he suggested that the other local authorities, such as the parish council, should also be represented. It was of extreme importance that these committees should have sufficient local knowledge to deal with many of the difficult and oftentimes delicate questions which would come before them.

Amendment moved—

"To insert the words 'Each local pension committee should be so constituted as to contain representatives of the other local authorities within their area.'" — (*Lord Clinton.*)

LORD FITZMAURICE said the proposals of the Bill were in reality to a certain extent a compromise, and he did not think the Government could go beyond the stage that they had reached in regard to recognising local information. They had heard a good deal of criticism for which no doubt theoretically a very great deal could be said, but with all respect for local government he thought that in a matter of this kind it would be going a very great deal too far to bring in representatives of not only what were known as the minor local authorities, but of the boards of guardians and even of the parish council, and might give rise to very considerable confusion. Anybody who had sat on a board of guardians knew that one of the very great difficulties of Poor Law administration, unless the chairman of the board happened to be a very strong man and had one or two members to back him up, was the tendency of each parochial representative to look after what he called his "own poor." That very often took the shape of a guardian coming into the room, and after doing what he thought was his duty, "looking after his own poor," going away and leaving the remaining guardians to do likewise. That was how mal-administration and jobbery arose. If they desired this pension scheme to work well they must take every precaution against anything of that kind happening, and for that reason the Government, when they decided to trust local authorities, selected the large authorities, leaving them to be the masters of the persons to whom they were delegates, and he sincerely hoped that in practice the county councils and other bodies would make up their minds to rise a little superior to the ordinary British prejudice against what was called the expert. There was nothing in the world so difficult as administering poor relief, and this would also be an exceedingly difficult duty. In fact a man might almost devote a very great portion of his life to attaining the knowledge which was necessary to administer matters of this kind faithfully and skilfully. There was another objection to the proposal, namely, that by bringing in the representatives of boards of guardians as such——

LORD CLINTON: I did not bring them in by name.

LORD FITZMAURICE pointed out that local authorities would include boards of guardians. They all desired to keep the administration of the pensions and the Poor Law entirely distinct. If there was any member of a board of guardians who from long experience had become an expert in the subject he felt convinced that the county and borough council would not require any spurring to call in their assistance.

*LORD LANSDOWNE: I quite agree that these committees should be strengthened, but I cannot help thinking that there are practical objections in the way of this proposal. The proposal makes it obligatory upon the county councils to include on the local pensions committees representatives of every local authority within their areas. It would be obligatory under those words to include members of the minor councils and also of the boards of guardians, and I think there is force in the objection that this Bill desires to keep the administration of the Poor Law entirely distinct from the administration of the pension law. I am afraid, therefore, that if this Amendment were to be inserted in the Bill it would give rise to a good deal of complication and trouble, and I respectfully suggest that my noble friend had better not press it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE EARL OF MAYO moved the omission of the words "either absolutely or under such conditions as they think fit," from the provision giving local pension committees the power to delegate to sub-committees powers and duties of the local pensions committee. He submitted that the words were not the least necessary, and if they were left out the subsection would have exactly the same effect as if they were in.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, lines 37 and 38, to leave out the words 'either absolutely or under such conditions as they think fit.'"—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

LORD FITZMAURICE thought there would be no difficulty in proving that the words ought to be left in. In the first place there was precedent for them. He was practically certain that the same words would be found in the Education Act of 1902, in regard to the delegation clause under which practically the education of the country was carried on. Considerable trouble arose at one time in the working of the Local Government Board Acts, because there were certain powers there which it was stated could be delegated, and some great lawyers took the view that delegation, if not qualified, was absolute and irrevocable. That danger was to be guarded against. What the words really did was that they enabled the county council to delegate and at the same time to remain members of their own delegation. If the words were left out, there might be considerable danger of unqualified delegation, putting the county council or other authority in the position of having parted with some of their powers and rendering it difficult for them to get them back.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE moved to add, at the end of subsection (2), which ran—

"(2) A local pension committee may appoint such and so many sub-committees, consisting either wholly or partly of the members of the committee as the committee think fit, and a local pension committee may delegate, either absolutely or under such conditions as they think fit, to any such sub-committee any powers and duties of the local pension committee under this Act"—the words "other than the power to give a decision on a claim within the meaning of this Act."

He moved this Amendment in the hope that the power of actually dealing with claims might be reserved to the pension committee. The sum of £7,000,000 was delegated by the Treasury to the local authorities. Those local authorities had power to appoint a committee, and this committee in its turn was empowered to appoint a sub-committee which would possess absolutely every power conferred upon the local pension committee by the Bill. Thus it would be possible for the local pension committee to delegate all or any of its powers, either absolutely or under such conditions as they might think fit, to this sub-committee. It would be possible, under this clause, for the pension committee to delegate the power of granting pensions to the vicar and churchwardens. He did not know whether such a provision would commend itself to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. His Amendment would leave full discretion to the sub-committee to gather information and collect as much material as possible to enable the local pension committee to arrive at a decision, but the giving of the decision would rest with the responsible local pension committee.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 40, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'other than the power to give a decision on a claim within the meaning of this Act.' "(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

LORD **FITZMAURICE** said that, if it was thought that the pension committee were going to act in the manner proposed, they ought not to give them these powers at all. It was surely a fair thing to assume that bodies of this kind would act in a reasonable manner. He could not imagine any county or borough authority with which he was acquainted acting in the way suggested, merely because the funds with which they would be concerned did not come from the local rates but from the Imperial Exchequer. Therefore he thought the precautions proposed to be taken quite unnecessary. If they could not trust these committees, the only rational alternative would be not to give them the powers at all.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 40, after the word 'Act,' to insert the following new subsection: '( ) The Local Government Board may appoint any person or any persons not exceeding three in number to be a member or members of any local pensions committee, or of any sub-committee appointed by the latter, who shall, when appointed, have all the rights of ordinary members of such committees.' "—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9:

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 7, after the word 'obtaining,' to insert the words 'or continuing.' "—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 8, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'either for himself or for any other person, or for the purpose of obtaining or continuing an old-age pension under this Act for himself or for any other person at a higher rate than that appropriate to the case.' "—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF **CAMPERDOWN** moved to add words in the same subsection to meet an obvious omission, and said he understood the Amendment was accepted by the Government.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 9, after the word 'misrepresentation,' to insert the words 'or if it appears that any person has directly or indirectly deprived himself of any income or property in order to qualify himself for the receipt of an old-age pension, or for the receipt of an old-age pension at a higher rate than that to which he would otherwise be entitled under this Act.' "—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

VISCOUNT **WOLVERHAMPTON** accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD **ATKINSON** moved the insertion of a new subsection. He said that as the Bill stood nobody was interested in making an inquiry to ascertain whether the recipient of the pension had ceased to be qualified to receive it. Subsection 2 provided that—

"If it is found at any time that a person has been in receipt of an old-age pension under this Act while the statutory conditions were not fulfilled in his case or while he was disqualified for receiving the pension, he, or in the case of his death, his personal representative, shall be liable to repay to the Treasury any sums paid to him in respect of the pension while the statutory conditions were not fulfilled, or while he was disqualified for receiving the pension, and the amount of those sums may be recovered as a debt due to the Crown."

But there was no person or tribunal whose duty it was to make the inquiry. His Amendment met that point, and placed the duty of making the inquiry upon the pension officer. If that were not done, he failed to see the value of the disqualifying clauses. Unless this duty were imposed upon somebody the inquiry would not be made, and a person once in receipt of a pension might easily continue to receive it though he had become disqualified.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 11, after the word 'labour,' to insert the following new subsection: '( ) The pension officer may at any time, without the matter having been referred to him, call upon and require a person in receipt of an old-age pension to establish that he has not since the same was granted to him become disqualified to receive it, and the pension officer shall inquire into the matter of the pensioner's disqualification and report on the same to the pension committee, who shall receive and, as far as applicable, act upon the said report as if it were a report received under the provisions of Clause 7, subsection (7).' "—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON thought this a case that might be left to be met by the regulations.

*LORD HAVERSHAM supported the Amendment and said he had received a letter from Sir John Young, for many years Secretary of the Royal Patriotic Fund, with whom he served for fifteen years as a member of the Executive of the Patriotic Fund, in which he stated that it was of the utmost importance that there should be personal visits by the pension officer to the pensioners. The areas allotted to the pension officers should not, therefore, be too large. He hoped there would be stringent regulations on this matter, and that every pensioner changing his residence should notify it to the pensions officers.

LORD ATKINSON warned the noble Viscount in charge of the Bill that he was taking a very dangerous step in embarking upon the task of giving jurisdiction by regulations. He admitted that it was possible to draft regulations as to the mode in which jurisdiction should be exercised, ; it was a very different matter to attempt to give jurisdiction by regulations.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 10 :

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN moved to insert a new subsection providing for the laying of the regulations before Parliament. He said it was not without considerable hesitation that he had adopted the period of twenty-one days in his Amendment, but, in the circumstances, it would, perhaps, be sufficient to give Parliament an opportunity of examining, and, if necessary, objecting to the regulations. He was surprised that the Government had not inserted in the Bill some provision akin to this, because the whole administration of the Bill depended upon regulations. If Parliament were not to insist upon having the regulations laid upon the Table and did not take power, if necessary, to object to them, then he thought Parliament would be surrendering a most valuable power.

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 17, after subsection (2) to insert the following new subsection: '(3) Every regulation under this Act shall be laid before each House of Parliament forthwith, and if an address is presented to His Majesty by either House of Parliament within the next subsequent twenty-one days on which that House has sat next after any such regulation is laid before it, praying that the regulation may be annulled, His Majesty in Council may annul the regulation, and it shall thenceforth be void, but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder.' "—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived.

The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow, and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 189.)

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS DUTIES) BILL.

SEED POTATOES AND SEED OATS SUPPLY (IRELAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª to-morrow.

WHALE FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY COUNCILS) BILL.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (MERCANTILE CORPORATIONS AND COMPANIES) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

COMMONS BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to order.)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, at the request of Lord Fortescue and the men of Devon I have to ask the House to allow me to insert an Amendment. Subsection (9) of Clause 1 provides that the expression "animals" shall mean "horses, asses, cattle, sheep, and swine." The men of Devon are anxious to add goats.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 17, after the word 'sheep,' to insert the word 'goats.'"—(*Earl Carrington.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

PROVISIONAL ORDERS (PROCEDURE) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

Debate on the Motion for Second Reading resumed (according to order).

THE EARL OF STRADBROKE: My Lords, I understand that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack is satisfied on the point of law raised in this Bill, and I therefore hope your Lordships will give it a Second Reading.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

POLLING DISTRICTS AND REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM BILL.

House in Committee (according to order): Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow.

GRAND JURY (IRELAND) ACT, 1836, AMENDMENT BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, this is a Bill of a non-contentious character which I do not think requires any lengthy explanation. Its object is to amend Section 67 of the Grand Jury (Ireland) Act, 1836, with respect to piers, quays, and other works, and for other purposes connected therewith, and it provides that the maximum sum which the council of a county may resolve to levy off the county for any work undertaken under the section shall be raised from £300 to £1,500. I beg to move.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

BATTLESHIPS, ARMOURED CRUISERS, AND DESTROYERS.

Return respecting; laid before the House (pursuant to Order of this day), and to be printed. (No. 190.)

House adjourned at ten minutes past Twelve o'clock a.m., till a quarter past Four o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 28th July, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Holderness Water Bill, London United Tramways Bill, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill, Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill.—Lords Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

River Wandle Protection Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, Wild Birds Bill, without Amendment.

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill, London County Council (General Powers) Bill, Gosport Gas Bill, Central Ireland Electric Power Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords], Leith Burgh Bill [Lords], London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Amendments to Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [Lords], with an Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to Confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Edinburgh and District Water." [Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 344.]

PETITIONS.

HOUSING, TOWN PLANNING, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Lewisham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Gillingham; and Rochester (two); to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Cambusnethan; and Ferry-Port-on-Craig; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOSS OF LIFE AT SEA.

Copy presented, of Return showing the lives lost by Wreck, Drowning, or other Accident in British sea-going Merchant Ships registered in the United Kingdom during the years 1891 to 1907, inclusive [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT, 1907–8.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd July; *Mr. Masterman*];

to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 263.]

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, ETC., 1907–8.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd July; *Mr. Masterman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 264.]

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Report of the Commissioners for the period from 1st April, 1907, to 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Local Government Board for Ireland, for the year ended 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUEZ CANAL (COMMERCIAL, No. 5, 1908).

Copy presented, of Returns of Shipping and Tonnage passing through the Suez Canal, 1905, 1906, and 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd July; *Sir Frederick Banbury*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 265.]

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901.

Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the Money received, expended, and borrowed, and Securities created under the said Act, to the 31st March, 1908, together with a Copy of the Report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 266.]

DEATHS FROM STARVATION OR ACCELERATED BY PRIVATION (LONDON).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 19th February; *Mr. Talbot*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 267.]

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Order [23rd June] for an Address for a Return relative thereto, read and discharged; and, instead thereof:—

Address for "Return of the names of every Member returned to serve in the Twenty-seventh Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland appointed to meet 3rd December, 1900, and dissolved 8th January, 1906, specifying the names of the county, city, university, or place for which each Member was returned (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 365, of Session 1901)."—(*Sir William Bull.*)

OFFENCES IN COUNTY ARMAGH (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "showing the number of convictions for indictable and non-indictable Offences committed in the following districts in Ireland in the three years ending the 30th day of April 1906, 1907, and 1908, repectively: (1) the town of Newry; (2) the village of Bessbrook; (3) the electoral division of Camlough, excluding Bessbrook, and (4) the electoral division of Mullaghan and Tullyhaggy, in the following form:—

District.	Total Number of Offences.	Cases of Drunkenness.	Minor Offences not Drunkenness.	Serious Offences.
Newry - - - -				
Bessbrook - - -				
Camlough, exclusive of Bessbrook - - -				
Mullaghan and Tullyhaggy - - -				

—(*Mr. Sloan.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Addition to Phœnix Park.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the cost of the removal of the old railings and the supply of new ones around the powder magazine in the Phœnix Park has been done at the expense of the War Office, or is to be a charge on the Vote for the Irish Board of Works; what is the cost of the work; what was the necessity for the expense; at whose request was the expense incurred; is it the fact that the only use to which the estate lately added to the Phœnix Park has been put is for War Office manœuvres; and when will the general public be allowed to participate in the enjoyment of the area added to the park.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) As regards the railings the work has been done at the expense of the War Office, and the cost is estimated to reach the sum of £560. The old wooden fence was worn out and required replacement by a better and unclimable fence. As regards the new estate, I am informed that only three acres of a total 200 acres have been let by the Board of Works to the War Office to facilitate bridging practice by the troops. The rest of the land, with some insignificant exception, is let on grazing tenancies or under agreements existing at the time of purchase. One of the tenants allows the War Office to use his land for signalling and a little horse training. The property was acquired to prevent its being built over and to preserve the amenities of the Phœnix Park. There is no intention at present to throw it open to the public, and a large expenditure would be necessary before doing so.

Matchem and Company and the Fair Wages Clause.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is aware that a firm of contractors named Matcham and Company are doing work at the Plymouth Post Office, and are only paying the bricklayers' labourers 4d. and 4½d. per hour instead of the recognised standard rate, viz., 5d.; and whether he intends taking any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I have made careful inquiries, and find there is no foundation for the allegation in the Question.

Sub-letting of Messrs. Lester & Perkin's Contract.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the firm of Lester and Perkins, who have the contract for fitting up the steamship "Rohilla" for conveying troops to India, have sub-let a part of the work to Mr. G. Peacock, of Wandsworth Road, and that he is paying from 2½d. to 3½d. per hour less than the standard rate to his workmen; whether this work was sub-let with his sanction and approval; and whether he will take steps to enforce the terms of the Fair Wages Clause in connection with this sub-contract.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The work referred to was such as could scarcely be considered as involving a sub-letting of a portion of the contract, but the matter has been inquired into, and my information is that the rate paid to the workmen works out in excess of the standard rate accepted as current in the district.

Cost of Living in Welsh Provincial Towns.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Postmaster-General what are the respective units and cost of living at Welshpool, Newtown, Montgomery, Llanidloes, Lllanfyllin, and Machynlleth; and whether their classification is the same as that of other towns in Welsh counties.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The information asked for as regards Welshpool, Newtown, and Machynlleth, so far as it is available, will be found on Pages 62, 64, and 65 of the Parliamentary Paper, Post Office (Changes in Wages, etc.), issued on the 11th instant. Montgomery, Llanidloes, and Llanfyllin are sub-offices, and their classification has not yet been definitely decided. The principles governing the new classification are explained on Pages 54 et seq. of the Parliamentary Paper referred to, and the list on Pages 57 to 65 of the same paper contains the classification of all head offices throughout the kingdom.

Sunday Duty in the Post Office.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the Post Office Department obliges post office assistants to work on Sunday without remuneration; and, if so, when will the practice be discontinued and these officials placed on the same footing as those in other grades of the service.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Assistants are not required to undertake Sunday duty without remuneration. Such duty is taken into account in fixing the weekly wages.

Promotion in the Customs—Mr. Clarke's Change.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that Mr. C. Clarke, employed in the Statistical Office, Customs, was informed by Treasury letter, dated 4th June, 1907, that no application for his exceptional promotion would be considered until he had withdrawn certain charges which he had made; what was the date on which Mr. Clarke formally withdrew his charges, and how long after that date was he nominated for exceptional promotion; whether Mr. Clarke was induced to send in his withdrawal by promises made to him by his superior officers that if he took that course his name would be submitted for nomination for exceptional promotion; what was the nature of the charges made by Mr. Clarke and against whom were they directed; whether he is aware that Mr. Clarke has been unable to take up the superior post to which he has been nominated owing to the refusal of the Civil Service Commissioners to grant him the necessary certificate, and will he say how many times have they refused and on what grounds; whether it is intended to continue to present Mr. Clarke to the Commissioners until he succeeds in obtaining their certificate; to what class of officers in the Statistical Office does Mr. Clarke belong; is it the practice to select a number of specially meritorious men in that class for the discharge of superior duties, such as checking, for which certain monetary allowances are granted, and have all previous promotions from the class to superior appointments been made exclusively from the ranks of these selected men; and whether, in view of the distrust in the system of selection for promotion shared by all classes in the Statistical Office, he will cause an independent investigation to be made into the circumstances of the nomination of Mr. Clarke for promotion over the heads of officers who are his seniors and of whom a number are specially entrusted with duties recognised by grants of monetary allowances as being officially superior to those performed by Mr. Clarke.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The officer referred to is one of 121 assistant clerks who signed a Memorial addressed to the Treasury in which an unfounded allegation of breach of faith as regards promotion was made against His Majesty's Government. It is not the case that an intimation was made to this officer individually as is suggested, but a general reply was sent to the memorialists to the effect stated in the Question. Mr. Clarke withdrew his signature to the Memorial on 13th September last, but it is not true that he was induced to do so on any promise whatever. He was nominated for the position of port clerk on 3rd December following, and has been examined twice by the Civil Service Commissioners, but on both occasions has failed to qualify. It is the ordinary practice of the Civil Service Commissioners to allow two trials and it is not proposed to allow him a third. The monetary (*i.e.*, checking) allowances in the Statistical Office are assigned in strict order of seniority to those assistant clerks who are certified to be efficient and of good character, but the possession of a checking allowance does not imply that the holder is of such exceptional merit as will justify the Board in recommending him for promotion to a superior appointment. No clerk with an allowance was qualified for such advancement when Mr. Clarke was nominated.

Colonial Audit Branch.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that the old system of recruiting the Colonial Audit Branch by nomination without any actual educational test examination has now broken down, he will explain why Volunteers for that branch were not heretofore called for, except in one or two cases, from amongst the trained auditors of the main establishment of the Exchequer and Audit Department.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether two chief examiners and a senior clerk in the Exchequer and Audit Department now serving in London, who owe their present superior position to the fact that they were members of the Old Colonial Audit Branch, are liable to further periods of service abroad, and, if so, will he explain why the Comptroller and Auditor-General has recently threatened to bring outsiders into the Department if Volunteers are not forthcoming for foreign service.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) These Questions relate to matters that, under Section 9 of 29 and 30 Vict., c. 39, are entirely within the discretion and authority of the Comptroller and Auditor General, and I have no power of interference.

Education Problem.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether under Article 14 of the Code of Regulations for public elementary schools in England, the phrase—The number of scholars under the instruction of any one teacher—means the number of scholars on the class register who may be under the instruction of one teacher, or the number ordinarily present under instruction; and, if the latter, is this regarded as in effect a material enlargement of the average attendance for which under Article 12 a teacher is counted as sufficient.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The number of scholars under the instruction of any one teacher means in this article the greatest number of scholars actually taught by that teacher at any one time. Article 12 supplies, subject to Article 10, a subordinate test of the sufficiency of the staff of a school or department as a whole. It is obviously necessary, in view of the difference in size of the various classes in a school, that some elasticity should be allowed in the number of children who may be taught by each individual teacher. Article 14 lays down the limits of that elasticity, and inasmuch as it imposes a limit upon the size of each class it is not an extension but a curtailment of the latitude allowed by Article 12, which is applicable only to the staff of the school as a whole.

Dismissal of Married Teachers at Aberdare.

Mr. YOXALL: To ask the President of the Board of Education if His Majesty's inspector of schools for the district has reported concerning the dismissal of several teachers at Aberdare who are married women, some of whom are nearing the pensionable age, and will, therefore, be unable to complete the maximum service entitling to a pension; whether he has been informed that some of the vacancies thus created are to be filled by the appointment of teachers who are related to a member of the Aberdare Education Committee; and if so, whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have not received a Report upon this Question; but, in view of Section 35 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, it is within the power of a local education authority to terminate the engagements of teachers in their employment, and the Act gives the Board no power to intervene. I have no information as to the last part of the Question.

College-Trained Teachers in Elementary Schools.

Mr. YOXALL: To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state for what reason the Board of Education have abandoned the footnote to Article 10 in the Code of 1906, indicating that, after July, 1909, the Board may require the employment of a certain proportion of college-trained teachers upon the staff of the public elementary schools; and whether, in view of the number of qualified teachers unable to get appointments and the number of unqualified teachers at present employed, the Board will take steps to re-issue this notice, and to announce some definite provision to secure the reform indicated.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The withdrawal of the footnote was due mainly to the fact that a deputation from the National Union of Teachers represented to my predecessor that the new provision would, in their view, inflict grave hardship on a large number of their colleagues unless all teachers certificated prior to 1908 were to be regarded as "trained," irrespective of whether or not they had in fact "completed a course of training in a training college."

Coastguard and the Naval Manœuvres.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what number of coastguards was mobilised for the Fleet during the recent manœuvres; if all the coastguard stations on the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland were fully manned at war strength during the manœuvres; and, if not, in what part of the coast was there a deficiency.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) 1,300 coastguard men were embarked for manœuvres, being about half the number that would embark in war time. The war complement of the coastguard was maintained complete during the manœuvres, the men embarking for manœuvres being taken only from those stations that would be vacated in war time.

Independent Order of Foresters—Funds in Toronto.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state what amount of funds, if any, the Independent Order of Foresters, whose head office is at Toronto, has deposited with his Board as security for their liabilities in this country; and if he will take steps to prevent the withdrawal of such deposit from this country, lest, in the event of any of their member proceeding against them for a recovery of premiums paid, they should have no realisable assets here.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Independent Order of Foresters (Toronto) in November, 1892, made the deposit of £20,000 with the Postmaster-General of the Supreme Court of Judicature, as required by Section 3 of the Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870. This deposit was withdrawn on 29th December, 1904, pursuant to an Order of Court dated 5th December, 1904. Under the provisions of Section 35 (1) of the Companies Act, 1907, this company is required to file with the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies the names and addresses of some one or more persons resident in the United Kingdom authorised to accept on behalf of the company service of process.

Tullaghan Evicted Tenant.

MR. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an application has been received by the Estates Commissioners from Michael Felly, of Cragh, Tullaghan, County Leitrim, for reinstatement in the farm from which he has been evicted on the Folliott estate; and, if so, what steps, if any, they purpose taking to have him reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners proposed to allot Michael Feely, a holding on the estate of Miss Dickson, but they now find that they cannot acquire this land compulsorily. The applicant's name has been retained on the Commissioners' list, and it is intended to provide him with a farm if the Commissioners should acquire any untenanted land in the neighbourhood.

Naval Court Martial.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will say what is the number and percentage of the men composing the crews of the Altantic, Channel, Home (Nore Division), and Mediterranean Fleets respectively, who, during the past twelve months have been tried by court martial for offences against discipline.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The number of men tried by court martial in the various fleets is given in a quarterly Return, a copy of the latest issue of which I have sent to the hon. Member. It is not clear from the Question on what basis the hon. Member desires the percentage calculation to be made, but on any basis they would involve an amount of labour out of proportion to any advantage which it would seem could be gained from the result.

Creech Grange Post Office.

Mr. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the postmistress in charge of the Creech Grange Office near Wareham, has to work excessive hours, week days 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., Sundays 7 a.m. to 12 noon, without relief, unless she pays for help out of her own stipend; whether he is aware that such stipend is £24 a year, out of which she has also to provide lamp, oil, coal, and blotting paper for use in the office; if so, will steps be taken to staff and equip this office as the need requires, and to see that adequate wages are paid such staff.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The circumstances are approximately as stated, and, although the attendances are not quite so arduous as they may appear, I am inquiring into the question of reducing them. The remuneration will probably be somewhat increased as soon as the new scale of pay is brought in force. The sub-postmistress is remunerated on the usual basis applicable to small post offices maintained in connection with a private business, and of course she does not depend for her livelihood on her emoluments from Post Office work. The amount of business transacted falls far below the standard which would justify me in maintaining and staffing a salaried post office.

Sligo Post Office—Night Duties.

Mr. McHUGH (Sligo, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that in Sligo Post Office officers who perform a considerable amount of night duty, from 1.45 a.m. to 9 a.m., are required to return on overtime, on Mondays, from 2.30 p.m. to 4 p.m.; is he aware that for a considerable time past, even when the overtime attendance in this office was abnormal, the officers performing the night attendance were exempted from this overtime; and will he give instructions that this practice will be again introduced, or that a sufficient period for rest be given to officers on completion of their duty at 9 a.m.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I regret there should be any necessity for working overtime at Sligo, but it arises from the difficulty experienced at this time of the year, more especially in the North of Ireland, in providing substitutes for officers absent on leave. In the case of the particular officers in question the duty commences at 3.45 a.m., 1.45 a.m. on Mondays only, so that they enjoy an interval for rest of eleven and three-quarter hours after 4 p.m. No better alternative is feasible. The duties will be restored to their usual limits as soon as possible.

Thames Steamers and the Conveyance of the Mails.

Mr. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe): To ask the Postmaster-General whether any attempt was made by the Post Office to utilise the London County Council Steamboat Service for the purpose of the conveyance of mails, in accordance with Clause 36 of the Thames River Steamboat Service Act, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The steamboats on the Thames have not been used for the conveyance of mails, as it did not at any time appear that an improvement in the service could have been effected by their use.

Small-Pox among Post Office Employees.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): To ask the Postmaster-General what was the number of cases of small-pox and the number of deaths, if any, from small-pox among the employees of the Post Office in each of the ten years ending with 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The following statement gives the number of cases in each year:—

	1898	no cases.
	1899	one case.
	1900	no cases.
	1901	three cases.
These three were years of epidemic.	1902	sixteen cases.
	1903	six cases.
	1904	four cases.
	1905	two cases.
	1906	no cases.
	1907	no cases.

There were three deaths in 1902, and none in any of the other years. The approximate number of persons to whom this Return applies was 82,000 in 1898, rising to 132,000 in 1907.

Shetland Cable Breakdown.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been drawn to the renewed breakdown of the Shetland cable between Aberdeen and Lerwick which ceased working over a week ago; if he is aware that this cable was laid down by a private company over forty years ago; and whether, seeing that these constant breakdowns are inflicting losses on the herring-fishing industry in the North of Scotland, the business transactions of which are necessarily largely carried on through cablegrams and which is at its height at the present moment, he will see to the immediate repair of this cable, and also take steps to provide him with a little delay as possible for a new cable with a larger number of wires than the existing one.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) My attention has been drawn to this unfortunate occurrence. The cable was laid by the Post Office twenty-three years ago. A ship has been sent to repair the cable, and in the meantime I am glad to say that my engineers have been able to arrange for more rapid working on the remaining cable. The question of laying a new cable or of establishing a wireless service is under consideration.

Bristol Post Office.

MR. HOWELL DAVIES (Bristol, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to a notice posted on the new Post Office works at Bristol by the contractors to the Government, stating that any workman inquiring of another workman engaged on the works if he belonged to a trade organisation would be subject to summary dismissal; and whether he will ask the contractors to so modify their notice to their workmen as to bring it within the spirit of the fair wage and condition clause which they, the contractors, signed before receiving the contract.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The hon. Member will find my Answer to a similar Question yesterday to the Postmaster-General which is circulated with Votes this morning.

Willesden Education Committee.

MR. MACPHERSON (Preston): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that Willesden Education Committee have introduced an area scheme against the wishes of the parents, and also a scheme which imposes hardships upon the scholars, as, under the said scheme, children are being removed from the schools in which they have received all their education, and are being sent to other schools, in some instances further from their homes; and will steps be taken to see that the scheme is vetoed and the wishes of the parents recognised.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) It is understood that the Willesden Local Education Authority desire to assign a particular area to each of their council schools and to confine or give a preference in admission to each school to the children resident in that area. The arguments advanced by the local education authority in support of this arrangement are by no means trivial, and the Board agree with them in thinking that it offers substantial advantages from the point of view of organisation and would, on the whole and in the long run, be quite as convenient to the parents as to the local education authority. On general grounds, therefore, the Board are reluctant to interfere with the discretion of the local education authority. On the other hand, the introduction of such an arrangement may give rise to personal grievances in some cases, and although the local education authority are willing to make large exceptions to their rules and to allow the elder children (and the younger of the same family as elder children) to continue in attendance at the schools which they now attend, it is possible that still further provision should be made to meet the views of parents who object to their children's removal to a new school. The whole question is receiving careful consideration.

Certified Training Colleges.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the President of the Board of

Education whether he will state the names of the training colleges which fulfil the conditions set forth in Sections 7 (*g*), 7 (*h*), and 8 of the Training College Regulations, 1908; and also the names of those colleges which are known as certified training colleges, under Chapter 11 of the same Regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I will send the hon. Member a list of the training colleges recognised by the Board. As I have already stated, the Board have no reason to believe that any of those colleges fail to comply with the Regulations. No occasion has yet arisen for certifying a training college as efficient but not as recognised for grants.

Sheep-Dipping in North Wales.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the objections of farmers in North Wales to the double dipping of sheep enforced by the recent Sheep-scab Order have been considered; and whether he is in a position to make a statement with reference to any modifications which can be made in the said Order in response to the representations made by those concerned.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Board are prepared to alter the dates of dipping provided by the Sheep-dipping Order to meet, so far as it is possible, local convenience; but, in view of the prevalence of sheep-scab in North Wales, they are unable to relax the requirement for two dippings until a very considerable diminution in the amount of disease has been effected.

Small Holdings Act—Tonbridge Eviction Case.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been directed to the case of Mr. David Nichol's, against whom an eviction warrant was made by a bench of magistrates sitting at Tonbridge on the 20th instant, upon the application of Nicholls' landlord, the reason alleged being that Nicholls has applied for land under the Small Holdings Act; and whether he proposes taking any action in the matter; and, if so, what.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The attention of the President of the Board has been drawn to the case to which my hon. friend refers. It is a matter of very great regret to him that he has no power to take any action in the matter.

Horse Breeding.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, to whom the inspection and approval of stallions and mares in connection with the horse-breeding scheme is to be entrusted; and if any steps have yet been taken to organise the proposal.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The proposals put forward have not been approved, and it would be therefore premature for me to enter into the details of the scheme.

Scottish Sheriffs and Insurance Company Directorships.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Lord-Advocate if his attention has been called to the fact that sheriffs and sheriffs' substitute in Scotland frequently act as ordinary directors of insurance companies, for which they receive remuneration, and that these companies are often engaged in litigation in the Law Courts, in many cases as defenders against workmen's compensation claims; and if, in future appointments to Sheriffships, he will make it a condition that active work in connection with trade shall not be entered on.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) My attention has not been called to this, and there is no information to support the suggestion that sheriffs and sheriffs' substitute frequently act as described. The disqualifications and disabilities of sheriffs and sheriffs' substitute are set forth in Section 21 of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Act, 1907, and to this I cannot doubt that they conform. As to the sheriffs' substitute, they are prohibited from *inter alia* engaging in "legal banking, or other private practice or business," and this would seem to include the directorships referred to. If any cases were found to exist in which directorships are held by sheriffs which have produced, or are likely to produce, indirect relations with litigants or a conflict with judicial duty it would be for consideration whether the section mentioned should not be amended. As to future appointments there is, of course, no power to impose conditions not warranted by the law as it stands.

British Museum Extension.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): To ask the First Commissioner of Works why the building operations for the extension of the British Museum in Montague Place have been suspended for nearly a year, and when they are likely to be renewed.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The delay has arisen in connection with the settlement of internal details and the preparation of the drawings for the superstructure. It is anticipated that the works will be recommenced early in October.

Officers on Retired Pay.

MR. W. NICHOLSON (Hampshire, Petersfield): To ask the Paymaster-General if he can state by what authority a form has been issued to officers on retired pay demanding full particulars of their incomes from all sources, private and official, to be forwarded without delay to the Paymaster-General.

(*Answered by Mr. Causton.*) Under the Finance Acts the officers of His Majesty's Paymaster-General are assessors of income-tax and act with regard to the collection of income-tax under the authority of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue.

East London and the Pension Scheme.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he proposes to make special arrangements to assist the pension officers in the East End of London, where large numbers of claims for pensions from naturalised foreigners are to be expected, and where the double difficulty will arise of proving not only the births of these claimants in foreign countries, but also the dates of their arrival in this country and of their naturalisation.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The arrangements necessary for meeting the requirements of the district referred to will be duly considered at the proper time.

Dromard Evicted Tenant.

MR. McHUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners wrote to an evicted tenant named Edward Gillmore, of Brockagh, Dromard, County Sligo, on 17th January last, informing him that he had been noted as a person whom the Commissioners deemed suitable to be provided with a new holding in place of the holding, from which he had been evicted on the estate of Mrs. Ramsay, Ballintogher, County Sligo, and which is occupied by a planter; and can he state what steps have been taken to provide Gillmore with a holding, and with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners wrote the letter of 17th January referred to in the Question, but they have since further considered the matter and have decided to take no action. The applicant lives with his mother on a holding of about twelve acres.

Knocklong Evicted Tenants.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain from the Estates Commissioners whether they have at any time been in communication with Mr. Sanders, of Charleville, County Cork, agent to the Cooper estate in Knocklong, County Limerick, over the reinstatement to their evicted farms of John McGrath and Thomas Barry on the same estate, or are the Estate Commissioners aware that William Hatte, the alleged tenant on the farms of McGrath and Barry, is not even a planter nor a farmer, as he does not reside on the lands but in Blackrock, County Dublin, and has never farmed an acre of land, but has been chief clerk in Mr. Sanders' office, and latterly a partner in the firm; are the Estates Commissioners aware, or can they say, that the farms have been worked by a caretaker; and will the Estates Commissioners resume with Mr. Sanders negotiations for the reinstatement of those tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into the cases of the evicted tenants in question, and intend to provide holdings for them if possible. The Commissioners have ascertained that the evicted holdings are occupied by Mr. Hatte, who lives at Blackrock, Dublin, and is partner of Mr. Sanders, the agent of the estate. Mr. Hatte has signed an agreement to purchase the holdings. The Commissioners will consider all the circumstances before making an advance to him. The case of the evicted tenants has been placed in the hands of an inspector with the object of procuring their restoration or of providing other holdings for them.

Land Purchase in County Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he ascertain from the Estates Commissioners whether negotiations have been carried on for sale to the tenants on the part of Lord Massey on his Galbally property in the County Limerick, Mr. Lowe and his tenants around Galbally in Lowestown, Earl Dunraven and his tenants around Croom, County Limerick, Mr. Duncan and his tenants around Ballylander, County Limerick and, if the rural tenants have signed the agreements for purchase, will the Estates Commissioners endeavour to effect arrangements for sale and purchase between those several landlords and their town tenants; and will the Estates Commissioners open negotations for sale and purchase as between landlord and town tenants on the estate of Lord Clonmel around Down, the representatives of the Reptons around Cappamore, the Earl of Limerick around Bruff, Mr. Brazier in Kilmallock, and the agent of the Erasmus Smith property in Pallasgrean, all in County Limerick.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Proceedings have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners for the sale of the estates of Lord Massey, Mr. Lowe, the Earl of Clonmel, the Earl of Limerick, and Erasmus Smith, but no proceedings are pending before them in connection with the Earl of Dunraven's Croom property or the estates of Mr. Duncan, Mr. Repton, or Mr. Brazier. The Commissioners will consider any application which may be made to them in reference to any of these estates, but cannot undertake themselves to open negotiations between the landlords and tenants.

Fermoy Urban Council Meetings.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Lord-Lieutenant has yet considered the petition of the urban council of Fermoy respecting their right to hold meetings of the council in the Court-house, conferred by the Fermoy Act of 1808 and renewed by the Towns Improvement Act of 1854, and if this right, exercised and enjoyed for over 100 years, will be confirmed; whether he is aware that, while the memorial of the urban council was under the consideration of the Lord-Lieutenant, Mr. Carroll, Crown Solicitor, who had been duly notified thereof, proceeded to peremptorily demand from the council the surrender of their right, under threat of eviction; if he is cognisant of the fact that Mr. Carroll, who held the position of legal adviser to the urban council, was deprived of that office a month ago by the council acting within their discretion; and whether he will take any steps to restrain the action of the Crown Solicitor in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The petition referred to is still under the consideration of the Lord-Lieutenant, who will cause a reply to be sent to the Fermoy Urban District Council as soon as possible. As the hon. Member has already been informed, Mr. Carroll, is not acting in the matter as Crown Solicitor, but as the private solicitor of the High Sheriff, in whose custody and control the Court-house is vested by statute. I am not aware that Mr. Carroll has been deprived of the office of legal adviser to the urban council. The Government cannot restrain Mr. Carroll from acting as solicitor to the High Sheriff.

Irish Assistant Teachers.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the character of the salary and prospects of promotion of assistant teachers in Irish National Schools, provision will be made in the new grant for giving those teachers greater consideration for their services; what are the proposals of the Government for the future payment of those men; and is it proposed to enable them to enter the second grade.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to the revised Supplementary Estimate for Public Education, Ireland, which is now before the House.

Shoeburyness Foreshore.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the character of the estate of about 890 acres of foreshore at Shoeburyness, recently purchased by the War Office for £5,500; whether it is part of the Maplin Sands; what is its position; whether, and, if so, to what extent, it is covered at high water; what use, if any, has been made of it by the vendors; and whether the War Office has acquired it in order to acquire the right of firing over it, or for what, if any, other purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This estate is part of the Maplin Sands and lies almost three miles north-east of Shoeburyness. It is entirely covered at high water. So far as the War Department is aware, no use of this foreshore was made by the vendors, but the War Department fired over it and have acquired it for the purpose of firing over it.

Territorial Uniform Contracts.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that uniforms for the Territorial Reserve Forces are being made in the homes of employees in the East End of London, and that some of the contractors are working their employees in their factories seven days per week; and whether, in view of the Fair Wages Resolution of this House, it is his intention to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am not aware of the matters alluded to in the Question. The attention of the associations has been drawn to the Fair Wages Clause, but, as I have already informed the hon. Member, it is not practicable to interfere with their discretion.

Bermuda Engineer Stores.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any officer has been held responsible for the incompetency in connection with the Bermuda engineer stores; and, if so, what was his name and what notice has been taken of his incompetency.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I must refer my hon. friend to the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee which will shortly be in the hands of hon. Members.

Territorials at Brecon Public Meeting

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a Mr. Thomas Davies, whilst wearing the Territorial uniform, disturbed a public meeting at Brecon on 12th June, 1908, assisted by others also attired in uniform, this meeting being addressed by a Mr. Pattison, of Ruskin College, Oxford, and not by a lady, as the right hon. Gentleman has been informed; whether he is aware that a second meeting held on 16th June, with the Territorials absent, was conducted without any disturbance; whether he is aware that a third meeting was held on 19th June, 1908, and addressed by a Mrs. Keating Hill, of Cardiff, was again interrupted by Territorials led on by Mr. Thomas Davies as before-mentioned, and, although this gentleman was allowed five minutes, during which he addressed the meeting, he afterwards continued to upset the meeting; and what action does he intend to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I have no information regarding the meetings of 12th and 16th June, and I am awaiting a full Report. The meeting of 19th June was dealt with in my previous Answer to the hon. Member, to which I have nothing to add.

Orissa.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the operations of keeping up-to-date the record of rights involved in the last resettlement of the temporarily settled districts of Orissa is being conducted without causing any vexatious interference to the parties concerned.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) It is presumed that the Question has reference to the operations set on foot by the Bengal Government for revising, as the first step in the scheme for their annual maintenance, the village records prepared some twelve years ago at the last land revenue settlement of Orissa. According to the latest Reports the operations are proceeding satisfactorily. The local Government has made the procedure as simple and expeditious as possible, and has confined the work to what is absolutely necessary for bringing the records up-to-date. The settlement officer reports that the revision is welcomed by the ryots and the better class of landlords, as it clears up disputes and gives effect to changes which have occurred since the records were first prepared.

Registration of Titles in Scotland.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is now able to state when the Report will be issued of the Royal Commission on the Registration of Titles in Scotland which was appointed on 23rd May, 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am informed that the Royal Commission hope to conclude the evidence during the ensuing autumn, when they will proceed to consider their Report.

Rates in the Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland in view of the fact that the chief contributor to the rates in the island of Lewis has failed to meet the demand for payment made on him, and seeing that there is no prospect of the difficulty being overcome in the near future, will he state whether the local authority has applied to the Local Government Board for Scotland for guidance and assistance; and, if so, will he state the nature of the advice given by the Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am informed by the Local Government Board that, in reply to communications from the parishes of Barvas, Lochs, and Uig, they telegraphed that the parish councils should take immediate proceedings to recover the outstanding rates.

Syre Settlers.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the statement contained on page 9 of the last Report of the Congested Districts Board, will he state on what ground settlers in Syre have expressed their desire to become tenants instead of purchasers.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The grounds are financial; but, under the circumstances at Syre, I think the settlers are mistaken in their view.

Post Office Surveyors—Subsistence Allowances.

Mr. A. ROCHE (Cork): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the subsistence allowance to surveyors of the Post Office when absent from head-quarters is intended as a source of profit; is he aware that the subsistence allowance of the head surveyor of the Southern District in Ireland, when absent from his head-quarters in Dublin, is not less than 21s. per diem, while his actual expenses do not exceed 50 per cent. of this amount; and, in these circumstances, will he explain why sorting clerks and telegraphists compelled to perform relief duties in country districts are expected to exist on a subsistence of 3s. per diem.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is a well-established Treasury principle that subsistence allowance is not intended as a source of profit, but rather as a repayment of necessary additional expenses involved by travelling. Obviously a different scale of expenses is warranted in the case of a high officer such as a surveyor and one occupying the position of a sorting clerk and telegraphist. I have no information as to the sums actually spent by surveyors. Their subsistence allowance is that commonly granted to all officers of similar standing in the Civil Service.

Revenue Statistics.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state, for each of the years 1907–8 and 1908–9, as estimated the amount of revenue raised by taxes, distinguishing the revenue raised by permanent enactment from the revenue raised by temporary enactment, with the totals of each.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*)—

Revenue raised by Taxes, 1907–8.

(Net Receipt.)

	Revenue raised.			Temporary Duties.
	By Permanent Enactment.	By Temporal Enactment.	Total.	
	£	£	£	
Customs -	26,355,715	6,226.279	32,581,994	The whole of the tea duty 5*d.* the pound 4*d.* per pound on unmanufactured tobacco, with proportionate increases on cigars and manufactured tobacco 1s. per barrel on beer 6*d.* per gallon on spirits From 1st April to 30th June 1907
Excise -	35,104,582	620,003	35,724,585	1*s.* per barrel on beer 6*d.* per gallon on spirits
Estate, &c., Duties -	19,108,256	—	19,108,256	—
Stamps -	7,930,584	—	7,930,584	—
Land Tax -	710,003	—	710,003	—
House Duty -	1,939,865	—	1,939,865	—
Income Tax -	—	31,860,380	31,860,380	The whole of the tax, 1*s.* in the pound on unearned incomes and 9*d.* in the pound on earned incomes to 5th April 1908.
	91,149,005	38,706,662	129,855,667	

Amount of Revenue estimated to be raised by Taxes in 1908–9.

	Amount of Revenue estimated to be raised.			Temporary Duties.
	By Permanent Enactment.	By Temporary Enactment.	Total.	
	£	£	£	
Customs - -	23,400,000	5,800,000	29,200,000	The whole of the tea duty 5*d.* the pound.
Excise - -	35,500,000	—	35,500,000	—
Estate, &c., Duties	19,500,000	—	19,500,000	—
Stamps - -	8,080,000	—	8,080,000	—
Land Tax - -	700,000	—	700,000	—
House Duty -	1,900,000	—	1,900,000	—
Income Tax -	—	33,000,000	33,000,000	The whole of the tax 1*s.* in the pound on unearned incomes and 9*d.* in the pound on earned incomes to 5th April, 1909.
	89,080,000	38,800,000	127,880,000	

American Cattle.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if, in view of the agitation being fomented on both sides of the Atlantic for the unrestricted importation of American cattle without any quarantine regulations, he will issue a leaflet specifying such diseases as are existent there.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board do not see their way to adopt my hon. friend's suggestion.

Scotch Smokeless Coal.

MR. WATT: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether Scotch smokeless coal was used by the Fleet on its last visit to the Forth; if not, will he say what was the freight per ton for bringing the coal used to the Forth; how does the original cost plus this carriage compare with the price of Scotch coal purchased on the spot; and will he use the cheaper coal on future prolonged visits to Scottish waters.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Welsh coal was used by the Fleet on its last visit to the Forth. "Scotch smokeless coal" is presumably a trade term, as no Scotch coals which have been tried by the Fleet have proved "smokeless," except when burnt at low powers. The Admiralty after making many trials of all descriptions of coals, have adopted Welsh steam coal as that which, taking into account all considerations, is the best coal for use in His Majesty's ships.

Naval Paymasters.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, on a survey of the paymaster's branch of the Navy, together with the few prospective retirements on account of age before 1920, and allowing a reasonable margin for deaths and voluntary retirements, there is reason to believe that the seniority of assistant paymasters will by 1920 have increased to a grave extent, thus arresting the equal and steady flow of promotion which Mr. Childer's Order in Council of 22nd February, 1870, was designed to promote; and what steps the Board intends to take to improve the prospects of these officers.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The seniority of assistant paymasters on promotion is at the present time under nine years, which is less than it was a few years ago. It will be time enough to consider what steps should be taken when the necessity arises; but it may be remarked that the twelve officers at the top of the list did not obtain their promotion to paymaster's rank under about sixteen years seniority.

Regent's Canal.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether his attention has been called to the defective condition of the paling separating a portion of the Regent's Park from the towing-path of the Regent's Canal, permitting an easy access of children from the park on to the towing-path; and whether, in view of the danger incurred by children thus trespassing on the tow-path, he will direct that the paling in question be kept in proper repair.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The Regent's Canal Company is responsible for the repair of this fence, and this complaint as to its condition will be brought to the notice of the company.

Income-Tax.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in the forms for claiming a reduction of income-tax from the 1s. rate to the 9d. rate in respect of earned income, there is any reference to the need for claiming such reduction before 30th September of the year for which the tax is charged; and, if not, whether he will consider the desirability of having such a reference inserted.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The necessity for claiming the relief granted by the Finance Act, 1907, within the period prescribed by the Act, is clearly indicated on the forms referred to.

Ballymahon Evicted Tenant.

MR. J. PHILLIPS (Longford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners will reinstate Gerald Daly, of Ballymahon, county Longford, in a farm from which he was evicted off, the property of W. Molyneux Shouldham, now in the possession of the Commissioners, or about to be purchased by them for the tenants of this estate, and, if not, why will they not do so.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The reply is in the negative. The holding in which Gerald Daly claims reinstatement consisted of a house, yard, and out-offices, and was, therefore, not one to which the Land Law Acts applied. The applicant is not eligible for reinstatement under Section 2 (1) (*d*) of the Act of 1903.

Clonrellick Lands.

SIR WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the lands of Clonrellick, near Monte, county Westmeath, have been purchased by the Commissioners; and, if so, when they will be in a position to allot the same to intending purchasers.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are unable to identify the estate referred to, but if furnished with the name of the owner or late owner they will be in a position to answer the Question.

Claremorris National School.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will inquire if the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland are aware that in the recent local government elections in Ireland the Claremorris National School, which was built by the people of Claremorris, was placed at the disposal of one of the two parties nominating candidates for the county and district councils, and, as the result of the elections showed, placed at the disposal of the party supported by a minority of the electors; whether the Commissioners are aware that the great majority of the parents of the children attending the Claremorris school voted against the candidates to whom the school-house was lent for electioneering purposes; whether the Commissioners are aware that demonstrations were organised in the school by the supporters of the candidates of the minority, which led to regrettable scenes in the streets of Claremorris, culminating on one occasion in a baton charge which the constabulary were compelled to make in the interests of public order and tranquillity; whether any damage to school furniture, windows, maps, slates, or papers was done during these meetings, and, if so, by whom will the expense of making good the damage be borne; whether the Commissioners of Education will say if it is recognised as an essential principle in the management of Irish national schools that schools should not be made available for one particular religious or political section in any district for the purpose of antagonising the views of another section in the same district; and whether the Commissioners propose to take any steps to prevent in future the use of school buildings for objects in connection with which differences of opinion exist amongst the parents whose children attend such schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that, under their rules, no political meeting can be held in any school-house, nor can any political business whatever be transacted therein, and further that school-houses are not permitted to be used for meetings called to support or discuss the claims of candidates for the office of district or county councillor. The Commissioners have no information that the Claremorris National School-house has been used in contravention of the rules in question, but they have directed inquiries to be made into the matter.

Rathdowney Disturbance.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the attack made by the police upon the people of Rathdowney on 20th June last; whether he is aware that peaceable inhabitants were assaulted returning from their work, inside their own houses and the houses of their employers, and that amongst those assaulted by the police on the occasion was their own officer, District Inspector Irwin, acting county inspector, who was in coloured clothes; and will he say what steps he proposes taking in connection with this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As I informed the hon. Member yesterday, a charge of riot is pending against a number of men in this case, and while the matter is subjudice it is undesirable that I should make any statement as to the details.

Sir George Colthurst's Estate.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any decision has yet been arrived at by the Estates Commissioners on the claims of the three tenants excluded from the purchase on the estate of Sir George Colthurst, viz., Messrs. Forrest, Henderson, and Byrne, on the alleged ground that they were demesne tenants; have the Commissioners received a copy of a valuation made in the case of Mr. Henderson in 1890 by Mr. Richard Martin, valuer for the landlord; was this valuation at the instance of the landlord and on the assumption that Mr. Henderson's holding was a purely agricultural one; is it a fact that Mr. Henderson has been paying rent since 1890 on the basis of Mr. Martin's valuation; and, having regard to the fact that these three tenants and their predecessors have been paying rent for generations for the farms held by them and used by them as agricultural tenancies, will he urge upon the Estates Commissioners the desirability of having them admitted to purchase on the same terms as the other tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have made inquiries into the cases of Messrs. Forrest, Henderson, and Byrne, who occupy, as yearly tenants, certain land in the Ardrum demesne of Sir George Colthurst. The vendor has intimated his intention of renovating the buildings and settling his eldest son in what was for many years the residence of the Colthurst family. He is, therefore, unwilling to sell to these three tenants, and the Commissioners do not propose to refuse to declare the other holdings, some hundreds in number, to be a separate estate because the vendor is unwilling, on what would appear to be reasonable grounds, to sell these three holdings in his demesne to yearly tenants. The Commissioners have received from the hon. Member a copy of the valuation of Mr. Martin referred to, but they have no information as to the circumstances in which it was made.

Irish School Teachers' Grievance.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to complaints of teachers of national schools in Ireland of their treatment by the two chief inspectors of the National Education Board and to the fact that complaints of such ill-treatment are rarely brought before the Commissioners, or, if so brought, are seldom properly represented by the officials in question; and whether, as foreshadowed a year or so since, he will hold an inquiry into the general working of the office, in view of the dissatisfaction therewith that prevails throughout Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they have received no complaint from teachers regarding their treatment by the chief inspectors, and the Commissioners have no reason to believe that there is any general dissatisfaction with the manner in which the chief inspectors discharge their duties.

New Forest Military Camps.

SIR ROBERT HOBART: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the date when the sites of the camps for the military manœuvres in the New Forest were finally settled; whether, in accordance with his promise, instructions have been given to the military authorities to purchase supplies for the troops from persons residing in the immediate localities; and whether any contracts have been entered into with persons not residing in the New Forest previous to the date in question; and, if so, will he give instructions to cause his promise to be carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Holmesley and Ashley Walk Camps were fixed on 17th June, and Rochford Common on 16th July. As regards the rest of the Question there appears to be some misunderstanding. I told my hon. friend on 1st June that I hoped the military would find it possible to obtain butter, eggs, and milk locally, but I gave no promise that all contracts should be placed locally or that I would give instructions to units to make their canteen purchases locally. Some of the contracts for bread and meat, forage and fuel, have been placed locally, Canteen purchases are always left entirely to the units to arrange.

Colonial Auditors.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that special terms are now given by the Comptroller and Auditor-General to local auditors and assistant auditors in the Crown Colonies and Protectorates who have volunteered to come home from unhealthy climates, he will explain why it was necessary to give these special terms to these officials serving in such climates in addition to granting them the privilege of returning to the United Kingdom.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain why the ex-Second Division clerks in the Exchequer and Audit Department, who have voluntarily accepted liability to serve abroad, and some of whom are serving abroad, are not put on the same scale of salary as the nominated members who entered the old Colonial Audit Branch without any actual educational test examination.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain how, seeing that members of the Colonial Audit Branch now serving abroad are offered special terms on coming home on condition that they remain liable for a further term of service abroad, this liability applies in the case of a man who returns on account of a breakdown in health, and who under the old system would have returned under similar circumstances to a scale of salary only equal to that of the old Second Division clerks.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain why, seeing that those members of the Colonial Audit Branch who, prior to amalgamation, returned to headquarters after service abroad, either on account of ill-health or unfitness, were placed on a scale of salary similar to that of the old Second Division and remained liable for service abroad, a salary based on an initial salary of £100 per annum is now offered to those who return under similar conditions, while it was denied to those former members of the Second Division who became examiners at the reorganisation in 1905.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain why in the Exchequer and Audit Department two bodies of men are employed on identical work with identical periods of service to their credit, the one, however, receiving from £65 to £115 per annum more salary in consequence of service performed on petty accounts abroad for which they were liable on entry and had been already adequately recompensed financially.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain why, seeing that members of the Colonial Audit Branch who entered by the system which has now broken down, and who were sent abroad in many cases with insufficient training, are offered with the sanction of the Treasury special terms if they elect to come home and enter the main office, a considerable body of men who entered under the Order in Council of 21st March, 1890, who became examiners at the reorganisation of 1905, and from whose ranks men have been chosen for the examination of accounts in the Colonial Audit Branch, and volunteers have been called for to serve abroad, are compelled to remain for periods varying from twelve to nineteen years at a considerable financial disadvantage as compared with contemporaries in other offices with inferior certificates who have benefited under the Order in Council of December, 1907.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain why, seeing that members of the Colonial Audit Branch of the Exchequer and Audit Department who joined that branch before the amalgamation did so for the express purpose of a career abroad, and that the Department now finds great difficulty in filling vacancies which occur in the Colonies and Protectorates, it was considered necessary to offer them exceptional terms as an inducement to return home.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain why the six nominated members of the old Colonial Audit Branch of the Exchequer and Audit Department, who were serving at headquarters at the time of the amalgamation on a scale of salary, £70, £5, £100, being unfit for service abroad consequent on lack of training or health, were immediately advanced to a salary of £100 per annum, whereas certain Second Division clerks who were transferred to the Colonial Audit Branch, consequent on the breakdown of the system till then in force, were compelled to continue on the scale that the Colonial Audit Branch men had been receiving.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I have nothing to add to the previous replies in connection with these points.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

British-built Warships.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will make it a condition of the retention of firms upon the list of contractors to the Admiralty that they will undertake to insert in all contracts for the construction of ships of war for any foreign Power a provision that in the event of such Power desiring to sell any such warship it shall be first offered to His Majesty's Government.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): It is not proposed to insist on the insertion of a condition in the terms suggested. As my hon. friend will observe, once a ship built in this country has been delivered to the foreign country to which it belongs, the contractor would have no means of enforcing against such foreign Power the provision which he suggests.

Mr. HERBERT: Would not His Majesty's Government be able to enforce it?

Mr. McKENNA: The contract would not be between the Government and a foreign Power. It would be between the contractor and a foreign Power, and the contractor would have no power to enforce it.

Mr. HERBERT: Might not the Government be given the right under the contract?

Mr. McKENNA: I do not think any contract made between a contractor and a foreign Government could give the British Government such a right.

Mr. HERBERT: Are the right hon. Gentleman's advisers unable to settle any form of contract which would give such a right?

Mr. McKENNA: I do not think it is conceivable that any form of contract between a contractor and a foreign Government would give it.

Mr. HERBERT: Will the right hon. Gentleman give me an opportunity of submitting such a form of contract?

Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): Might not the right hon. Gentleman insert a clause giving the right of pre-emption?

Mr. McKENNA: The British Government cannot impose on a contractor a condition that they shall have a right of pre-emption on his ship.

Apprentices on Naval Contract Work.

Mr. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the firm of Messrs. Hawthorn and Leslie, Wallsend, have drafted a number of apprentices to Devonport to take the place of men withdrawn from work on H.M.S. "Temeraire" on account of a dispute as to wages; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

Mr. McKENNA: The question as to what action I should propose to take in the circumstances alleged by the hon. Member does not arise, as there appears to be no foundation for the statements made.

Mr. CURRAN: From what source did the right hon. Gentleman get that information?

Mr. McKENNA: From the Dockyard at Devonport. I got it by telegraph this afternoon.

Wallsend Slipway Company's Employees.

Mr. CURRAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the Wallsend Slipway Company have compelled about a dozen draughtsmen, under threat of instant dismissal, to perform fitters' work on H.M.S. "Superb," at Elswick; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

Mr. McKENNA: We have no knowledge of the circumstances set out in the hon. Member's Question; but assuming the facts to be as stated, there does not appear to be any ground for action by the Admiralty.

Mr. CURRAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this is a breach of the Fair Wages Clause?

Mr. McKENNA: I have examined the question and am unable to discover that the alleged circumstances constitute a breach of the clause. It does not deal with fair wages at all.

Mr. CURRAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the firm of Leslie's have Government contracts overdue, and are asking for an extension of time on the ground of labour disputes?

Mr. McKENNA: I should like notice of that Question.

Admiralty Payments to Quantity Surveyors.

Mr. GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what sums have been paid by the Admiralty in each of the last five years to firms of quantity surveyors; how many firms have been employed, and what amounts have been paid to each.

Mr. McKENNA:

Fees paid to Quantity Surveyors from 1903 to 1908.

Naval Works Acts and Vote 10 Works.

Name.	1903–4.	1904–5.	1905–6.	1906–7.	1907–8.
	£	£	£	£	£
Corderoy, G., & Co.	32,842	30,739	28,411	19,894	13,671
Deacon, T. M.	—	809	315	—	137
Franklin & Andrews	—	128	73	29	—
Gardiner & Theobald	—	122	67	—	—
Hitchen, T.	—	—	264	—	—
Hodgson, H. M.	—	—	—	—	153
Hunt & Steward	—	—	46	—	—
Lawrence, B., & Co.	—	59	—	—	94
Leaming, J., & Sons	—	457	124	145	—
Lorrimer, Fairbairn & Lightbody	—	53	63	18	18
Mann, C. J., & Sons	711	1,222	1,015	1,562	1,615
Moreham & Gardiner	—	53	123	—	—
Rualt & Young	—	280	21	—	—
Strudwick, W. H. & P. B.	622	212	—	—	—
Welch & Atkinson	83	—	—	—	—
Widnell & Trollope	1,442	1,609	5,142	597	509
Totals	35,700	35,743	35,664	22,245	16,197

Defence of Sea Trade Routes.

Mr. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the Report of the Treasury Committee upon the subject of national insurance for merchant ships, and of its conclusion that the latter must depend for protection exclusively upon the Navy, and in view of the fact that the Navy list shows that we have but sixty-seven unarmoured cruisers, most, if not all, of which would be required for service with our battle fleets, with which our armoured cruisers are also mainly intended to serve, the Government are prepared to guarantee the security of our trade routes in time of war.

MR. McKENNA: While we do not commit ourselves to the accuracy of the statements made in the preamble to the Question, the reply is in the affirmative.

German Naval Policy.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, having regard to the fact that Germany has laid down thirty-six destroyers in the last three years, he will consider the advisability of increasing the number of those to be laid down during a similar period by this country from seven to a figure corresponding with that of Germany.

MR. McKENNA: I am unable to verify the figures on which the hon. Member has based his statement that during the last three years seven British destroyers were laid down. As to the number to be laid down, the hon. Member will observe that in the present year it is proposed to lay down sixteen.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: Is it not the fact that the German destroyers for this year are already laid down?

MR. McKENNA: The German year differs from the British year, and that makes it impossible to draw a comparison.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Is it not a fact that the German destroyers for this year are already laid down?

MR. McKENNA: It is impossible to make a comparison, as the year's programmes do not cover the same period.

MR. ASHLEY: Are we really to understand that the Government do not know what has been the German programme in regard to destroyers for the last three years?

MR. McKENNA: The Admiralty are perfectly aware, but that does not arise out of the Question.

H.M.S. "Invincible"—Fair Wage Clause.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can now say why Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company, Elswick, have not carried out the Fair Wage Clause in their contract on H.M.S. "Invincible," at the Elswick Works, with regard to the wages paid to the electrical wire-workers.

MR. McKENNA: The contractors state that they pay the wages generally accepted as current for competent workmen in their trade, and the evidence which so far has been put before the Admiralty is not inconsistent with that statement.

*MR. HUDSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this question has been pending since March last, and as late as last week thirty-five of the men were paid at a figure below the standard rate which obtains in the district?

MR. McKENNA: We have examined the evidence we have been able to obtain and are not satisfied that wages below the current rate are being paid.

*MR. HUDSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman place himself in communication with the trade union of the electrical workers and obtain from them a statement as to the wages current in the district?

MR. McKENNA: We have had a communication, but I am not sure if it came from the trade union. I rather think it did.

German Naval Expenditure.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state by how much the naval expenditure of Germany was above or below the Estimates in the years 1903 to 1907, inclusive; and whether any reports have been submitted to the Admiralty as to the assistance rendered to German naval administration and expenditure by the State ownership of canals and railways.

MR. McKENNA: The difference between the naval expenditure of Germany and the money voted is as follows—In 1903–4 there was £149,162 more expenditure than was voted. In 1904–5 there was £464,600 less; in 1905–6 there was £123,477 less; in 1906–7 there was £341,507 less; for

1907–8 the total naval expenditure is not yet available. We have no official information as regards the latter part of the Question.

MR. BELLAIRS: What is the authority for these figures? They do not agree with the Berlin *Imperial Gazette* figures?

MR. McKENNA: They are official figures. I will inquire as to the divergence.

The Admiralty and the Press.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions forbid naval officers holding any communications with the Press and so prevent them from contradicting statements of a defamatory character; and whether in the absence of any guidance in the King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions, he can state if they are free to take proceedings for libel when a newspaper of repute submits them to malicious and defamatory attacks.

MR. McKENNA: As regards the first part of the Question, the existing rule, as laid down in circular letter of 21st November last, is that all persons belonging to the Fleet are forbidden to write for publication or to publish or cause to be published, either directly or indirectly, any matter or information relating to the naval service unless the permission of the Admiralty has been first obtained. With regard to the second part of the Question, an officer on half-pay or on the retired list would be free to act, should he so elect, without formal reference to the Admiralty, subject to the paramount interests of the naval service. An officer on full pay or serving under the Admiralty on salary would, as a matter of discipline, apply to the Admiralty for sanction of his proposed proceedings.

MR. BELLAIRS: In the event of its being against the paramount interest of the Navy for an officer on full pay to bring a libel action, do the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues recognise their special obligation to defend an officer whose reputation is assailed by falsehoods circulated in a paper of repute?

MR. McKENNA: I have no case before me in which it is alleged that it is not in the interests of the service that any officer on full pay should bring an action for libel. I cannot consider the question unless I have a specific case before me.

MR. BELLAIRS: Is any statement going to be made in regard to the alleged occurrence in the Channel Fleet under Lord Charles Beresford?

MR. McKENNA: That is an entirely different question. It has nothing to do with the Question on the Paper.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): Does the regulation quoted apply to naval officers employed at the Admiralty or on the staff of the Admiralty?

MR. McKENNA: The regulations would apply universally through the service.

Chain Cable Contracts.

MR. J. JOHNSON (Gateshead): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Government has extended the period of a contract for chain cables and mooring chains entered into with several firms of chain-makers, under which arrangement other employers have been debarred from tendering; if so, will he say on what grounds such preference is justified; and whether, in future, he will see that equal opportunity is given to all firms to tender for such contracts.

MR. McKENNA: Pending the preparation of certain technical details for a new contract, the existing arrangements have been temporarily continued to meet current requirements. As soon as the necessary particulars are available the usual opportunity will be afforded to all firms.

Land Trade between Persia and British India.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the disturbed condition of Persia has adversely affected the traffic to and from India by the Quetta-Nushki route.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The figures of the land trade between Persia and British India *via* Sind and British Baluchistan, the bulk of which, presumably, went by the Nushki route, show an increase for 1907-8 as compared with the two preceding years. The value of the total trade by the Nushki route for 1907-8 was the biggest on record.

Sylhet Bomb Factory.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether a branch of the Manicktollah bomb factory has been discovered in Sylhet?

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has no official information on this subject, but he gathers from the newspapers that arrests have been made at a place in the Sylhet district of persons who admit being engaged in the manufacture of bombs for revolutionary purposes.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Was this information obtained through Reuter's agency?

MR. BUCHANAN: I cannot say.

Gun Running on the Afghan Frontier.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the India Office has information to the effect that another large caravan of arms is in transit through Persian Baluchistan to the Afghan frontier; and whether it is proposed, by strengthening our patrol in the Persian Gulf, or by representation to the Sultan of Muscat, to deal with a state of affairs which is a menace to the North-West frontier.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Answer to the first Question is in the negative; the last caravan of which the Secretary of State has information must have reached its destination some weeks ago. Every possible means is taken by action on the coast and otherwise to stop the traffic, and, as was stated by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on the 30th June, the question of the traffic at Muscat is engaging the attention of the Conference now sitting at Brussels.

*MR. REES: It seems there is a regular gun-running season for three months in the year.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Can the right hon. Gentleman say from what country the arms conveyed by this caravan came?

MR. BUCHANAN: I am unable to say.

AN HON. MEMBER suggested that the Government should send the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs out to patrol the Persian Gulf, or to act as Minister Plenipotentiary to the Sultan of Muscat.

Sedition in Northern India.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Muslim community of Madras, in public meeting assembled, has expressed its condemnation of the growing sedition of Northern India, and assured the Government of its own staunch loyalty to British rule.

MR. BUCHANAN: I have seen in the Press a notice of the meeting referred to, and my hon. friend is no doubt aware that meetings of a similar character have been held in other parts of India.

Indian Civil Service.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the local Governments and high judicial authorities consulted, condemned the proposed separation of executive and judicial functions in the Indian Civil Service; and, if so, whether the opinions of such Governments and authorities will be made public.

MR. BUCHANAN: The opinions of the local Governments and other authorities consulted on this subject have not yet reached the Secretary of State: it is not possible, therefore, to say whether they are papers which could suitably be made public.

Indian Excise Administration.

SIR HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the reply of the Government of India to the statement relative to Excise administration, submitted to him on the 17th October last and forwarded for consideration and report to the Government of India, has now been received; and whether he will lay Papers upon the Table before the end of the present session.

MR. BUCHANAN: I regret to say that the reply has not yet been received.

Calcutta Liquor Shops—Hour of Closing.

SIR HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Indian Excise Commission recommended that liquor shops in India should be closed at 9 p.m., and that this recommendation was approved by the Government of India; and whether any special reasons exist for the extension of the hour of closing to 10 p.m. in the case of liquor shops situated in the neighbourhood of mills in Calcutta.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Indian Excise Commission recommended that as a general rule the closing hour should be 9 o'clock, but that this limit should be relaxed in special cases, when a special fee should be levied. The Government of Bengal has been advised by the Calcutta Licensing Committee that extension is necessary in the case of particular shops in certain localities where owing to late shifts at mills, docks, etc., the workers do not leave work until a late hour. Such cases are dealt with on their merits by the Board of Revenue, under power given to it by the Excise Act.

Calcutta Country and Foreign Liquor Licences.

SIR HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether the Indian Excise Commission recommended the entire separation of the country liquor and foreign liquor licences in Calcutta, with such a redistribution of facilities as would not increase the number of sites; whether this proposal was provisionally approved by the Government of India; and whether effect has been given to the proposal under the resolution of the Government of Bengal recently issued upon this subject.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Answer to the first two Questions is in the affirmative. With regard to the last Question. the Government of Bengal has not given complete effect to the recommendation, as separation cannot, in their opinion, be effected in Calcutta without an undesirable increase in the number of liquor shops. But it has issued instructions which will reduce considerably the number of cases in which licences for the two classes of liquor are held conjointly.

The Sentence on Mr. Tilak.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Secretary of State for India will recommend His Majesty the King to extend his clemency to Mr. Tilak, in view of the position he holds in the Indian national movement, and remit a portion of his sentence, with a view to allaying to some extent the present unrest in India."

*MR. REES asked if the right hon. Gentleman thought that expressions of sympathy in the House with notorious enemies of British rule were likely to have the effect of "allaying to some extent the present unrest in India."

MR. BUCHANAN: I think the Answer I have to make will cover both Questions. It is impossible for the Secretary of State to take the action suggested in the Question. My hon. friend hardly realises the nature of the charge on which Mr. Tilak was convicted and the circumstances of the trial. The trial lasted ten days before a judge of the Bombay High Court with a special jury. Mr. Tilak was convicted by seven out of nine jurymen of offences under Section 124*a* and 153*a* of the Indian Penal Code. At the beginning of the trial he exercised his full rights of challenge, objecting to six Europeans, one Jew, and one Hindu. He spoke for several days in his own defence. In passing sentence the judge said—"The articles are seething with sedition; they preach violence; they speak of murder with approval; and the cowardly and atrocious act of committing murder with bombs not only seems to meet with the prisoner's approval, but he hails the advent of the bomb in India as if something had come to India for its good." I think the hon. Member will agree with me that writings of such a character cannot fairly be held to fall under the exception made by the Penal Code in favour of "comments expressing disapprobation of the measures or action of the Government with a view to obtaining their alteration by lawful means." The Government deliberately instituted these proceedings in a Court of Law, and in a case of this kind for them immediately to traverse the verdict of the Court or precipitately to set aside its sentence, would be to stultify themselves.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked if the article could now be published as a Parliamentary Paper to give the House and the country the opportunity for learning what foundation there was for the language used by the Judge.

MR. BUCHANAN said he could make no promise of the kind.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): Can a copy be placed in the Library?

MR. BUCHANAN: I can give no pledge.

*MR. REES asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that copies could be obtained at the office of the paper called *India*.

SIR H. COTTON asked if the substance of the article published in *The Times* was correct.

MR. BUCHANAN: I cannot say.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) asked if the proportion of seven Europeans to two natives was the usual proportion on special juries in Bombay.

MR. BUCHANAN: I cannot say. There were on the jury seven Europeans and two Parsees, and the Judge was a Parsee gentleman.

MR. LUPTON: And then there was a division of opinion on the jury?

MR. BUCHANAN: Yes; I have already stated so.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the sentence of six years' transportation recently passed upon Mr. Tilak can be made the subject of appeal; whether a sentence of transportation involves the removal of the prisoner to a penal settlement; and, if so, what is the nature of the punishment to which he is there subject.

MR. BUCHANAN: No appeal lies to the High Court from any order or sentence passed by a Judge exercising the original jurisdiction of the Court, but points of law may be reserved for consideration. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council may give special leave to appeal in cases where grave and substantial injustice appears to have been done. The appeal, in such cases, lies to the Judicial Committee. A sentence of transportation may involve the removal of a prisoner to a penal settlement, but does not necessarily do so; the prisoner may be sent instead to a Central Jail appointed for the purpose. A prisoner sentenced to transportation is subject for a time to solitary confinement: he is then put to some form of work with the other prisoners, and may obtain various privileges by good conduct.

Bombay Factory Workers' Disturbances.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether there have been disturbances amongst the factory workers of Bombay; and, if so, whether he has any information showing that these are largely attributable to the excessive hours of work; and whether the Government proposes to take any steps in the matter.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State understands that the disturbances which have occurred in the factory quarter of Bombay are not exclusively connected with labour questions, although, as my hon. friend is aware, the subject of the hours of labour has recently been investigated by the Factory Commission, whose Report is now under consideration. He is informed that they are connected with political agitation, by which pressure has been exercised on the Hindu mill hands to come out on strike, and, in some cases, to attack Europeans. The Mahomedan factory workers have not joined in the rioting, and resent the enforced loss of wages.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): Had the Factory Inspector to be afforded police protection?

MR. BUCHANAN: I have seen a statement to that effect.

Law of Transportation in India.

Sir H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if he can state what is the law in regard to transportation in India; and whether there is any authority or precedent for sending a convicted offender to the Andamans for a period of less than seven years.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The law in regard to transportation in India is contained in Sections 53, 55, 57–59 of the Indian Penal Code, and the sections of that code prescribing transportation as the penalty for particular offences. Section 124a enables the person convicted under that section to be "punished with transportation for life *or any other shorter term.*" There is, therefore, no reason to doubt the legality of a sentence of transportation for less than seven years.

Sir H. COTTON: Is there not a statutory rule which limits transportation to cases of seven years punishment and does not permit it in the case of persons over forty-five years of age?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I am not aware of that, but I would refer my hon. friend to the various sections of the Penal Code which govern the law relating to transportation.

Prosecutions for Sedition in India.

Sir H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he will grant a Return of prosecutions for seditious speeches and writings which have been instituted in India since 1st January, 1907, showing the names of the persons charged, the courts which tried them, the precise character of the charge, and the decision in each case.

Mr. BUCHANAN: If the hon. Member will move for a Return the Secretary of State will instruct the Government of India to prepare it.

Sentences for Treason at Tinnevelly.

Sir H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether Chidambaram Pillay and Subramania Siva, who were lately convicted of treason and were sentenced to transportation for life and for ten years respectively by the district judge of Tinnevelly, have appealed against the sentence; and, if so, what has been the result of the appeal.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has no information as to whether an appeal has been filed.

Treatment of Prisoners in India.

Sir H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the character of the sentences which are being passed in India on persons who are accused of seditious utterances; and whether the Government will consider the propriety of issuing instructions which will prohibit the herding of political offenders with common criminals.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State does not consider it necessary to take action in the manner suggested by the hon. Member. The punishment for offences under Section 124*a* Indian Penal Code varies over a wide range, from fine without any imprisonment through simple imprisonment and rigorous imprisonment up to transportation for life. As regards simple imprisonment, Inspectors-General of Gaols already have authority to order the provision of separate accommodation for prisoners in certain cases.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Is there anything in Indian legislation which makes incitement to murder a political offence?

[No Answer was returned.]

Indian Relief Works.

Mr. R. HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether it is proposed to lay before Parliament papers giving an account of the relief works recently carried out in India, particularly in the United Provinces, in continuation of Famine Commission Reports already issued.

Mr. BUCHANAN: On the conclusion of the present relief operations full reports regarding them will be submitted by the several local Governments, and the Secretary of State will then be glad to consider whether any, and, if any, what Papers might with advantage be presented.

Bombay Factories Commission.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the India Office has information that the factory workers in Bombay have deprecated interference with the system under which they work; and whether the Factory Commission has reported that the hours of work in Bombay factories are not excessive.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Commission's Report, which will be presented shortly, will show the hon. Member that he is under a misapprehension in respect of both points of his Question.

Carib Canal, St. Vincent.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the original cost of the Carib Canal in St. Vincent, and by whom was it borne.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): I cannot supply the information, but the Governor will be asked to do so, if my hon. friend wishes.

*MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the disuse of the Carib freshwater Canal in the island of St. Vincent has prejudicially affected the districts which it formerly served; and whether its reopening is stated by the Governor of the Colony to be an essential preliminary to their development.

COLONEL SEELY: Yes, Sir, and recognising these considerations, the Secretary of State has agreed to a loan to Mr. Porter, in addition to the free grant of £1,600 already sanctioned, though not a loan from the invested portion of the Eruption Fund.

St. Vincent Eruption Relief Fund.

MR. LAMONT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will state the total amount subscribed for the St. Vincent Eruption Relief Fund, and the amount of the unexpended balance of that fund.

COLONEL SEELY: The amount subscribed was £73,340. The unexpended balance consists of the £25,000 invested. The rest or practically all the rest has now been expended or definitely allocated for expenditure.

Carib Canal Loan.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state when the despatches from the Governor of the Windwards, recommending that the Secretary of State should assent to a loan from the Eruption Fund for the purpose of reopening the Carib Canal, will be laid upon the Table.

COLONEL SEELY: It is not proposed to lay the despatches. The chief despatches recommending a loan are marked "Confidential," except one, and that deals with the business and family affairs of private individuals, and could not properly be published.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of the Memorandum from the Governor of the Windwards with regard to the Carib Canal question which was read by the Administrator of St. Vincent at the meeting of the Legislative Council on 30th May.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State has just received a copy of the Memorandum referred to. He does not consider it necessary to lay it.

Parsee Indian in Natal.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Mr. Shapurji, a Parsee Indian resident of Charlestown, Natal, who has been arrested and ordered to leave the Transvaal as a prohibited immigrant although he was able to fulfil all the educational requirements of the Immigration Laws of that Colony; and whether, in assenting to this law, His Majesty's Government understood the test of desirability to be one of race or of education.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State has made telegraphic inquiry with regard to this case and other British Indian complaints, but no reply has yet been received and, pending the Governor's

Report, I am not in a position to make any statement.

Island of St. Vincent Revenue.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the floating balance of revenue of the Island of St. Vincent at the end of the last financial year.

COLONEL SEELY: On the 31st of March last the surplus of assets was £6,258 3s. 4d. Against this, however, there is a sum of £700 due to the Treasury at home, in refund of an over-payment from Parliamentary Grants in Aid.

St. Vincent Relief Fund—The Carib Canal.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what were the purposes for which the St. Vincent Relief Fund was collected: and what was the cause of the disuse of the Carib Canal.

COLONEL SEELY: The relief fund was subscribed for the relief of distress. The disuse of the canal was caused by the eruptions.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when he will lay Papers upon the Table with regard to his refusal of the request from the Government of St. Vincent for authority to make a loan from the Eruption Fund.

COLONEL SEELY: I would refer the hon. Gentleman to the Answer to the hon. Member for Blackpool. It is not proposed to lay Papers on this subject.

South African Compensation Fund.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the loss of £41,420 7s. 11d. entailed on the Exchequer through the failure of the Colonial Office to reply to the High Commissioner of South Africa as to the allocation of the charge for the administration of the Compensations Fund between Great Britain and the Transvaal; whether the responsibility for this loss has been brought home to any particular official; and what action has been taken in the matter.

COLONEL SEELY: I would refer my hon. friend to my reply to a similar Question yesterday.

Crown Colonists Stranded in England.

MR. OWEN PHILIPPS (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is any public fund to defray the cost of return to their native land of inhabitants of the Crown Colonies who may be unfortunately stranded in England: and, if not, whether the Government will favourably consider the question of providing a fund for this purpose.

COLONEL SEELY: There is no public fund which could be ear-marked to the purposes which my hon. friend mentions. The matter is one of great difficulty, but the Secretary of State proposes to take it into early consideration.

Kingston Wharves and Railways.

MR. OWEN PHILIPPS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Governor of Jamaica, since his return to the island, has been able to advise him of any progress in the scheme for connecting the Government railways with all the wharves of Kingston; and whether he is aware that in the neighbouring island of Cuba the ports are being rapidly developed in connection with the railways.

COLONEL SEELY: The Governor has not yet reported as to the progress of the scheme referred to by my hon. friend, but I have no doubt that he will do so as soon as he can. I am sorry that I have no official information as to what is being done in Cuba.

King's House, Jamaica.

MR. OWEN PHILLIPS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the damage to the King's House at Jamaica, caused by the earthquake in January, 1907, has yet been repaired; and, if not, will he ascertain when the King's House will be again fit for habitation by the Governor of the Colony.

COLONEL SEELY: The money for rebuilding King's House in St. Andrew has been voted by the Legislative Council, and the Vote has been approved by the Secretary of State. The Governor's recent visit to this country was chiefly concerned with the arrangements for this and other public building work, and I understand that the question of the acceptance of a tender for the restoration of King's House is now under the Governor's consideration. The Governor will be asked when he anticipates being able to re-occupy the house.

The Sultanate of Bruni.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government, when establishing a British residency in the Sultanate of Bruni, has also assumed any responsibility other than advisory to that State, and, if so, what are the limitations of any such authority prescribed by His Majesty's Government; will he say from what source year by year since such recent residency was established the expenditure connected therewith, either directly or indirectly, has been defrayed: and if any, how much, of the money applied as above-mentioned has been borrowed or granted from the purse of either the Federated Malay States or from that of the Straits Settlements; will he state the amounts given or lent by either or both, the rate of interest charged on such loans, and what prospect there is of repayment.

COLONEL SEELY: The treaty with the Sultan of Brunei, which was signed in 1905, provides that the advice of the British Resident must be taken and acted upon in all questions in Brunei other than those affecting the Mohammedan religion in order that a similar system may be established to that existing in other Malay States now under British protection. His Majesty's Government, therefore, through the Resident, control the whole administration of the State, except where religious matters are concerned. The Resident of Brunei is also Resident of Labuan, which is now part of the Straits Settlements, and in view of that fact he draws a salary from Straits Settlements funds, a sum of £600 a year being paid from Imperial funds to the Straits Settlements in consideration of the Consular work performed by this officer. The other expenses of the Residential system are borne by Brunei funds. To enable the Government of the State to buy up a number of monopolies and concessions, and to put the new system into working order, the Federated Malay States advanced to Brunei the sum of $200,000, without interest. I cannot say when this sum is likely to be repaid. No grant or loan has been made by the Straits Settlements.

Trade of Brunei.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies the value of the export and import trade of Brunei for the last year for which figures can be obtained; whether a poll tax of $2 per head has been imposed on the Kadayans in the Muara district, and, if so, by whose authority; whether such an imposition is not directly in contravention of Clause 3 in the Farms lease held by His Highness the Rajah of Sarawak from the late Sultan of Brunei; whether it was proposed to exact a similar tax from the Brunei Malays; and whether the cause of remitting, or of not imposing, such tax in such quarters was the expressed or the anticipated intention of these Malays to emigrate from Brunei.

COLONEL SEELY: I am unable to furnish any reliable figures as to the Trade of Bruni. In 1906 the dutiable imports were valued at $60,878 and the dutiable exports at $1,560, but no record was taken of the value of articles on which no duty was levied. The Secretary of State has no information with regard to the other points raised by the hon. Member, but the High Commissioner will be asked for a Report.

West Indian Banana Trade.

*MR. LAMONT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that an annual subsidy, at first of £10,000 and latterly of £20,000, has been paid out of the Treasury since July, 1899, to the Imperial Direct West India Mail Service, principally in order to encourage a trade in bananas between Jamaica and England; whether during the financial year 1907–8 a total of 15,847,580 bunches of bananas were exported from Jamaica, of which 14,505,911 bunches were shipped to the United States and only 1,239,500 to England; and whether he will give notice to terminate this contract at its expiry on 15th January, 1911, seeing that £20,000 paid by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom for the advantage of receiving 1,239,500 bunches of bananas is equivalent to the bounty of fourpence per bunch, and that a sufficient supply of this fruit can be obtained, without subsidy, from other West Indian Colonies, from the Canary Islands, and from other parts of the globe.

COLONEL SEELY: I am aware generally of the conditions of the service referred to. The question as to the renewal or termination of the service is one which will no doubt receive very careful consideration, but, as the contract does not expire for some years, it would be premature to consider it now.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): May I ask the hon. Gentleman if this subsidy was not granted in order to assist in developing the banana trade generally, and whether this proportion of 14,000,000 bunches and 1,000,000 bunches to the United States and England respectively does not represent the purest principles of free trade?

COLONEL SEELY: I do not know what the hon. Gentleman means by the "purest principles of free trade." I should hardly think he is a good judge. I would only add that my hon. friend is quite right in supposing that there are other considerations involved besides the encouragement of the trade between Jamaica and England.

*MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Was not this contract made in the reign of the protectionist Party?

COLONEL SEELY: I do not know what the particular views of the Party were at the time this contract was entered into.

Dominica Light Railway.

*MR. LAMONT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether proposals have recently been made to the Government of the Leeward Islands regarding the formation of a company to build, on the land-grant system, a light railway into the interior of the island of Dominica, with a view to the development of its resources; whether negotiations are in progress; and, if so, whether the Colonial Office regards the project with a favourable eye.

COLONEL SEELY: Yes, Sir, a syndicate has been in negotiation with the Government of Dominica since about a year ago with regard to the construction of a light railway up the Layou valley. The Secretary of State regards the project favourably.

Imports of Live Cattle.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state what countries have made representations to His Majesty's Government with reference to unrestricted importation of live cattle, and the nature of such representations; and whether, in view of the fact that all foreign countries impose quarantine restrictions of a severe nature, he can state if any have made any suggestions for reciprocal arrangements for free trade and abandon of quarantine restrictions imposed by them.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): Since the present Government have been in office representations have been made by the Governments of Norway and Sweden asking that the regulations prohibiting the importation of live cattle from those countries might be revoked. The Answer to the last part of the Question is in the negative.

Cancellation of Venezuelan Concessions.

MR. H. GOOCH (Camberwell, Peckham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware of the cancellation by the Venezuelan Government of certain concessions held by British subjects; and, if so, what steps he has taken or proposes to take in the matter.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am aware that the Venezuelan Government have cancelled two concessions, the one for the manufacture and the sale of matches, originally granted to a Venezuelan citizen and subsequently transferred to a Venezuelan company, and the other for working the salt deposits of Venezuela, originally granted to a British subject and subsequently transferred to a Venezuelan company, the shares of both enterprises being now, it is understood, controlled by two British companies respectively. The matter is at present under consideration; it presents many difficulties owing to local peculiarities which operate adversely to the interests of all countries.

Franco-Canadian Treaty.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is now in a position to lay Papers upon the Table relating to the Franco-Canadian negotiations in respect of the most-favoured nation clause.

SIR EDWARD GREY: For the present I am not in a position to add to the Answer which I returned to the hon. Member's Question on 30th ultimo.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: Are there any means of expediting the negotiations?

SIR EDWARD GREY: As far as I understand, the subject of the treaty is still under consideration in Paris.

The Release of Mr. Clark Kennedy.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the rapid release of Mr. Clark Kennedy from the brigands in Morocco was owing to the fact that the Government announced that no ransom would be paid; and if this resolution will be strictly adhered to in the future.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer to the first part of the Question is that I do not know. If British subjects, in pursuit of their own pleasure or business, and in no public character, are captured by brigands in Morocco, there will certainly not be any advance from the British Exchequer for the purposes of ransom, and anyone who counts upon it under any circumstances is likely to be disappointed.

MR. FELL: Will that also apply to captures by Smyrna and other brigands?

SIR EDWARD GREY: We have issued a warning to the effect that in no case must people expect the Government to advance money for their ransom.

MR. ASHLEY: Has the right hon. Gentleman made an exception in the case of Raisuli?

SIR EDWARD GREY: He is not a British subject. He is under British protection, which is not the same thing.

The Czar of Russia.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information showing that it is the intention of the Czar of Russia to pay a visit to this country before the end of September; and, if so, whether it is the intention of the Government to associate themselves in any way with such a visit?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No intention has been expressed by the Czar of visiting this country during the present year.

The Scots College at Rome.

MR. SUTHERLAND (Elgin Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the cause of the delay in bringing to trial the assailants of the students of the Scots College at Rome; and whether he can state if and when the trial is likely to take place.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The trial was to have taken place this month, the delay being accounted for by the necessity of collecting additional evidence and of ascertaining how far the injuries of the victims were likely to be permanent, with a view to the proper assessment of the penalties. It now appears, however, that the accused have appealed against the judgment of the Court of First Instance, committing them for trial by the Court of Assize, and it is to be feared that the case will not be heard before November. His Majesty's Ambassador will continue to do all in his power to secure an early hearing, and I may add that the legal adviser to His Majesty's Consulate has been instructed to watch the proceedings.

The Russo-Japanese War—British Claims.

MR. GRETTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how many outstanding claims for damage to British shipping and property during the late war in the Far East remain unsettled; and what steps are being taken to obtain a settlement.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The position as it stood last year was stated generally in an Answer I gave to the hon. Member for the Cockermouth Division of Cumberland on the 23rd of May of last year. I have stated the present position of specific cases in answers I have given in the course of the present and last month to various hon. Members, and particularly in the replies I made yesterday to the hon. Member for the St. Austell Division of Cornwall. No later developments have occurred.

The Imprisoned Suffragists.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if, in view of the statement that the imprisoned suffragettes are more or less associated with criminals, and that their methods have been encouraged by references to former riots and breaking park railings by a Cabinet Minister, he will see that the ladies shall not associate with or be treated as ordinary criminals.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): None of these prisoners are allowed to associate with ordinary criminals.

Medical Officers' Reports.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the apparent lack of uniformity in the reports of medical officers of health, he has considered the advisability of issuing a Circular to local authorities informing them that they must include in the Annual Report of the medical officers of health to the Home Office all premises visited in connection with infectious disease, provided home work is found to be carried on.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have no authority to issue the instructions suggested in the Question, nor would they meet the case, as Sections 109 and 110 of the Factory Act do not apply to all kinds of home work. The Home Office has done what it could to secure uniformity in the Reports of the medical officers of health by issuing forms of tables, but the use of the forms is not compulsory.

Out-workers Returns.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the continued and increasing discrepancy between the total number of addresses of out-workers reported by medical officers of health as forwarded to other councils, and that returned having been received by other councils; whether, according to the Home Office Return [Cd. 3986], those reported as received were only 34,377, whilst 50,579 had been forwarded; and, if so, whether he will confer with the Postmaster General as to where the 16,202 missing lists have gone.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am aware that the discrepancy between the number of addresses respectively forwarded and received by local authorities rose from 7,350 in 1904, and 5,300 in 1905 to over 16,000 in 1906. It will be seen on examination of the Return that the increase is chiefly a London increase, and probably the key to the problem lies here. I am not prepared to say positively what is the reason for it, but the increase, which cannot, I think, be accounted for as merely an increase in the fringe of out-workers outside London working for London employers, probably indicates an increasing thoroughness on the part of London authorities in enforcing the Act, both in forwarding lists themselves and in searching the lists sent to them for duplicates of names already on their lists. It may be noticed especially that the City of London forwarded 14,376 addresses in 1906, as against only 3,334 in 1904. I will consider the point further when the figures for 1907 are available.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to Table 6 in Part 2, in the Summary of Reports of Medical Officers of Health for 1906, to the Home Office, wherein it is shown that the number of names of out-workers received are greatly in excess of the number of inspections made in Stepney, Worcester, West Ham, Gloucestershire, and other places; whether representations were made last year about the places named; what steps he proposes to take in the case of these and others, such as Leeds, to bring the local inspection up to an efficient standard; and whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that Ipswich, about which similar representations were made regarding its neglect in 1905, has made no Return at all for 1906; and what steps he proposes to take with that town.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am aware of the figures in the Return which has been issued by my directions. I would remind the hon. Member that in October of 1906 the Home Office issued a circular to local authorities (printed in the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories for that year) urging a more thorough enforcement of the Home Work provisions of the Factory Act, and the figures in the Return in question relate to a period before the issue of that Circular. The above question will come up for consideration in connection with the Report of the Home Work Committee just issued.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Can nothing be done in cases like that of Ipswich, which seems to be particularly bad?

MR. GLADSTONE: There is much that may be done, and I will see what I can do.

Tramcar Speeds in London.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware of the speed of tramcars in such places as the Vauxhall Road, and the risk of life and limb by motors passing the rapidly-driven trams on the off-side, any vehicle or pedestrian passing in front of a tram being liable to be run into or run over; and if he will give necessary instructions to the police to protect the public.

MR. GLADSTONE: In the Vauxhall Bridge Road, to which I presume my hon. friends refers, the Board of Trade regulations permit tramcars to proceed at a speed of twelve miles an hour, except when they are passing the end of Rochester Row. There is no rule of law with respect to traffic passing tramcars, and any general rule must be subject to exceptions according to the circumstances; but the common practice of passing a tramcar on the near side is usually the safest course. The police do their utmost to protect pedestrians crossing the road.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that tramcars in London frequently run at a speed of over twenty miles an hour? Will he not consider the advisability of making a rule that the drivers shall be supplied with an instrument which will show them the speed at which they are proceeding?

MR. GLADSTONE: That is a matter for the Board of Trade.

*MR. WATT: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of publishing anew the rules of the road, as it is not clearly understood on which side a vehicle should pass a tramcar going the same way.

MR. GLADSTONE: I will see if anything can be done.

Disabled Motor-Buses.

MR. S. COLLINS (Lambeth, Kennington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a recent speech of the Mayor of West Ham, in which he stated that every day in the main roads of that district there was an average of twenty-two disabled motor omnibuses; and whether, as similar breakdowns are constantly occurring in other parts of the metropolis, he will demand that greater care be exercised in the licensing of these vehicles so as to prevent the dislocation of traffic and the inconvenience of the public.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have not seen the speech referred to. Perhaps the figure quoted includes cases where the driver gets down to make temporary adjustment. The police have no knowledge of so many omnibuses breaking down, and if these vehicles had been disabled on the scale indicated, it must have come under their notice. Great care is taken in licensing motor omnibuses; but in working them the strain on the machinery is very great, and it is inevitable that a certain number, however good when licensed, should get out of order from time to time.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex Horsham): When a motor bus breaks down, do the police take note of it?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir.

Isle of Man Excursion Steamers.

MR. McLAREN (Staffordshire, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that on the 15th instant the boats "Ben Machree" and "La Marguerite," carrying large numbers of passengers from the Isle of Man to Liverpool, began to race on approaching port and came within a few feet of one another; and whether, in view of the fact that a collision was narrowly averted, he will take steps to put a stop to this dangerous practice.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): Yes, Sir. My attention has been called to the matter to which my hon friend refers, and I have communicated with the owners of both vessels concerned. I trust that no further ground for complaint will arise, but any instance of improper navigation which infringes the collision regulations will be severely dealt with.

Port of London Inquiry.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what has been the cost to date of the inquiry into the Port of London Bill before the Committee, and how much more will it probably cost; from what source this sum will be paid, and if the capital of the dock trust is to be inflated or watered by the amount of these expenses; and how much the port dues will have to be increased to pay the additional interest charge involved.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is not possible to state at present the cost of the proceedings before the Joint Committee on the Port of London Bill. It is provided by the Bill that all costs incurred by the Board of Trade in connection with the preparing, applying for, obtaining and passing of the Act shall be repaid to the Board by the port authority. This is in accordance with the usual practice. It is not anticipated that the payment of these sums will have any appreciable effect on the amount of port dues, or that they will amount to anything approaching the cost that would have been incurred had the docks been purchased by arbitration.

MR. FELL: Does not the cost exceed £100,000?

MR. CHURCHILL: I can add nothing to my Answer.

London Traffic Commission Report.

SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether there is any intention on the part of the Government to take any action on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on London traffic, appointed five years ago.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Board of Trade have constituted a special branch to deal with matters relating to London traffic. This branch is at present engaged in preparing a Report on the whole subject, bringing up to date, so far as far as possible the information collected by the Royal Commission on London traffic. This report will shortly be completed and His Majesty's Government will then be in a better position to determine what further action if any it is expedient and practicable to take.

Meat Trade Inquiry.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade with reference to the appointment of a Departmental Committee to inquire into the prices of meat in this Country, whether he will have a representative from Scotland on that Committee.

MR. CHURCHILL: As I have already stated in reply to questions on this subject, I am reluctant to add to the numbers of the Committee by the appointment of representatives of special interests or views. In those circumstances, especially as the reference to the Committee does not extend to recommendations affecting the conditions of the Importation of Cattle, I do not, as at present advised, think it necessary to include a representative of Scotland among the Members.

*MR. WATT: How many business men are there on the Committee, and if none will he see his way to appoint one?

MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Weddell, a very distinguished gentleman connected with the meat trade but having no personal interest, has already been appointed.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade in reference to the constitution of the Committee appointed to inquire into the general supply, distribution, and price of meat in the United Kingdom, whether he has taken into consideration the views of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone on the subject, when asking him to act as chairman of the proposed Committee; and whether he will consider the advisability of appointing representatives of agricultural constituencies on the Committee.

MR. CHURCHILL: In answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question I have to say that I have considered to the best of my ability all the qualifications of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone to preside over an inquiry of this character. With regard to the second part of the hon. Member's question, the reference to the Committee does not include inquiry into matters relating to diseases of animals in the United Kingdom or into the conditions of the importation of live cattle from abroad and I do not under the circumstances think it necessary to include in its numbers representatives of agricultural constituencies.

The All-Red Route.

MR. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been drawn to a resolution recently adopted by the Canadian Government endorsing the resolution of the Colonial Conference in reference to an All-Red Route; has His Majesty's Government concluded its negotiations with the Governments of Canada, New Zealand, and Australia as to subsidising the proposed All-Red Route; is he aware that all sections of Irish Parliamentary representatives are in favour of including Ireland in the proposed scheme, and will he state what is the present position in regard to negotiations with Colonial Governments; and what are the intentions of His Majesty's Government in reference to this matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have been asked by my right hon. friend to reply to this Question. My attention has been called to reports of the resolution referred to, but I am not in a position to add anything to the statements which have been already made to the House by the Prime Minister and other Members of His Majesty's Government.

Severn Foreshore.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, in view of the decision in the case of Lord Fitzhardinge v. Purcell, 1908, 2 Ch. 139, that a private title had been proved to part of the foreshore of the Severn and that the public have no rights in respect of that foreshore except such as are incident to navigation, whether that foreshore is taken account of in the valuation list for rating purposes; if so, whether it is valued separately or is included with the adjacent property, and at what amount it is valued or what proportion of the valuation of the property as a whole is attributable to it.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I have made inquiry on this subject, and am informed that the foreshore affected by the decision in Lord Fitzhardinge v. Purcell is mostly situate in the Unions of Dursley and Wheatenhurst. According to the information I have at present received, it is not assessed for rating purposes in either union.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE: Was it assessed at all for rating purposes?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I cannot say. I may say that the hon. Member for Cambridge has presented me with a handsomely bound volume containing a report of the case, and I hope to read it in the holidays.

Shoeburyness Foreshore.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, with reference to the estate of about 890 acres of foreshore at Shoeburyness, recently purchased by the War Office for £5,500, what was taken as the annual value of that estate for rating purposes at the time of the purchase; or, if that estate formed part of a larger subject, by how much the annual value for rating of that larger subject has been reduced in consequence of the severance of that part.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am informed that up to the present time the foreshore in question has not been assessed for rating purposes. I understand, however, that the valuer of the Guardians of the Rochford Union, in which it is situate, is in communication with the Treasury valuer as to the assessment of this and other parts of the foreshore belonging to the War Department.

Motor Competitions on Public Roads.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to the conviction for dangerous driving through Croydon of one of the competitors in a motor-cycle race from London to Edinburgh; and whether, in the interests of the public safety and to relieve the pressure on the police, he is prepared to take steps to make all such competitions on public roads illegal.

MR. JOHN BURNS: Probably my hon. friend refers to the conviction at Chester-le-Street of one of the competitors in a motor car run from London to Edinburgh. He came from Croydon. Some information about the case has been supplied to me since the Question appeared on the Paper. I think these competitions on public roads are much to be deprecated, and I will bear in mind the suggestion which my hon. friend makes with regard to them.

Driffield Guardians Vaccination Contract.

MR. FERENS (Hull, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been directed to the recent action of the guardians of the Driffield Union in determining their vaccination contract with Dr. Brand, solely in consequence of his resignation of his office as district medical officer; and if he has sanctioned the utilising of emoluments, arising from the office of public vaccinator, as an inducement to Poor Law medical officers to accept low salaries and allowances for supplies of medicines, surgical appliances, and dressings, visits, and consultations in their treatment of sick poor parish patients.

MR. JOHN BURNS: My attention has been called to this matter. I have not expressed any approval of the principle referred to in the last part of the Question. It was, however, competent for the guardians to determine the vaccination contract if they thought fit to do sc, without any sanction on my part.

Motor Car Dust Nuisance.

MR. HERBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will consider the advisability of making regulations, under Section 6 of The Locomotives on Highways Act, 1896, prescribing a minimum height from the ground for the bodies of motor cars, with a view to abating the dust nuisance.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The suggestion is generally similar to that which was made in the Question put to me by my hon. friend the Member for Orkney and Shetland on the 13th instant. As I then stated, I will take note of it, but I am not sanguine that it will be possible to adopt it.

Disclosure of Official Information.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he is aware that recently an extract from a Treasury Minute of 1875, against the divulging of official information, was circulated amongst the officials of the Department; and whether this was done by his authority; and, if so, will he say to what cause the revival of this Minute was due.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange, for Mr. T. W. RUSSELL): The Minute referred to was circulated by my right hon. friend's special directions for reasons which appeared to him to render that course desirable. In my right hon. friend's opinion, the present Question illustrates the necessity for the adoption of that course.

MR. DELANY: Does the right hon. Gentleman hold that an M.P. should not have access to a Department which spends so much of the taxpayer's money?

MR. CHERRY: The objection is to the staff of the Department giving confidential information.

Irish Department of Agriculture Official Salaries.

MR DELANY: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of

Agriculture (Ireland) whether, since the money for the payment of the officials of his Department is voted by this House, he can state the grounds which commended themselves to the Treasury and the Department for increasing the salaries of the three chief officials of the Department's veterinary branch, by a sum amounting in the aggregate to £350; whether he can also state how many of the assistant clerks of the veterinary branch are eligible for promotion to the Second Division, and why they are denied the right of entrance thereto; and whether he will see that no further promotions of the higher officials of the veterinary branch will be made till the claims of the subordinate gentlemen are duly dealt with.

MR. CHERRY: My right hon. friend has nothing to add to the Answers which he has given to the hon. Member's previous Questions on this subject.

Canadian Cattle Imports.

MR CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if his attention has been directed to the fact that, since the last Colonial Conference, when the question of the unrestricted importation of Canadian cattle was discussed at no great length, no representations have been made by the Canadian Government to His Majesty's Government with reference to the subject; and if, in view of the dangerous infectious diseases existent in America, he will not propose any modification of the existing law unless such modification is accompanied by the stringent quarantine regulations in force in America and Europe.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): There is no present intention of proposing any legislation in regard to this matter.

Illegal Trawling in the Moray Firth.

MR. SUTHERLAND: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the dissatisfaction along the East Coast of Scotland in connection with existing conditions regarding fishing in the Moray Firth, the Government would consider the advisability of urging negotiations with foreign Powers with the object of bringing the present unsatisfactory state of affairs to an end.

MR. ASQUITH: The Secretary for Scotland will, before the House adjourns for the recess, introduce a Bill to prohibit in English and Irish ports what is already prohibited in Scottish ports—namely, the landing or sale of fish caught by trawling in prohibited areas of the sea adjacent to the coast of Scotland. It is hoped that this measure may provide an effectual remedy for the difficulty which exists in relation to these waters.

Natal Act of Indemnity.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that martial law was proclaimed and has been maintained in Zululand in opposition to the views of His Majesty's Government, and considering the purposes for which it has been used in connection especially with the arrest, imprisonment, and trial of Dinizulu, it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to advise that the sanction of the Crown be given to the Act of Indemnity recently passed by the Legislature of Natal.

MR. ASQUITH: My hon. friend will state the views of His Majesty's Government in the course of the debate on the Colonial Vote this afternoon.

Land Law (Ireland) Acts.

MR. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the promise conveyed in the King's Speech at the opening of the present session that a measure would be introduced to amend the Land Law (Ireland) Acts, and of the dissatisfaction prevailing in Ireland at the failure of the Government to carry out its promise in this regard, he will, with a view to preventing unrest and disturbance in Ireland, state what are the present intentions of His Majesty's Government on this matter.

MR. ASQUITH: My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland has more than once stated that it is the intention of the Government to introduce in the coming autumn a measure dealing with congestion in Ireland—that is still our intention. The Report of the Royal Commission is at present under consideration with that object. My right hon. friend has not had sufficient time, since the Report was received, to formulate the necessary legislation for dealing with a matter of so much importance.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): Will the Bill deal generally with the question of land purchase?

MR. ASQUITH: I prefer to reserve my reply to that till the autumn.

Government Army Policy.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the changes in the Government, whether they adhere to the statement of policy of the Secretary of State for War in the city of London on 4th January 1906, prior to the general election, when he announced that the Prime Minister and the Cabinet as a whole had given him a free hand in reference to the Army, and that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman laid such stress on efficiency that, if necessary, the Government was prepared to find more men and more money for the Army.

MR. ASQUITH: If my hon. friend will refer to the speech of the Secretary of State for War on the occasion in question, he will find that he said that while the policy was as stated in the Question, he was not at all sure that it would necessitate the finding of either more money or more men. My right hon. friend is of opinion that in this respect his anticipations have been well founded.

THE SPEAKER AND MR. SWIFT MACNEILL.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.), referring to the action of Mr. Speaker in stopping him putting a Question in which he applied the term "illegal" to certain proceedings on the part of the Natal Government, asked Mr. Speaker if he would lay down how far the term was to be barred. Did it imply or infer a rule that the term was not to be used in reference to the administration of Colonies having responsible Government?

MR. SPEAKER: When I stopped the hon. Member yesterday he had not completed his Question; but, when he had reached a point imputing illegality to the Natal Government, I thought it was time to intervene. It seems to me that it is undesirable, by means of a supplementary question, to make observations of that kind which are very much resented by the Government to whom they apply.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I want to guard against any restriction on absolute freedom of discussion in ordinary debates in this House in reference to the internal administration of Natal.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 345.]

PUBLIC OFFICES SITES (EXTENSION) BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 346.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Ordered, "That on this day, notwithstanding anything in Standing Order No. 15, Business other than Business of Supply may be taken before Eleven of the Clock."—(*Mr. Secretary Haldane*).

SUPPLY [19TH ALLOTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

CLASS II.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,450, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, including a grant in aid of certain expenses connected with emigration."

*MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) said that South Africa was the centre of interest in Colonial matters;

but, while his remarks would be devoted chiefly to South African subjects, he had a word or two to say in the first instance on a matter relating to the opium traffic, which, unless it was cautiously handled by the Government, might bring us trouble in our great Eastern Dependencies. In discussing the Resolution of the House for the discouragement of the opium traffic, it was presumed by everyone who took part in that debate that any action taken by the Government would be deliberate and cautious, and in particular that they would seek to enlist the co-operation ot the authorities of the various Colonies concerned. Unless he was misinformed, there had been a grievous departure from that wholesome rule in Hong kong, and a similar disposition seemed to be likely in regard to the Straits Settlements. The Legislative Council in Crown Colonies consisted of official and unofficial members. The latter were a kind of advisory council in a permanent minority, but their advice was extremely valuable. It was axiomatic at the Colonial Office that the utmost consideration should be shown to those gentlemen, and that they should be consulted on every occasion of importance. Such an attitude was pre-eminently desirable in the case of the question of opium. The opium habit had been an engraved habit in the East for centuries, and a large portion of the revenue of these Colonies was raised from opium. In a matter so delicate, therefore, as that, he would have thought it hardly credible that the Government should not have consulted the Legislative Council of Hong-kong before taking any specific action in regard to the matter. He was informed that a peremptory telegram was sent by the Secretary of State on 6th May saying to the Colony of Hong-kong that His Majesty's Government had decided to close the opium establishments in Hong-kong. That telegram reached Hong-kong three hours before the statement was made public in the House of Commons, and therefore before any information was vouchsafed to the Colony on the matter. Absolutely no previous consultation had taken place, so far as he was informed, and no opinion taken of the members of the Legislative Council Naturally this excited a great deal of feeling amongst the members of that body. They moved and voted for a resolution of censure on the Government for that very high-handed proceeding. He hoped there would be some explanation given of this proceeding, because, in his opinion, it was calculated rather to hinder than advance the object—the reduction in the consumption of opium. There was another matter which he thought would interest the late Under-Secretary more than the present, because it referred to some sarcastic comments which he made with regard to a certain concession that had been made in the pearl fisheries of Ceylon. The late Under-Secretary, who, if he might say so, was the youngest and most inexperienced of any official who had had any dealing with this subject at all, selected and identified himself as the only person among the officials to condemn that particular concession. His ground was—and he was good enough to absolve him (Mr. Lyttelton) from any fraud in the matter—but his ground of condemnation was that this was not a speculative but a very valuable and stable undertaking, and that therefore the Ceylon Government had acted very wrongly in parting for twenty years with the pearl fisheries. For 100 years the profits had averaged £10,000 a year. There had been sometimes years without a pearl being taken at all; on other occasions the profits had been very large. The Government did not like to spend their revenue upon so unstable a product, and accordingly they thought it desirable to put the matter upon a proper footing. The fisheries were therefore leased to a company for twenty years at a rental of £20,000 a year, and there was an obligation on the part of the concessionaires to spend 3,000,000 rupees on the development of the fisheries during the period of the concession. At the end of that time the Government were to resume possession. If, therefore, the large expenditure was successful the Government would have the results of that success, and if it was a failure the company would have to bear the expense. It might be thought that that was not altogether a bad arrangement, but the late Under-Secretary, cheered by the reflection that the company had an extremely good first year, spoke in very opprobrious terms of the wisdom of the grant, but unfortunately he forgot that time sometimes brought correction even to the youngest of them. This year the company was in the position of having to pay the Government £20,000 to execute 150,000 rupees worth of development work, while they had not been able to recover a single pearl. He thought that was worth mentioning.

Passing to the position of affairs in the Transvaal, he said that the minority there had borne themselves like men in the last two years. There had been no unmanly laments as to the consequences of the action that had been taken; they had courageously and toughly accepted that which was inevitable. He admitted that after self-government was granted they were bound not to indulge in any factious criticism nor to embitter feeling by any partisan comment. At the same time he utterly repudiated the indolent and pusillanimous counsel that, in the circumstances which existed in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, they were entitled to absolve themselves from all criticism, to shut their eyes, and to say lazily after all the sacrifices which our fellow-subjects had made and the immense financial aid this country had given them, that these Colonies were immune from all criticism because they had self-government. On the contrary, the condition of these Colonies and the financial obligations we had undertaken not only entitled Parliament to exercise, but demanded from them an unceasing vigilance and also criticism where it could be honestly made and where it was sincerely felt. There were some features of the situation in the Transvaal to which he thought they were all entitled to look with satisfaction. The great fabric that had been erected by the labours and genius of Lord Milner and his colleagues after the war in the main stood. That fabric included the railways, the roads, the bridges, public works, schools, municipal self-government, a system of education which needed only wise and tolerant administration, a system of law remodelled so as to bring the Colony fully up to every modern need, a judiciary equal to any in the Empire over seas, a scientific system of agriculture which, by the assent of the Dutch and the British, had done great good in bringing classes together, in improving agriculture in the Colony, and in increasing its productiveness. There was also a progress towards unification of the Colony, a progress which had been recognised by General Botha as being largely due to the results of the war. That unification was furthered by the Progressive Party in South Africa. He thought they were entitled to congratulate them, and to congratulate the country upon the progress that had been made towards it. Let those who had denounced the war from the beginning permit him to read a passage from a speech by General Botha. He said—

> "If we go back into the history of South Africa we find that there were not only Colonies here, but also republics, and as long as there was more than one flag, it was impossible to think of a united South Africa. The dissension which has existed in the past has led to serious difficulties. We know that it has led to difficulties between the Colonies and the republics, and has led to one of the most bloody wars that South Africa has ever seen. . . . Before the war was over it was impossible to think of a united South Africa."

They might congratulate Lord Milner and those who supported the war at the time on the fact that such an authority should have uttered so striking a statement. He might say parenthetically that the main source of difficulty which he anticipated in the future in respect of the problem of unification was one about which he had warned the Government two years ago. It was the lowering of manhood suffrage in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, contrary to all South African precedent, with the result that when the position of the natives came to be discussed in connection with the entire subject the only argument left for those opposed to a native suffrage was "your skin is black and the white man's skin is white." That was a position of which the Government were warned at the time, and he was sorry that the warning had come only too true. Having pointed out some of those matters, which were matters of legitimate congratulation, he was bound to say that there were three main sources of irritation and bitterness which still existed in South Africa, and which he thought the influence of the Government ought to be enlisted to allay. First, he was glad to recognise that since there had been a change in the *personnel* of the Government the same abuse of the British minority which they used to have from the hon. Member's predecessor had been absent. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Withdraw."] He was speaking in the recollection of the House when he declared that on almost every occasion when South African matters were discussed they were prefaced or concluded by the late Under-Secretary by whoops of invective and sarcasm more fitted for other assemblies than the House of Commons. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] Then there had been—he knew some hon. Gentlemen did not like it, but he was going to say it—repeated and injurious comments made on the system of labour which had prevailed in the Transvaal for a number of years; and lastly, and most conspicuously, there had been a failure, as he read the difficult and obscure facts, to carry out towards the Civil servants employed in the country the honourable understandings which they owed to all those who served the King in any department. He maintained that the minority in South Africa endured the chiefest burden of the war. They also endured at the present moment the heavy taxation which was necessary. Seven-eighths of the taxation was borne by them. He did not think that any candid opponent would deny that a heavy strain had been placed upon them when, contrary to the policy of the last Government, to the treaty, and to the expressed intentions of many authorities, responsible government was granted to the Colony. He did not go back upon that, but he did not think that any candid opponent would deny that a serious strain was imposed on their cheerful loyalty and their temper by the handing over to the custody of a great majority of their political opponents the actual government of the country. He would have thought that every chivalrous adversary and every lover of concord would have thought them worthy of respectful treatment. But so far from receiving respectful treatment these Colonies had received in the House of Commons jeers and insults. The late Under-Secretary had delivered speeches containing many injurious attacks and he had caused them to be circulated in South Africa in official telegrams. It was one of those lucubrations which poured suspicion on the voters list, and the consequential alteration of the voters' list caused the minority to be a good deal smaller than it would have been. [AN HON. MEMBER: "No."] That, at any rate, was the opinion of those on the spot. What could be more odious to men of great industry and ability doing this work than an imputation cast on their good faith? That imputation had never been frankly withdrawn by the former Under-Secretary, notwithstanding the fact that Lord Selborne had absolutely denied that there was any grounds for suspicion, and that the present Under-Secretary was good enough to say the Government did not associate itself with the imputation. There were other matters tending to cause exasperation, imputations on the good faith of those who managed the recruiting of native labour, and reflections made, not here, but in South Africa, upon the financial administration of the Crown Colony Government. Perhaps the hon. and gallant Gentleman would give some information in regard to this matter. It was reported that the Treasurer last year had condemned the extravagence and incompetency of the Crown Colony Government, by alleging that there was a large deficit, but it had been pointed out by the official auditor that the deficit had been created by putting a sum of £67,000 in the accounts of the following instead of the current year. He would not say that an apology was due, but a retractation should be made of the statement, because the honour of the Crown Colony Government ought to be dear to no one more than to the hon. and gallant Gentleman who represented that Government in this House, and who was bound, when an accusation of that kind was made, if it were true, to call attention to it. He knew that offensive imputations of that kind had provoked the bitterest feelings in South Africa, and had done much to weaken the spirit of conciliation which they all desired to see in the Colonies. No one on the Unionist side ever doubted that there were mischiefs attendant upon indentured labour in South Africa. What were the facts about native labour at the present moment? What was the difference between indentured native labour and Chinese labour, about the abolition of which hon. Gentlemen opposite congratulated themselves so much, and asked the country to congratulate them? He would tell the House what the condition was now with respect to Portuguese natives, say, 50 per cent. of the native labour employed in the Transvaal mines. It was foreign alien labour. It was indentured foreign labour. It was brought thousands of miles, and from a climate which made those who came a great deal more susceptible to illness than Chinamen. These labourers were brought without their wives or their families, and the arrangements were such that there could be no holding of land and no holding of property by those who came.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): Why?

*MR. LYTTELTON said he would tell the hon. Gentleman in a moment. The arrangement provided also for the repatriation of the labourer immediately his indenture was terminated. The disability from holding land arose from the fact that the person who was subject to the indenture was bound under penalties to work in the mines for the whole period of his indenture, and he was obliged to return to his own country at the end of it. The recruiter was bound to effect and defray the cost of repatriation in accordance with the obligations undertaken by him. The native was under an obligation to return to Portuguese territory immediately the period of his contract was ended unless he effected a re-engagement. He quite agreed that, in the absence of an Ordinance, there was no opportunity compulsorily to exercise the provisions of that contract. But Lord Selborne had stated explicitly that the Government were bound in honour not to countenance the settling of Portuguese natives in the Transvaal. What occurred was this. The Foreign Office had made an arrangement with the Portuguese authorities by which the system of indenture was permitted on condition that the Portuguese natives should spend the money they had earned in Portuguese territory. Not merely were we bound in honour to fulfil that obligation; but, if it were not fulfilled, the arrangement would be at once terminated.

COLONEL SEELY: It is not fulfilled.

*MR. LYTTELTON said it might not be fulfilled in every case. But the Government had bound themselves to fulfil it, and if they did not, the Portuguese Government had a grievance against them, not merely because of an obligation of honour unfulfilled, but because of an actual injury done. If the Under-Secretary did not value his opinion in regard to the character of this indentured native labour let him listen to the opinion of his great friend Mr. Cresswell, whose sincerity had never been controverted. That gentleman in a Report on the subject of native labour in the mines, after giving figures in regard to the natives imported into the Transvaal, said—

> "It is clear from these figures that so far as the Transvaal is concerned the supply of indigenous cheap coloured labour is wholly insufficient for the carrying on of the mining industry, and that the great mass of coloured labour employed upon the mines has to be obtained from outside its borders. The supply is, therefore, not a natural supply, indigenous to the Colony; it is not even a natural supply indigenous to British South Africa. So far as the natives imported from outside British South Africa are concerned, constituting a further 41 per cent. of the coloured labour force, these consist for the most part of East Coast natives, whose importation is dependent on arrangements between this country and the Portuguese authorities. The continuance of these arrangements on our side depends, among other things, upon the view being upheld, that while it is undesirable, and has been made unlawful, to import indentured alien coloured labour—from China—it is beneficial and deserving of State help to do so overland—from adjacent territories in Africa. In the opinion of the Commission, the imported Portuguese East African offers no advantages to the country, from a social or economic point of view, more than the imported Chinese coolie did. Both fill the place of, and do work which would otherwise be done by white men. Both take out of the country a large proportion of the wages fund which ought to be spent in the country by a resident industrial population, thereby stimulating the prosperity and development of the country. There remains the 17 per cent. of the coloured labour force recruited in British South Africa, and the 5 per cent. recruited in the Transvaal."

There they had the opinion of the greatest opponent of Chinese labour, given after months of investigation, that the difference between Chinese labour and the native labour, upon which hon. Gentlemen opposite were always congratulating themselves, was the difference between bringing indentured alien coloured labour overseas and bringing black labour over land. Perhaps the subtlety of hon. Gentlemen opposite might be able to see some essential difference; he confessed he was unable to do so. The mischiefs such as they were attendant upon indentured labour arose from the settled determination of every white man's community in the world, in which there was a great preponderance of native labour, not to take any part in the work done by the lowest class of coloured labour. If they looked into the matter with a candid mind they would find that the mischief existed with regard to natives who were brought thousands of miles overland as well as with regard to those brought from China; and the one serious and lamentable difference was that the death-rate in the case of the former was two or three times what it was in the case of the latter. He came now to the third cause of exasperation, the retrenched Transvaal officials who had been employed when the Transvaal was a Crown Colony. He admitted that the facts were very difficult to get at, but many of those to whom notice of retrenchment had been given believed themselves to be dependent, first on His Majesty's Government and, perhaps, in a second degree on the Transvaal Government, for standing between them and absolute ruin. Naturally enough they were timid as to giving information. He did not wish to, and he did not believe that anyone would for a moment, impute to the present Government that they would bear hardly against any man whose name was mentioned in a debate like this, or who made any complaint as to the wrongs he believed that he had suffered. The position was this. Nobody denied that there was and had been a need of retrenchment; but the Civil servants in the Transvaal were given to understand that when they took that position—of course at that time the rule was that of a Crown Colony—that at any rate the rule of Great Britain in South Africa was going to last much longer than it actually did. They were assured by Sir Arthur Lawley on 1st December, 1905, that—

> "Many of them had acquired vested rights, that the country was under obligation to them, and that he had sufficient confidence in his countrymen that these obligations would be fulfilled."

Lord Selborne, at a meeting of the Intercolonial Council on 30th May, 1906, said of the constabulary—

> "It would be quite impossible to ask the existing officers and men to accept reductions in their pay and allowances and not, at the same time, to fulfil those hopes which had always been admitted and encouraged, that the South African constabulary would one day be a permanent police force and their services pensionable."

Sir Richard Solomon, acting Lieutenant-Governor of the Transvaal, at the Legislative Council on 25th May, 1906, said in no less strong terms—

> "This session gives the present Government its last opportunity of redeeming its pledges to the Civil servants, and of that opportunity it intends to avail itself. An ordinance regulating the pensions of officers of the service will, therefore, be introduced, substantially based on the recommendations of the Public Service Commission, to which I believe no possible objection will be taken by any section of the people of this Colony. I wish it clearly to be understood that the Government firmly believes that the new Parliament of the Transvaal under responsible Government would deal fairly with the Civil servants of this Colony, and it would with the greatest confidence leave any legislation relating to the *status* and pensions of Civil servants to such Parliament; but it feels that it cannot honourably leave the pledges it gave to these Civil servants any longer unfulfilled, especially in view of the fact that the principles on which the legislation will be based will have been decided by an independent Commission, whose *personnel* has been approved by the people of this country."

The opportunity was not taken and there were now scores of Civil servants who were being retrenched without pensions. He inferred—of course, he had never seen the report—from a letter that Sir West Ridgeway had written and which appeared in *The Times* that he had reported so as jealously to safeguard the rights of the Civil servants. If that were so, it would only be candid if the Government would tell the Committee what the facts were, what they had done in order to fulfil the three separate promises which had been given, afterwards confirmed by the West Ridgeway Commission. He did not intend to weary the Committee with a long list of names, but those who had acquainted themselves with this subject of retrenchment knew that many British officers and officials in the Transvaal had been retrenched and replaced by Dutchmen.

He might mention the cases of Colonel Curtis and Colonel O'Brien, the heads of both police forces who had had eight years of honourable service. These distinguished men were replaced by a gentleman by the name of Papenfus, who had had no active service in the police, and the outcry against whose appointment out there as well as here was so acute that he learned a day or two ago that that gentleman had resigned.

COLONEL SEELY: He was only appointed temporarily.

*MR. LYTTELTON said he was quite aware that he had been replaced, but he was not aware that his appointment was temporary. Then there was the case of Dr. Sansome, a gentleman who had rendered eminent services in the Medical Department of the mines, and during the course of whose service in Lord Milner's time and afterwards had been able to reduce the death-rate amongst the natives by at least 50 per cent. Two persons had been appointed in his place, but he did not gather that there had been any reduction in the cost of the Department. Then there was the case of Mr. Thornton, the General Superintendent to the Victoria Hospital, whose dismissal could not be looked upon with other than grave indignation by those who valued the honour of this country; and the cases of the three magistrates, Major Bolton, who had filled his office of resident magistrate at Pietersburg for five years with conspicuous success, and who had given up the prospect of commanding his regiment to join the service; Major McInerney, the resident magistrate at Barberton, Mr. Rolleston, resident magistrate at Lichtenburg, and others. He did not wish to assume that all the facts in favour of the case which he was putting before the Committee were absolutely correct in every detail. He frankly admitted that he had found it impossible accurately to inform himself, except in a few instances, of all the details. He did not think he would be justified in asking the Committee to draw the inference which he had drawn if it were not for the fact that new circumstances had occurred since the time that he and the hon. Member for Gravesend had brought this subject before the House of Commons on a previous occasion. The position then taken up by the Government in regard to it seemed a very strong one. It was said that Lord Milner himself had pointed out the necessity for considerable retrenchment, and that many of the retrenchments had been made under the advice of a distinguished Indian Civil servant, Mr. Marriss, who had been appointed by the late Crown Colony to superintend the reconstruction of the Transvaal Civil Service. But these pleas were no longer open, for on 15th May, 1908, Mr. Marriss wrote to the Transvaal Government in these terms—

> "I have decided with reluctance to ask your Government to relieve me from my present appointment under it, in connection with the public service reorganisation. I do not feel that retrenchments and appointments are being made in such a way that I can remain associated with them. I will send you a further memorandum on the subject, and need not go into details now. I place myself in your hands as regards the actual date of my departure. It may be convenient that I should wait a few days to finish half-completed proposals, and to give the Government time to decide what arrangements, if any, it will make to carry on the work. But I do not propose to undertake any fresh work, and should be glad to leave as soon as it is convenient."

A valuable authority speaking with respect to the manner in which the grievances were to be redressed, said that a Bill was before the Transvaal Parliament to enable the Government of the colony to make the appointments to the Civil Service exactly as they pleased. There was no provision for entrance examinations, and it was truly affirmed that if that policy was carried out it might be said with perfect accuracy that there would be no test at all of the ability of the men to be appointed to the Civil Service in the Transvaal; and that the Government would not be able to resist the pressure put upon them by their supporters for appointments. Two years ago, it was pointed out in the frankest possible manner that the spoils should be given to the victors. He thought he had shown the Government the facts of the case, but he appealed with all the earnestness in his power to hon. Gentlemen opposite not to assume the facts as he had stated them, but to influence the Government to have an inquiry by three men of impartiality from this country, who would go into the facts, and who would say whether the case, which rested on the very strong *prima facie* grounds put before the House, was one which did not mark the action which should be taken by His Majesty's Government. He was extremely sorry to detain the House so long, but there had been no opportunity of discussing these matters at all this session. The only discussion of the affairs of Natal in which they had engaged in that House was afforded of what he thought, was the most exasperating form of controversy, namely, by Questions put to the Government by zealots below the gangway. In this controversy it should be remembered that our policy had added to the work of the Natal Government the very formidable problem of Zululand as well as the very formidable problem with respect to natives in their own territory. Natal was a small Colony with honourable traditions, and in the humanity of whose rulers he had the most implicit confidence. This controversy, so far as he was able to judge, had gathered round four principal points. One was the arrest by a strong force of the Chief Dinizulu; the second was the proclamation of martial law; the third was the question of the prolongation of the preliminary examination of Dinizulu; and the fourth was the question of Dinizulu's salary. Speaking entirely for himself, he thought we were in this difficulty. We were bound to believe that the Natal Government were acting with reasonable cause. At the same time we were bound by all our honourable traditions to presume the innocence of a man until he was found guilty. These two positions were extremely difficult to reconcile in discussing this matter, and the House would bear with him if he might seem not always satisfactorily to recognise them. He was bound to assume that the Natal Government had good cause for arresting Dinizulu; he was glad to assume it, and he could assure them he would not do so unless he thought that they had good cause. He thought that the Natal Government were absolutely right, if they undertook that step, to use a force to effect the arrest which would make resistance impossible. That was both a humane and an expedient thing to do. They had also acted legally in putting Dinizulu through a long preliminary examination. A Statute had been passed by the House authorising them to do it. He spoke with diffidence, for there were lawyers present who would correct him if he was wrong, but he thought that even in this country there had been occasions in which two or three months had been spent in preliminary investigations in important cases.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): Without formulating a definite charge?

*MR. LYTTELTON said he did not think that was quite the point. The arrest took place under a warrant or under an information in this country, but frequently the result of a preliminary investigation was an indictment to be made of entirely different character from the cause of the original warrant. Now the length of time required for the purposes of the law was about double what was needed in this country. The distances in Zululand were enormous. The difficulty of finding the witnesses was exceedingly great, as was also the amount of time occupied in bringing them up to Court. The Attorney-General had also distinctly stated that he regarded it as in the interests of the prisoner, that every fact to be relied upon at the trial should be given notice of to him and his advisers in the preliminary examination. It was stated that the view which the Attorney-General had taken had met with the approbation of those who defended Dinizulu. Although it was natural that comment should have been made on the length of time occupied, yet on reviewing the circumstances in comparison with our own system, which, of course, possessed facilities infinitely greater for ensuring speed, he doubted whether any just condemnation could be cast on the Natal Government in respect of this delay. He did not pass any opinion in regard to the circumstances in which martial law was proclaimed, but he was entitled to say that martial law never had been administered in a more lenient way than by the Natal Government. Not a single execution had taken place under it, and it would be unjust and ungenerous in them at this distance from the scene to pronounce a hasty opinion against the proclamation until they were fully acquainted with the circumstances under which it was made. In regard to the payment of Dinizulu's salary, he thought that His Majesty's Government were right in having paid it to him. He thought that the documents showed that there was a primary obligation on His Majesty's Government to pay that salary, unless the circumstances could be established affording not technical but real and convincing reasons why they should not do so. He did not attach much importance to the question, but for what his own personal opinion was worth, he thought that His Majesty's Government were right, having regard to the length of the proceedings that were taking place and to the poverty and unjust needs of the Chief Dinizulu, in recognising that the obligation to pay the salary to him, even if their view did not coincide with that of the Natal Government. He did not believe that there would be much difficulty for anyone in whom they had confidence to persuade reasonable men in Natal on this point, and he did not think that he should have any difficulty now. He was afraid that he had detained the House longer than he had intended, and he knew that he had tried the good-will of the hon. Gentleman opposite once or twice. He had endeavoured, as he should always endeavour, to speak on these matters in no partisan spirit. He thought that that which had taken place with reference to questions in the East was of very serious importance. Unless the House was satisfied that the Government were really going to consult and pay some deference to the views of legislative councils in the Crown Colonies, an infinite amount of trouble would come upon us. He admitted that the problem of South Africa was more vital than even those other questions in the East to which he had referred. How could we expect to retain the confidence and allegiance of our fellow-subjects in South Africa if His Majesty's Government stood by and allowed Civil servants to return ruined from the country to which they had rendered good service? No country, however great, could afford to lose such allegiance, and he appealed to hon. Gentlemen opposite, who he knew felt as strongly as he did upon this subject, whether this was not a problem which closely touched the honour and reputation of our own country. He had made no reflection on the Transvaal Government, and he would be unwilling to do so, unless the facts were more fully known. He had asked that an inquiry should take place in order to satisfy the people of this country. The honour and reputation of the country ought not to suffer at their hands, and he made this demand for an inquiry in terms which he had striven to make moderate in tone, and he commended it with the utmost earnestness to the consideration both of the House and the country.

Colonel SEELY said he had listened with much pleasure to the right hon. Gentleman, and although he had said that it was a long speech, it had not proved too long for those who had heard it. He would endeavour to answer all the points which the right hon. Gentleman had raised. He might say that he welcomed the moderation with which he had spoken, as he always did, with the exception of an allusion which he had made to his right hon. friend, to which he would revert later. On the last point to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred he thought that he had a complete answer—so complete that he made an appeal to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen in that House, and to all persons outside, especially those who had a knowledge of or were connected with our Civil Service, to take note of the official figures, which were an absolute refutation of the charges made against the Transvaal Government. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the opium traffic, and said that they had taken action without consulting the authorities at Hong Kong. It was impossible fully to consult the authorities. It was not certain until a short time before the debate that that particular debate would take place. Although they did their best to ascertain the views of those cognisant of the matter, it was quite impossible to get anything like a reasoned opinion from the inhabitants of Hong

Kong. He reasserted what he had said in a previous discussion, that it was the policy of the Government to close the opium dens in Hong Kong. That remained the policy of the Government, and as regarded that policy itself the right hon. Gentleman would forgive him if he quoted some words of his. The right hon. Gentleman said on a former occasion—

> "I congratulate the Government and the Under-Secretary on having taken steps which are entirely reasonable in the circumstances."

*MR. LYTTELTON: Of course, I agreed with that policy, but what I said was that every person of sense presumed that the ordinary steps had been taken that would make the policy palatable.

COLONEL SEELY said the ordinary steps could not be taken for reasons that he had given. The ordinary steps were now being taken, and the Government would act throughout on the advice they had recently obtained, and would obtain, from the Governor. He believed he would be able to satisfy the House that the best public opinion in Hong Kong, and the opinion of the Governor himself, coincided with the policy of the Government as to the measure they proposed to take. With regard to Ceylon pearls, the right hon. Gentleman opposite was extraordinarily persistent on that point, which he would have thought anyone in his position would have desired to forget. In a public career which had been distinguished by almost uniform success, in the opinion of the man in the street, there were two matters on which the right hon. Gentleman had come croppers. One was the question of Ceylon pearls and the other Chinese labour. But the right hon. Gentleman would return to them. The right hon. Gentleman said that his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade had used some sarcastic language on the subject; but that language seemed to him to be well justified, and, speaking on behalf of the Colonial Office, he said they still thought that the right hon. Gentleman made an uncommonly bad bargain, for he thought he was right in saying that the company that got the concession, greatly to the right hon. Gentleman's surprise, made a profit of something over 60 per cent. That was a fairly large percentage. When a man made a bargain with another man to exploit something which he had in his possession, and that person made a profit approaching even remotely 60 per cent., the man in the street would say that he had made a bad bargain. That the profits in this particular year had not been so great was exceedingly likely, but, of course, this was rather a barren controversy, because they would not know for many years, with certainty, who was right. But if they took the contract as far as it had gone and the profits made, the right hon. Gentleman had made a very bad bargain. Now he left these two points, and came to the question of Natal, which had occupied the House at Question-time very fully for many days past. He would say that the matter was critical and important, for at this moment the Natal Parliament was discussing it. The Natal Government had not seen fit to pay Dinizulu's salary. He did not wish to go over the ground again, but it would be remembered that their reason was that Dinizulu was in the position of an ordinary civil servant, and that, therefore, they were entitled to withhold his salary. To this the Government had replied that whatever their view might be, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham made the bargain he said that the salary should not be withdrawn without the consent of the Secretary of State. The Government were convinced that if the right hon. Gentleman were present—and he need hardly say that every one in the House wished ardently that he were—he would agree with the Government that to take away a man's salary just at the moment when he wanted it most, just at the moment when by the operation of martial law he was debarred from getting resources from his own countrymen, was action they could not take and action to which they could not and would not give their consent. The Government had said they would wait until the Natal Supreme Court had decided whether the Natal Government were liable or not—because the Natal Government said they wished to submit the question to the tribunal—but they were not able to wait, first, because the action did not come on, and also for two other reasons which were conclusive to them and he understood to hon. Gentlemen opposite. The first was that they had found out that Dinizulu had got no more money, and that those who supported him had no money either. He did not know what the expenses of the defence of this native chief were, but he was told they amounted to £100 a month, and if they amounted to anything like that it was apparent that there had been a strain on his resources, and it was not surprising that he and his friends should be denuded of resources. Convinced that what they were told was correct and that he had no more money, the Government decided that that was an added reason why they should themselves pay in accordance with the statement made by the Attorney-General. The third reason why they considered that they must take action was that they were threatened with legal proceedings as a Government, based on the statement of the Attorney-General, for the payment of the salary from Imperial funds. So far as the payment of the salary was concerned, they would have been most willing litigants, for they wanted to pay the salary, and nothing would have pleased them better than to have been ordered to do so by the Court; but they foresaw that were a case brought, either by petition of right or by some other method, against the Government in the Courts here the pleadings and the speeches of counsel would have contained violent indictments of the Government of the Colony of Natal for their action in not paying. They were anxious, and especially in view of the effect it might have on natives in Natal, that no such state of affairs should arise. A public controversy between the Government of this country and the Government of Natal on a matter of honourable obligation, would have been so injurious to all concerned that it was their bounden duty to put an end to it at once by paying the salary; and in taking that action he felt confident that the Government had the assent of all their friends on their own side of the House. And he must add that all on his side of the House would welcome the statement of the right hon. Gentleman opposite that he was convinced that in this case the Government had acted rightly; but even more were they grateful to the hon. Member for Darlington, who, yesterday, knowing the views of the Opposition, and that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman would come too late to be brought to the notice of the Natal Parliament, who would wish to know the opinion of the Members of the House of Commons, with characteristic courage and straightforwardness, stated in the form of a supplementary question the view to which he had referred. He thanked the hon. Member for his courage and assistance in the matter. With regard to the Special Court, hon. Members wished to know how it would be constituted. It would be constituted on similar lines, though not precisely the same, to the Special Court which tried what were called the rebels in Natal. He wished at once to explain that, of course, the forming of a Special Court of Judges was greatly to the interest of the prisoner. No one would wish to suggest that a jury of white men in Natal would not wish to come to an absolutely fair conclusion, but it was also true that when even the most honourable men were asked to try a prisoner whom they had lately been mobilised to capture they would find it a matter of almost superhuman difficulty to arrive at an unprejudiced conclusion.

Earl WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): Oh, Oh!

Colonel SEELY: Perhaps the noble Lord has an excess of superhuman virtue.

Earl WINTERTON: My interruption was directed against the amazing assertion of the hon. Gentleman that because a man was sent out to capture this unfortunate chief he would not be able to form an unbiassed opinion on his case.

Colonel SEELY said he had stated that it would be more difficult for such a man than it would be for the Judges who would be appointed under this Act. He knew the noble Lord was a soldier, but he was sure he would agree with him that were he to mobilise his Yeomanry in order to capture somebody with whom he disagreed in some portion of his constituency his judgment would possibly not be quite so sound as that of a man who had had nothing to do with the capture. But in order that the noble Lord might set his mind at rest, he wished to read from a despatch sent to the Government by Sir Matthew Nathan. Speaking on behalf of his Government, he said—

> "Mr. Carter gave me various instances, some of which, I know, are recorded in your Lordship's office, in which trial by jury, owing to racial feeling, had proved most unsatisfactory, and he told me that it had been generally recognised that the special tribunal above referred to had served its purpose excellently."

The noble Lord and every one in the House would see that by the appointment to this special tribunal, which was recommended by the Attorney-General in Natal, it was more certain that they could ensure an absolutely unprejudiced trial for this chief; and for that, he thought, all in the House would be grateful to the Natal Government. It might be supposed that pressure from home had induced them to take this step. So far as he was aware, that was not the case. Of their own motion the Natal Government proposed this Special Court in order to secure the most unprejudiced trial possible for this native chief. He had been asked what the constitution of the Court was to be. He could not say definitely, but he thought it was very likely that Sir William Smith, a puisne Judge of the Transvaal, would serve, and every one who knew anything of South African Judges would agree that a more admirable and impartial appointment as President of the Court could not be made. The other representatives would be also judicial functionaries, and there would be at least one with a special knowledge of native affairs. Mr. Schreiner, who, he thought, might be said to be the greatest lawyer in South Africa, had been retained for the defence of Dinizulu, and by the generosity of those who were anxious to see complete and unprejudiced justice done, the funds would be forthcoming for the defence. Much of the funds had been provided from Natal, and some by members of that House and others, irrespective of their general views, simply because they were anxious to see full justice done to the prisoner in the matter of legal assistance. Dinuzulu had been in prison seven months. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had very properly made the best case he could for the Natal Ministry, but the fact remained that to keep a man in gaol seven months without a definite charge was unprecedented, at any rate in recent times. It was impossible to expedite the matter from here, but he was sure the House would be glad to hear that Dinuzulu was not suffering in health from his confinement. The following telegram had been received from the Governor of Natal that morning in reply to a telegram sent by his noble friend the day before—

> "Have spoken to Dr. Ward, medical officer in charge of Central Gaol, Maritzburg, in whose sympathetic treatment of prisoners I have full confidence. He informs me that Dinizulu's general health considerably better than when he arrived in December, and that chief recently told Governor of gaol he had not been so well for years. He is less puffy, and unsatisfactory kidney symptoms are less pronounced. He has all exercise he wants and such dietary and medical treatment as suited to his state of health."

He was sure the House would be glad to know that Dinizulu was not suffering from ill-health. The prosecution would be brought to an end very soon indeed. He understood that the extraordinary idea had gained ground in Natal that there was some intention on the part of His Majesty's Government, as a consequence of undertaking the obligation of paying Dinizulu's salary, to take an active part in this matter and send him away from the legal proceedings which were now going on and return him to Zululand. Such a statement was absolutely absurd. The Government had neither the power nor the wish to interfere in any direction of that kind, and to attempt to send Dinizulu back to Zululand before any Court had pronounced judgment on a charge definitely brought against him was absolutely out of the question. With regard to the Indemnity Act, the point that had excited most interest was whether, if His Majesty were advised not to disallow it, the Home Government would not be assenting to a proclamation made deposing Dinizulu from his position as chief—a position which was assured to him by the Member for West Birmingham. It had been stated that a pronouncement had been made by a military officer that the sanctioning of the Indemnity Act by the Home Government would for ever deprive the supreme chief of his position as such in Zululand. They were informed by the Governor that he did not think that was the case, but he had induced his noble friend to send a further telegram with a view to making quite sure on the point, because he believed that irrespective of party the House would hesitate to assent to this Bill if the result of it was likely to be as stated by Miss Colenso and others. In reply to inquiries, the Governor of Natal had telegraphed—

> "I have reason to believe that McKenzie did make statement imputed to him, but that he was not authorised by Governor Natal. I certainly gave no authority to exercise powers of supreme chief, nor was I advised by Ministry to do so."

It would thus be seen that whatever pronouncement had been made by Colonel McKenzie was of no effect in law. The Indemnity Act would not legalise the action which he had taken, which was illegal from the start. The House, therefore, need have no fear that the Indemnity Act would prejudice the *status* of Dinizulu. In the view of the Home Government to take the step of hesitating to pass the Indemnity Act would be most unwise. The Act was the only means by which they could get rid of martial law, and to refuse to pass it would be quite contrary to precedent, and would have a most prejudicial effect. The Home Government were so convinced that to hesitate in this matter would be prejudicial to the interest not only of good relations between ourselves and the Government of Natal, but especially to the natives in that territory, that they would ask the House to raise no question as to recommending His Majesty not to disallow the measure which was shortly to be presented to them. He came to the question of the Transvaal, and Lord Milner's judiciary and agricultural proposals. He agreed that the judiciary and many other things set up by Lord Milner did admirable work; but they were set up on an altogether extravagant scale, and when the right hon. Gentleman asked them to say that all the retrenchments and reductions were due to the policy of General Botha's Government, he must remind him that the greatest retrenchment and reductions were made under Crown Colony government.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked how many of those reductions were made during Lord Milner's administration.

COLONEL SEELY said he could not say how many. With regard to manhood suffrage, the whole question was whether we ought to have granted it, and in so doing indirectly set up a colour bar. He could not say more than that the thing was done. He remembered very well his right hon. friend below the gangway raising this point when the Constitution was first granted. He did not then fully apprehend the dangers which might follow from that course. He was not there to criticise in any way the conclusion which was come to, but he declared that the Government fully realised the difficulties which were created by this situation. It might be said that had they taken the other course, the difficulties would have been as great, in some respects even greater. That was all he now had to say on this matter. The thing had been done and could not be undone. To deprive white people of the vote they had enjoyed was a thing which it seemed to him they could not seriously propose. With regard to federation or unification, he could only repeat that the Government would welcome proposals from the South African Governments to that end. They were fully aware that the unification or federation of the South African Governments in whatever form it came, must tend to make things easier in almost every respect, and especially in regard to the relations between this Government and the Governments out there. But the Home Government did not propose to make any proposition themselves; they thought it would be unwise to do so. They awaited confidently and with great interest the conference shortly to meet at Durban, and would take every step to render it due dignity. The right hon. Gentleman had said that they ought to remove the causes of irritation and bitterness which now existed in South Africa. He mentioned four, but before doing so he poured what he could hardly describe as less than vitriol on the head of the President of the Board of Trade. He admired the right hon. Gentleman's adroitness in choosing for the purpose a moment when the President of the Board of Trade was out of the House. Besides that his right hon. friend had left that Department and, therefore, could not speak for himself.

MR. LYTTELTON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman meant that they were to abstain from criticism of Ministers because they were absent from the House when important questions were being discussed, in regard to which their presence was required.

COLONEL SEELY said that when any Member criticised another in far more violent terms during his absence than during his presence, it might naturally be imputed to him that he was using a wise discretion.

MR. LYTTELTON said he himself gave the hon. and gallant Gentleman notice of the general line of his argument and, therefore, he ought to have acquainted his right hon. friend.

COLONEL SEELY said he thought his right hon. friend was fully justified in the statements to which the right hon. Gentleman took exception. Those statements were almost always directed against persons who introduced a particular form of labour in South Africa. That form was regarded on the opposite benches with favour; on the Ministerial side with disfavour. As to the voters' list, he did not wish to reopen the controversy. He must repeat that, whilst the Government did not disagree with or demur to Lord Selborne's statement that he was satisfied that the list was accurate, it could not be surprising that people in South Africa did demur to it when they found that several thousand more persons were on the register than they believed there were adult males in the country. There was great reason for people calling in question a roll of this kind with so remarkable a discrepancy. He himself was of the opinion that there had been an extraordinary influx into the Rand, and he should think there was no proof of any kind that the roll was not accurate. He submitted that it was most unwise to reopen a controversy which could only have the effect of reviving certain class and race bitterness in South Africa now happily passing away. With regard to Chinese labour, the right hon. Gentleman said there was no difference between Chinese labour and black labour imported from Portuguese East Africa. To that he listened with amazement, thinking such a statement could not be made by any reasonable man. What did the Liberal Party say about Chinese labour? They said first of all that it was introduced against the will of the people. They went to an election and by a majority of two to one they said the Liberal Party was right.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) here interjected a remark across the Table which was not heard in the Press gallery.

COLONEL SEELY: I trust that remark will not be recorded in the journals of the House. A more disgraceful and unworthy suggestion——[Loud MINISTERIAL cheers.]

Mr. STUART WORTLEY rose, but Colonel SEELY refused to give way.

The CHAIRMAN also rose amid cries of "Name" and "Withdraw."

MR. STUART WORTLEY: I rise to order.

* THE CHAIRMAN: I think hon. Members on the front benches ought to know that it is not in order to remain standing when I rise. If the right hon. Gentleman rises to a point of order I will hear him.

MR. STUART WORTLEY: I wish to ask whether the expression of the hon. Gentleman is Parliamentary—the word "disgraceful."

COLONEL SEELY: On that point of order may I ask whether the original statement of the right hon. Gentleman is Parliamentary? [SEVERAL MEMBERS: What was it?]

* THE CHAIRMAN: I did not hear what the original statement was.

MR. STUART WORTLEY: I said the people of the Transvaal arrived at no such vote as the hon. Gentleman said they did, and I added, not till the loan of five millions was offered, and not even then did the people of the Transvaal arrive at such a vote.

* THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think, whatever opinion hon. Members may form of what the right hon. Gentleman said, that he said anything unparliamentary. Then I am asked whether the word "disgraceful" is unparliamentary. I do not consider the word is essentially an unparliamentary expression.

COLONEL SEELY: I remained standing, Sir, only because I thought it was the custom in this House that the hon. Member speaking should give way or not at his option, and I did not wish to give way until I had concluded my sentence. I apologise to you, Sir, for the mistake I made.

MR. STUART WORTLEY: In remaining standing, Sir, while you were standing I was undoubtedly guilty of a mistake, but I thought you were securing to me the right to raise my point of order.

COLONEL SEELY said he was saying when he was interrupted, that such a statement commenting in such language upon a Government friendly to this country, which had rendered us such signal service, or under any circumstances, seemed to him absolutely contrary to the best traditions of this House, and he ventured to hope that the right hon. Gentleman would withdraw it. [Cheers and cries of "Withdraw."] The suggestion was one which he could not characterise in Parliamentary language. Reverting to the retrenchments the hon. Member said that, although he did not consider there was any blame to be attached to the Transvaal Government in this matter, the Colonial Office had done their best to find places for those who were retrenched. The total number of these retrenched candidates since the beginning of 1907 was 164, and the committee of the Colonial Office had found room for thirty-nine and twenty-one and eight, making 56 per cent. of the vacancies. There were persons outside who had made the extraordinary allegation against General Botha's Government to the effect that they were making wholesale displacement of British officials and replacing them by Dutch, that no Englishmen need apply, and other wild statements of that kind. It was admitted there was a larger Dutch population than an English in the Transvaal. It was almost certain that the adult males of South African descent were larger in number than the adult males of English descent. If there were any word of truth in the allegations made, one would expect to find that there were about 60 or 70 Dutchmen to 20 or 30 or 40 Englishmen in every 100. What were the facts? In the whole Transvaal Civil Service, including the police and prison department, but excluding the railways, instead of there being about 70 Dutchmen and only 30 Englishmen in a country where the Dutch preponderated, out of every 100 there were 84 Englishmen and 16 Dutchmen. He asked the House to realise the significance of those figures. He asked that the campaign of misrepresentation against General Botha's Government should come to an end. It was absolutely unjustified. What about the new appointments? He would not have been surprised if, in that case, there had been a preponderance of Dutch to redress the balance, though he would have deplored it. Yet, instead of 70 or 80 Dutchmen being appointed to 30 or 20 Englishmen, since General Botha took office the number of new appointments made were 59 English, 41 Dutch. Well, they had now scotched and killed that calumny, and he was glad they had. Looking at those figures which had just come to him, and certified officially to be correct, it would be observed that General Botha and his Government had treated the minority politically with extraordinary generosity. He did not himself admit that the cleavage was on racial lines. Then there were the railways. In 1907 there were employed of South Africa born (English and Dutch descent) 2,195; English born, 3,629; other nationalities, 329, the percentages being 35 per cent., 58 per cent., and other nationalities 7 per cent. He could not add, therefore, to the statement he had made, and directly the figures were presented he thought that the whole argument fell to the ground. One could not help being sorry for the gentlemen whose appointments had been brought to a close. He had seen nearly all of them personally, and in several cases the Department had managed to get them suitable appointments. He had received an announcement, indeed, to the effect that on the previous day an important appointment had been secured for one gentleman, and he would make an appeal to the other Departments of the Government to see whether they could not give help in a similar direction. He thought, however, that he had disposed of the allegation that had been made. The right hon. Gentleman said it still stood on record that the Opposition protested against the grant of self-government to the Transvaal. He was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman continued to make that statement. It was a great experiment, but its success had been most surprising. Of that there could be no question, for, whereas a few years ago we had there a hostile population, it was now true to say that in matters of great difficulty and delicacy during the last eighteen months no man had been so loyal a friend to the British Government as General Botha. That opinion was not confined to Englishmen in this country. He did not know whether hon. Members had read the speech which had recently been delivered by Sir H. de Villiers during the celebrations at Quebec, but it was so interesting that he would quote it—

> "South Africa in recent years has passed through a terrible ordeal, but she is slowly recovering from the effects of an injurious war. Only those who have lived there and had friends and relatives fighting on both sides can fully realise what that war meant to us. It was undertaken for the purpose of obtaining equal rights for all, but for some time after peace was established it looked as if political rights were to be withheld for an indefinite period from the new subjects of the King. At length, however, different counsels prevailed. A policy of trust was adopted, with the novel result that a sullen and discontented people were, as if by magic, changed into law-abiding, loyal subjects. From that quarter no danger need be apprehended for the future. On the contrary, if ever any foreign Power should attempt to wrest South Africa from the Empire, you may be quite sure that history will repeat itself, and, just as the French-Canadians were foremost in defending their country against attacks from without, so the Dutch inhabitants of South Africa will fight shoulder to shoulder with their British fellow-subjects for their King and country"

The Government were persuaded that the eloquent words uttered by this speaker represented the truth in South Africa, and His Majesty's Ministers rejoiced that they had enjoyed the privilege of helping to carry out this great and beneficent work.

MR. STUART WORTLEY said that he adhered to what he had stated. He said that the hon. Member's description of the South African elections was inaccurate, and that it had been adopted for the purpose of casting obloquy on his right hon. friend. Personally he had said nothing which had not already been said both in and out of the House. General Botha had stated that the Government returned from the polls not pledged to abolish Chinese labour—[Oh, oh!]—and for some time after they announced their intention not to abolish it. Thereafter the Government thought fit to accord to the Transvaal exceptional financial treatment which had never been accorded to any self-governing Colony; and he said that according to the historical sequence the evidence was accurate, and he had nothing to take away from the statement. It was for the Government to explain why they offered that financial assistance at that particular period of time. He had never seen any satisfactory explanation of the circumstance, and he refused to admit any inaccuracy in his statement.

COLONEL SEELY pointed out that General Botha in his speech before the poll, said that—

> "We will not have Chinese labour with indenture or without indenture."

The policy adopted as to Chinese labour had been justified by its complete success, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see that his statement with regard to the programme of the Government was incorrect. General Botha's statement was conclusive on that point. He regretted that the insinuation of the right hon. Gentleman had been made, and he hoped that before the sitting was closed he would withdraw it.

MR. STUART WORTLEY said that the statements were made by the Minister in the Transvaal to the effect that they returned from the polls to continue this Chinese labour policy. Hon. Members could only speak according to the general evidence that reached them.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) drew attention to the attitude of mind of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, as shown in his opening remarks. The right hon. Gentleman had treated the Committee once again to the now familiar doctrine that if they persisted in their criticisms on the action of Natal, they were doing something that was showing disloyalty or that was giving embarrassment to the loyal minority in that Colony. It was a most extraordinary doctrine to be preached from the front Opposition bench that in that Imperial House they must not say what they believed to be true of the political conduct of Ministers of our self-governing Colonies lest they laid themselves open to the retort of the right hon. Gentleman that they were putting obstacles in the way of and creating embarrassment for what he called the loyal English minority.

MR. LYTTELTON said that, on the contrary, he claimed and had always claimed in that House to criticise the action of the Government with regard to the Transvaal, and especially with regard to giving them self-government.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD admitted that that was perfectly true, but before the right hon. Gentleman made the general statement, he made with special reference to Natal the observation to which he (Mr. Macdonald) now referred. If the right hon. Gentleman did not mean to convey that impression, he could only say that that was the way it struck him. Those who had ventured to make these criticisms and who honestly believed they were entitled to do so, had met with the criticism outside that they were doing something to disrupt the Empire and putting difficulties in the way of Natal. It was perfectly true that they might sometimes criticise things that had happened in Natal during the last two or three years with a strength of feeling and in a way that might create offence in Natal, but hon. and right hon. Members must remember that whilst that criticism on Natal might be objectionable and indiscreet, those who exaggerated the meaning and value of that criticism and who came to that House and misrepresented that criticism were doing more than those who uttered it to contribute to the unrest in Natal. The person who exaggerated what was said in the House and caused it to be exaggerated out in Natal, forgot that it was his exaggeration quite as much as the criticism in this House that caused unrest there.

MR. LYTTLETON: Let the hon. Member quote the words that he imagines I made use of.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said he was sorry he had not taken down the observations which were made by the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the criticism that was offered both inside and outside the House on affairs in Natal. With regard to the Transvaal Civil Service appointments, his hon. and gallant friend had completely and in the strongest way disposed of the complaints which were so common on that subject. But there was something more that he (Mr. Macdonald) might say. He happened to be in the Transvaal shortly after the peace, and he saw the influx of those extraordinary Civil servants whom Lord Milner appointed to carry out the pacification. He did not wish to refer to what went on, it would be sufficient for him to say to any hon. Member of the House who had made himself acquainted with the affairs of the Transvaal that the whole body of imported Civil Service which Lord Milner placed in authority in offices in the Transvaal was known to the people of the Transvaal as "Milner's Kindergarten." Anybody who went into the Government offices of Johannesburg, Pretoria, or Bloomfontein must have seen that since the War a great change had taken place. Firstly, the staff, numerically, was far too large; and, secondly, the men whom Lord Milner appointed were not the proper men for the duty imposed upon them. Every Dutch Civil servant he had had the pleasure of consulting in the Colony held up his hands in horror and said that as soon as self-government was granted the unfortunate thing they would have to face was the complete reconstruction of the *personnel* of the Civil Service that had been imposed upon the Colony by the Governor. That had taken place. It was inevitable that it should take place, and it was an evidence of the common sense of the Government put into power both in Johannesburg and Blœmfontein. Last session he took part in the debate in the House on the question of the franchise in the Transvaal, and he then expressed some doubt as to the advisability of the manhood suffrage which the Government had instituted in the Transvaal, not because he was opposed to manhood suffrage but because he believed that everybody who had studied affairs in South Africa would see the enormous disadvantage of such a franchise when the time came to enfranchise the natives. It was certain that the question of the native franchise would not be left long, and directly that question came up it would be a great obstacle to the enfranchisement of the natives all over Africa that there was manhood suffrage in the Transvaal. His democratic principles, he was sorry to say, had struggled in vain to justify the action the Government took on that occasion, in view of the larger question of native rights. He thought greater good would have been done if the white men had been subjected to a higher standard of franchise. He thought we should not have established a franchise in the Transvaal which might be a permanent bar to the enfranchisement of the natives of South Africa. He hoped the Government would do its best to see that the Cape solution was followed when the new Federal Constitution was being framed. Although he knew that the Home Government might not want to interfere, unofficial members might express a hope that Cape Colony would stand by the native franchise when the Federation Convention meets. The first thing to observe about Natal was the extraordinary Indemnity Act, which he regretted the House was not going to have a further opportunity of discussing. The extraordinary feature of the present Bill, a feature that had never been known in connection with an Indemnity Bill, was the change that had be made in the Bill now on its way to this country as compared with the Act of 1906. In the Act of 1906 the preamble recited—

> "That whereas serious disturbances accompanied by rebellion have recently arisen and still continue among certain parts of the native population of this Colony."

Some Members doubted the rebellion. Some of them had never yet been convinced that there was ever a rebellion in Natal, though there were people who alleged from their point of view that there was a rebellion which justified the proclamation of martial law in 1906. The Bill did not allege rebellion. This was an example of the "Rake's Progress." The Natal Government were now going to withdraw "rebellion" and put in "several crimes of violence in Zululand creating a state of unrest and insecurity among the inhabitants." Was ever a more flimsy pretext made for martial law? What were we going to come to if we were going to jump from rebellion, from a state of war, from a hostile state of things under which it was impossible for the ordinary civil and criminal Courts to sit—the proper justification for martial law hitherto—to a state of things where "several crimes of violence" created a "state of unrest" — not even of civil disturbance but unrest—and insecurity among the inhabitants as the justification? Why, the brewers in this country at the present time could say that owing to the Bill in this House a state of unrest had come among them, and something akin to martial law should be established. He did not believe that political differences divided them on this matter. Hon. Members above the gangway shared their sense of British justice and were not going to countenance martial law in Natal because of "several acts of violence." Later on the words "disturbance and rebellion" were omitted, and the words "crimes and the restoration of order and good government" were inserted. Another reason given for the proclamation of martial law was to facilitate the investigation of crime and the arrest and detention of the persons charged. There was, he would venture to say, not a single Member of the House, even of the most old-fashioned Conservative type, who would maintain that the allegations in the Blue-book were adequate for a proclamation of martial law. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had said that if we did not accept this Bill things would remain as they were. That brought up the question of Dinizulu. What about evidence for defence? That was just the wickedness of it, because it proved that they went and did a certain thing which created injustice, and then at a certain point the Government turned round and said that unless they were excused from their wrong-doing the evil of that wrong-doing would be visited on the heads of innocent people. He was not going to argue the point, he only stated it and left the Committee to draw its own conclusions. The Committee would at all events agree that it was the duty of the Government to see that this sort of thing did not happen again. That was the general case against the Natal Government, not from a petty sectional point of view, but from an Imperial point of view; not from the point of view of Labour or Liberal Members, but from the point of view of the national, the inherited liberties of the British race. The right hon. Member for St. George's in his almost ladylike and drawing-room account of what was going on made him wonder if he was really listening to a statement of how Dinizulu was being tried. The right hon Gentleman left out the salient points. He did not tell them of the continued campaign of calumny, he did not tell them that they had to wait day after day and week after week before the Government could make any charge against Dinizulu; he did not describe the vagueness of the charges made against the chief; he did not refer to the long campaign of calumny which preceded the arrest when the Natal Government refused to protect Dinizulu from the libels. The Government were cognisant of the fact that these calumnies, amounting to libel, were published day after day in the South African Press, and the Government of Natal never gave any reason to show that they were the protectors of Dinizulu. They were, therefore, bound to say that the Government held on, waiting for an opportunity which inevitably came for arresting Dinizulu, not on any charge, but on a vague basis of assertions not one of which was definite enough to make it possible for Dinizulu's solicitor to deal with it, Dinizulu was accused of murder—the murder of whom, where, when—ten years ago, twenty years ago, or yesterday? Not a single definite statement was made in support of the accusations on which Dinizulu's solicitor or his friends could go and search for witnesses to enable them specifically to show that this or that particular story was untrue, because there was never a particular story told. The Natal Government had secured to themselves a roving commission to spread their emissaries and agents all over Zululand under martial law to inquire into this, that, and the other, not to find out whether this or that statement was true, but to find out whether Dinizulu had ever done anything which would enable them sooner or later to formulate a decent indictment to place before the Court. And not only that, but it had been alleged that in the course of gathering the evidence there had been certain floggings. He was perfectly well aware that this had been denied, and he was not going to make the statement as absolutely true; but he thought that no one who read the Blue-Book published yesterday would be very much impressed with that denial; nor did he think that anyone who read the newspapers would be very much impressed by it, seeing that Miss Colenso had offered to prove twenty-nine definite cases, with the names of the persons and circumstances under which they were flogged, and submit them for impartial investigation in Natal itself. But he was bound to say that in this case his mind was open. It was said, also, that Dinizulu's wife had made a statement, it was not definitely said whether on oath or not, but he thought it must have been made under oath. She stated that Sir Duncan McKenzie had threatened to shoot her unless she gave evidence against her husband. That had not been contradicted so far, and a statement given under those circumstances made it presumably accurate. Apparently a good many Members of the House had come in contact with the native. He did not care where they met him, whether in the Southern States of America, where they saw him generally in railway carriages, or elsewhere, he was always willing to tell one anything that seemed to please. He remembered very well an interesting incident which happened to himself, which established this characteristic of which he had spoken. He got into a train exceedingly tired one morning about four o'clock, and the negro attendant, seeing he was weary, was very anxious to assure him that he would have breakfast immediately. It did not come, however, until eight o'clock. Anyone who had come in contact with the native knew perfectly well, that, owing to the social habit of obeying which he had acquired, it was easy to put statements in his mouth, and get him to say what his questioner required. If the Government came and said they wanted evidence it was a perfectly certain thing that some native would give it. It was the psychology of the native to do a thing like that. Martial law being proclaimed in Zululand, emissaries, who were known to be agents of the Government, had gone hither and thither across the face of Zululand asking for evidence on which Dinizulu was to be tried, telling the natives what the evidence was for and what sort of evidence they wanted. Would any hon. Member who understood the native psychology tell them for a single moment that evidence would not be forthcoming? That was the sort of way in which the Natal Government was conducting this trial. It was necessary to say that. He knew that right hon. Gentlemen above the gangway might think it exceedingly criminal on his part to express such sympathies and opinions; but he held them very honestly, and he could assure them that he held them not from a party or sectional point of view, but from the Imperial point of view, because he and those with him felt that the future of this Empire would be decided by its honour and by the way in which it administered justice. Then as to Dinizulu's salary. From every quarter of the House there came thanks to the Government for having determined to pay Dinizulu's salary. There was absolutely no distinction of opinion on that point, no dissentient voice on the matter. It was what they had expected from His Majesty's Government; and they were delighted that it had done precisely what they believed it would do. There was one little unpleasantness, however. Yesterday they had been told that after the reply to the despatch of His Majesty's Government, policemen were sent up into Zululand, and again there was the cry of "unrest in Zululand." Whenever anything was said by His Majesty's Government which seemed to run counter to the will of the Natal Government, the latter were in a position to have telegrams sent to this country, specially and carefully preserved telegrams, which appeared exclusively in certain organs of the Imperial press, for the purpose of trying to deceive the people of this country, who were ignorant of what was going on, and also for the purpose of getting responsive telegrams from this country to Natal to strengthen the hands of the Government of that Colony by misrepresentation of public opinion here. The reply to the despatch was the first step towards creating another defence so as to justify themselves. He had a cutting from the *Natal Mercury* which said—

> "The whole Press of Natal is unanimous in condemning the Government's action in these matters as severely as any newspaper in England has done, and this expression of opinion is endorsed by the Colonists generally. The sooner the people of England are impressed with the fact that the Government are in these matters acting in direct conflict with the ideas of Natalians, the sooner they will recognise that a gross injustice is being done to the good sense and the good taste of the people of Natal."

That was the published opinion of an important Natal newspaper. Yet in spite of that, the moment His Majesty's Government ranged itself on the side of the majority of the people of Natal, some policemen were sent into Zululand in order to give His Majesty's Government reason to pause. In reference to Dinizulu's salary, his hon. friend had said that he could not understand the delay and Dinizulu's solicitor not applying for it. He had an extract from the *Natal Witness* giving the complete series of Mr. Renaud's letters. He was not going to read them, but this was one of them, written on 18th May to the acting Attorney-General—

> "We beg to refer to the correspondence which has passed between us with reference to the cession of Dinizulu's salary to us. You wrote us on 30th January that the matter was receiving

attention, but since that date we have not heard from you."

Therefore, the explanation was that the delay was not due to Dinizulu's solicitor, but to the Natal Government. When there was nothing more than a mere acknowledgement required, they took a day or two to give it, when more was required, they took weeks and months to investigate the matter, and make their reply. He had said all that he need say on the subject. He had spoken not as what was called "a Little Englander," but as an Imperialist. He had spoken as one who believed that this Empire was going to depend, not merely upon its size or its physical strength, but upon its justice, and he was perfectly certain that if they gave way one inch in their desire to see justice done to the unenfranchised negro, then it would be absolutely impossible to keep the Empire so clean and so pure as to enable it to survive the stress and storm which time had in store for it.

SIR GILBERT PARKER thought he would not be alone in regretting that the debate had not been absolutely free from heat. Perhaps he regretted it more than anyone else, because of a rather painful interruption which occurred in the last Parliament and in which the hon. Gentleman opposite was responsible. His right hon. friend below him was making his speech concerning South Africa, and was making statements in good faith and with great moderation as he always did, when the hon. Gentleman and several of his friends sitting below the Opposition gangway made remarks which he himself thought wholly unparliamentary concerning his right hon. friend and his statements. They questioned his good faith.

COLONEL SEELY: No; I may say——

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Allow me to finish. They questioned his good faith, and he interjected, but not loudly, the word "disgraceful." The hon. Gentlemen opposite, the President of the Board of Trade, the President of the Board of Education, and the President of the Local Government Board, entered a loud protest, and demanded that the Member for Gravesend should be pilloried by the Speaker. The Speaker rose, and the Member for Gravesend rose also, stating the cause of his interjection, and immediately, without being called upon to do it, withdrawing the word "disgraceful," which the Speaker had pronounced as un-Parliamentary. He only wished to say this because he thought it was the hon. Gentleman himself who had imported heat into the debate that afternoon. Remembering his career, however short it might have been in the Colonial Office, and his urbane and admirable manner in all other debates, he regretted exceedingly that he had given them cause to feel that they were not safe in future in making reasonable, and as he believed, just criticism. He wanted to say something very quietly and he hoped without offence. He understood the position taken up by his right hon. friend. He had stated that the elections in the Transvaal were not decided on the question of Chinese labour. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was correct. Furthermore, the right hon. Gentleman had suggested, as it had been suggested before and no doubt would be again, that considerations concerning the repatriation of the Chinamen entered into all the relations between this Government and the Botha Government, and also affected the granting of the Constitution itself, but he hoped to be able to quote the words of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies himself in which he frankly said, for no one eevr doubted his courage or audacity, that considerations of the repatriation of the Chinamen did enter into the granting of the Constitution and into our relations with the Transvaal Government, and the Transvaal Government would never have got the £5,000,000 loan if they had not agreed to repatriate the Chinamen. At any rate hon. Gentlemen would say he had said nothing offensive.

COLONEL SEELY: There is not a word of truth in that.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he might very well be angry at the hon. Gentleman's saying there was not a word of truth in what he said, but he was too broad minded. He understood what the hon. Gentleman meant, though the hon. Gentleman did not always understand what he meant. The hon. Gentleman he thought could not be speaking with absolute accuracy. It would be better for him to consult with his friend the late Under-Secretary, who, if he was sometimes vituperative, could stand a good deal of vituperation in return. He was a gallant fighter. He did not want to say that the hon. and gallant Gentleman was not a gallant fighter—they knew that he was—but he must not really pretend to this splendid indignation against a right hon. Gentleman on that bench when he made perfectly Parliamentary statements. In the last debate he thought the statements of the hon. Gentleman opposite would not add to the smoothness of debate, and he had expressed himself strongly about it. How much more strongly could he express himself concerning the speech made by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He had no fault to find with the underlying argument of that speech, but he had every fault to find with the manner in which it was expressed. He did not think the terms in which his argument was couched would tend to good feeling between Natal and this country, though he thought his main argument was sound, that martial law as it was applied by the Natal Government was not wisely applied. But he said in the last debate, and said very strongly, that the Government now in power was responsible for the present position, and it was responsible for the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down. They had it in their power, when martial law was to be proclaimed, through their Governor, through their supreme official, the King's representative in Natal, to prevent martial law being proclaimed. They had since acknowledged that the conclusion drawn by the Attorney-General was wrong, that in effect the Governor was the servant of the Natal Government. No one would stand up more strongly than he for the rights of a Colony or a Colonial Governor, but no one would stand up more strongly for the Imperial connection. The only thing they had was the Privy Council and the power of the Governor in regard to just such things as martial law. Our hold was very slight. Destroy the technical and constitutional hold that we had just through the Governor, and we destroyed our Imperial Power altogether. On the other hand, the refusal by Members to believe that Natal was acting in good faith, honestly and sincerely, did infinite harm to the Imperial connection. Suppose the Natal Government had made a mistake. Every Government desired to keep its self-respect and it was Natal who would pay the price of its mistakes, if it had made mistakes. It paid the cost in blood. This Government threw the whole responsibility for the late trouble upon Natal, and in a certain despatch, of which the hon. Gentleman was fully aware, said in effect: "We wash our hands of this whole business." But having washed their hands of the whole business they still intervened. Did they not see the absolutely absurd position in which they had been placed, not by Members of the House but by the Government? One word about Dinizulu's salary and the trial. He said deliberately that he thought Natal ought by every means in its power to expedite the conclusion of the examination of Dinizulu. Seven months was a long time. If the Government could not in seven months gather enough evidence against this man to formulate definitely a charge, he should be discharged. Of that he had no manner of doubt. Natal could only act, as he understood it, as a Government, compatibly with the relations of the executive and the judicial. It was a difficult situation, but he believed the Attorney-General could expedite the conclusion of the examination either here or in Natal. He believed in Natal's *bona fides* absolutely. He believed it had acted honestly and sincerely, but he was firmly convinced that it would do well in all the circumstances, even if the guilty were to go free, to bring Dinizulu to trial immediately. As to the salary, he had his doubts in the last debate whether it was correct to pay the salary—whether the suspension of the salary did not go with the suspension of the office. But it was certain that if the Government on the best advice possible interpreted the arrangement made by his right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham as meaning that the salary should in no case be suspended without the consent of this Government and this Government did not grant its consent, it was the duty of this Government to pay that salary. He knew the House recognised the consequences that must flow from such action. It practically overrode the act and the policy of the Natal Government. It was a dangerous thing to do at any time. It was extremely dangerous to do it now when events were so acute, and when feeling ran so high. Recognising the consequences that would flow, and it being a small matter, the Natal Government would have been well advised if it had paid the salary. Having said that he desired to pass to another subject. The position of the retrenched officials had been dealt with most effectively by his right hon. friend. The Under-Secretary read some figures which seemed entirely conclusive to hon. Members opposite. The figures showed that there had only been a very limited number of changes and that of those changes the preponderance of applicants had been of British born subjects. He hoped the hon Gentleman recognised that a great many of the names that appeared as English names were names of those who fought against us in the last war, and who were not Britishers in the true sense of the term. They knew perfectly well that the retrenchment of officials would go on slowly, and that the replacement of British officials by Dutch would also be slow. He had never made any wild statements. He had been most conservative in a double sense, in speaking of the action of the Botha Government. He had never accused the Botha Government of deliberately and wilfully throwing out British officials and putting in Dutch officials. If ever men worked, no matter how young they were or how inexperienced, for the country, giving their whole life and energy, it was the men who went out from this country to what had been called Lord Milner's Kindergarten. He could mention cases which ought to go to the heart of every Member of the House. It was idle to say that there were only a few. They knew that many of them suffered uncomplainingly. A petition was presented yesterday to the Prime Minister on this subject, and anyone who read it must be impressed by the quiet reserve and the diginity of its terms. There was no complaint, but there was an appeal, and that was what they all heard in every letter from South Africa. He had received two letters that morning, and he would venture to read one of them, because it was very important. The hon. Gentleman had said that there were practically no replacements of British officers by the Government. He would make the following quotation from one of the letters he had received—

> "Owing to the characteristic thinness of the Boer methods it is difficult to produce evidence at this distance of specific cases such as this Gazette provides. Hitherto, many of the replacements have been indirect, that is to say, British officials have been 'retrenched' from the established Government Departments and new offices embracing similar duties have been created to which only Dutchmen have been appointed. I refer in particular to the re-establishment of the Field Cornet system of pre-war days. In connection with these new appointments I would point out that when a number of us were retrenched at the end of last year on the ground of reduction of establishment, it was stated that in the event of vacancies occurring at a subsequent date the names of those officers who had already served for a good many years and who were leaving through no fault of their own, would be considered in preference to any new candidates. This promise like many others has evidently been ignored."

To what did he refer? He referred to the appointment of eight acting inspectors of constabulary in the place of British officers, he being one of those who had been retrenched. When the hon. Gentleman said that British officers were not retrenched and replaced by Dutchmen, he made a statement which was not accurate. He did not deny the right of General Botha and his people to be represented in the Civil Service of their country; it would be a monstrous thing to assert that after his own experience of another country, which had two races, and he would be the last man to suggest that there should not be Dutchmen in the Civil Service. What he did say, however, was that to turn out Britishers in order to put in Dutchmen, and turn them out without adequate compensation or pensions, was quite a different thing. He did not accuse the Botha Government of this, but he accused the present Government in this country of being responsible for that, because they failed when they were granting the new constitution to the Transvaal, to secure and safeguard the rights of British Civil servants. He assumed that the sympathy of the hon. Member representing the Government, and his patriotism disapproved of the action of the Government to which he belonged in making no provision for these retrenched Civil servants. Had the hon. Gentleman any real reason for not inquiring further into this matter? The late Under-Secretary for the Colonies promised that every effort should be made to draft the retrenched officials into other departments at home. The figure which had been given amounted to 56 per cent. out of 164, and although that was not bad it ought to have been 100 per cent. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why?] Because, as the hon. Member knew, if there was one man who could not get a job it was a man who had been a Government servant. Men who had been employed in general professions or general trades could get a job anywhere. But in the case of men who had been in the Government service their chances were much less of getting employment. They all knew that those who had served in the Army or in the public service had always a difficulty in getting a situation. The Governments in every other country, in Italy, Prussia, Canada, or anywhere where responsible government was granted, always took care that the Civil servants should have their interest safeguarded, and he thought the letter he had read might very well be framed and hung up in the Colonial Office for the guidance of his hon. friend and his colleague. Whoever wrote that letter was well informed as to what was the duty of the Government in the matter, and there was an element of ugly meanness in a representative of any Department of the State not even going extravagantly in the direction of protecting civil servants. There was not a right hon. Gentleman sitting on the Ministerial front bench who did not hold that the members of this Department and of all Departments of State deserved the best of treatment by this House, and this Government did a brutal thing in throwing upon the Botha Government the necessity of providing for the retrenched civil servant. They found money to pay Dinizulu's salary, and to repatriate Chinamen. He had evidence in his pocket in the shape of a letter showing that a distinguished officer, holding the C.M.G. Order, was given a third class indulgence passage by the Transvaal Government home to this country. He submitted that that was a case which ought to bring the blush of shame to the representative of any Government. Would it not have been a fair thing, after deciding that the compensation should be one month's salary for every year's service, to have sent that man and his five children home. Would it not have been fair, having deprived that man of that which he believed was a permanent position and pensionable, to have given him a second-class passage home? Not a single retrenched Civil servant had had his passage paid from Johannesburg to the Cape or from the Cape home, and many of them had been assisted in regard to their passages by people in this country. He thought the Government would do well even if they set apart in the Estimates a sum of money for these retrenched officials. [Cries of "Oh, oh."] Why not? They had no hesitation about voting £10,000 to Jamaica. He desired to draw attention to the railway which was being built in Uganda. Already a number of officers had gone out as engineers, and there were a good number of retrenched officials who were very capable and competent engineers. He would like to know why they could not be employed on those railways.

COLONEL SEELY dissented.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he had presented a concrete case where something could be done, and he did not see why these men should not be given a chance. The conduct of the Government was to be wholly reprehended. It was not too late to redress this grievance, because these men had been led to believe that their positions would be permanent and pensionable. He thought it was the duty of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies to see that none of these men should suffer so severely and cruelly as many of them were now suffering. He wanted to speak briefly on the question of land settlement in the Orange

River Colony and the Transvaal. He wanted to warn the House that an effort was going to be made to force the Land Board into making an arrangement with the Government. The Land Board which had been established was independent of the Government for five years. Both sides of the House agreed to that. Since the Board was set up there had been steady pressure to force it into an arrangement with the Government. The Board had behaved extremely well, and it had refused to do this. He did not hesitate to say that they had been incited to quarrel with the Land Board, in spite of the fact that the Board had been eminently successful in all it had done. He thought it was perfectly natural that the Orange River Colony should try to quarrel with the Board. Why? There was a revenue of £40,000 a year from rents and payments for land, and they would take that sum and apply it to the interest on the £1,200,000 loan which went for land settlement. The £40,000 now went to get fresh land on which to put the few settlers who did go there and to make it easy for the settlers when bad times came, and to shepherd them over the rough places. The Orange River Colony would be glad to have that money. A member of the Orange River Colony Government had said that it was inequitable that they did not get that money. They forgot that the Government here in its magnanimity wrote off a loan of £5,000,000 for which the Orange River Colony was responsible. He did not think that the Orange River Colony had really any ground of complaint. He still believed in the policy of the late Government in regard to Chinese labour and other matters, but he thought they made a great mistake when they guaranteed the £5,000,000 loan. What was the basis of his argument in saying so? It was that, when two races were together in a country, having to face prosperity and disaster together, they ought mutually to be responsible for all their liabilities and all their needs. He believed the hon. Gentleman opposite agreed with him that it would have been far better to have said to those people: "Work out your own salvation and raise your own loan within your colony. Struggle together until you find common working ground." The two races would have come more closely together infinitely sooner if they had been jointly responsible for the £5,000,000 which this Government secured to them, not without a political purpose behind it. [An HON. MEMBER: What about the £30,000,000?] Passing to West African affairs he said he did not think he would shock the susceptibility of any hon. Gentleman opposite in regard to the question he was about to raise. The Committee might be surprised if he appeared in the *rôle* of temperance advocate, but he did so that afternoon. He was going to challenge this Government, the past Government, and all past Governments in this country for their dealings with the natives in regard to the liquor traffic. There were certain portions of His Majesty's dominions where the sale of liquor was prohibited. He had always taken the ground that the vices of one race should not be made possible or incorporated in the nature of another race. The oriental could bear the effects of opium much better than the occidental. A European would find himself upset if he took a small portion of Kaffir beer, but a native would drink it by the gallon and not feel any evil effect. To every race its own vices. For this Government or any Government to get 67 per cent. of its revenue out of the sale to the natives of spirits made from potatoes chiefly in Germany was a thing which made one's Christian blood boil. In our own race there was, he supposed, a natural microbe which resisted to a very considerable extent the effects of our own liquors and spirits. The native had no such microbe. He thought the view expressed by the late Lord Salisbury in 1888 was one which would commend itself to all members of the Committee. He said—

> "I need not inform you that I am not a temperance enthusiast myself. I do not coincide with many of the views which I hear urged with great confidence in this country. But the controversy here and the controversy with respect to the native races have nothing in common. The native races are for all practical purposes children, and so far as we can do it, like children they must be protected. No one who even looks at history, still less at contemporary history, can doubt the extreme character of the evil which this unrestricted traffic causes. It has before this swept whole races away; it is now producing the greatest havoc in all parts of the world. We are so

> deeply convinced of that, that any efforts on our part would never be wanting, nor would our attention for a moment relax, from the purpose of inducing that common effort by which alone this miserable traffic can be restrained."

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in 1889 said—

> "I do not think I am a fanatic, and no one, I hope, has called me a sentimentalist, and I am certainly not a teetotaller. I hope I am not extreme with regard to any subject; but I hold, as a matter of deep conviction, that the liquor trade, and above all, the increase of the liquor traffic in West Africa amongst the native races, is not only discreditable to the British name, not only derogatory to that true Imperialism—the sentiment which I desire to inculcate in all my countrymen—but it is also disastrous to British trade."

He believed that to be the indubitable truth. What were the places where the sale of spirits to natives was prohibited? It was prohibited in the northern territories of the Gold Coast and Northern Nigeria. It was also prohibited in British Somaliland, the British East Africa Protectorate, Uganda, Nyassaland, and Rhodesia. In all the countries of the South African Customs Union, namely, the Cape, Natal, Orange River Colony, Transvaal, Southern Rhodesia, Basutoland, Swaziland, and the Bechuanaland Protectorate, more or less stringent prohibition of sale to natives existed. Lord Crewe, the other day, replying to a letter from an association which took a great interest in this subject, said that the question of revenue had to be looked to. Of course if once they established the principle of getting revenue from liquor, it was very hard to do away with it. It was very hard to get it out of cotton. A certain amount was got now out of cotton in Nigeria. Wherever the revenue from drink was highest the record of cotton was lowest. This Government and hon. Members opposite were always on the side of the angels, and they often said that the Members of the Unionist Party were on the side of the *diable.* When hon. Members opposite were challenged to carry out their good intentions they always hesitated if it was a question of revenue. They hesitated on the Licensing Bill to apply their principles to the off-licences. He wondered whether the hon. Gentleman would make a sympathetic reply now. Would the hon. Gentleman on behalf of the Cape Government prohibit the sale of drink to the natives in Southern Nigeria? If he would not do that, would he promise that the Committee which the Colonial Office had promised to appoint would be guided in the conclusions it came to on the merits of the drink question? Would he appoint a Committee to sit in London with power to send out a Commission to take evidence in West Africa? Southern Nigeria was a small place so far as the trading community was concerned and there were going to be difficulties in carrying out the examination there. There were local difficulties to be contended against. The native hesitated to give evidence in regard to the people with whom he was associated. The clerk to the small trade knew the effects of the drink trade, but he would hesitate to give evidence if a Member of the Committee happened to be his official superior in the district. He did not question the impartiality of any man in West Africa, but he did say that the choice was narrow. They could not argue this case from the purely official standpoint, or as the case of those who were necessarily more or less interested in the production of revenue. He suggested that the Committee be appointed here, and from that committee one commissioner should be sent out to Africa who would act as chairman of a local committee. He believed that this was one of the gravest questions with which the Imperial Parliament had to deal. He had always been a prohibitionist where native races were concerned. There was going to be in South Africa an increase of the native races. And they would increase still more if liquor did not destroy them. This country was bound to lead, as he believed it led at the Brussels Convention when it secured that there should be a minimum taxation of liquor, so as to have some effect in checking the trade. He believed that this country should lead all other countries in the matter of the treatment of the native races. We knew more about them than all other nations and we had the faculty for governing them. But we must go with clean hands to other nations and not say to them that out of potato spirit we got 67 per cent. of our revenue. He trusted that the Committee would have a favourable reply from the hon. and gallant Gentleman. He knew that the hon. and gallant Gentleman tried to meet the views of the Committee so far as was compatible with his position as Under-Secretary and the difficulties of his Department. He appealed to him to exercise to the fullest extent his influence with his Department, and when he was told that they could not get revenue otherwise, he should say they must. They tried for years to get cheaper postage of magazines to Canada before getting it and now the Post Office was going to make it pay. They could make temperance pay. He hoped that when the hon. and gallant Gentleman replied, he would make it clear that there were no longer to be mere vain pledges, but that a real reform in this respect would be introduced which would redound to the credit of the Empire.

*Mr. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough) said he would not attempt to follow the hon. Member for Gravesend, but as one of those Members alluded to by the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, as guilty of putting Questions, he desired, with the permission of the Committee, to say a few words on the subject of Natal. He thought they were all agreed on one thing, that when we granted self-government to a colony, the less we interfered with that colony the better. But he ventured to say that there should be some limit to the doctrine of non-interference. A self-governing colony, after all, was not a separate and independent country. He had listened to speeches from hon. Gentlemen opposite, in which opinions were expressed which, if carried out to a logical conclusion, came to this; that if a self-governing colony were to establish a system of undoubted slavery in their territory, it would, nevertheless, be the duty of this country to acquiesce in it. To that doctrine he could not subscribe. There must be a limit, and after that limit had been passed—as he thought it had been passed in this matter by Natal—it became the duty of the predominant partner in the concern to interfere to save the credit and honour of this country. There was that going on in Zululand and Natal which it would not be time wasted carefully to consider. Sometimes it was said that they were making an attack upon the colony of Natal. He wanted to repudiate that idea. Even if they ventured to criticise the Government of Natal it could not be said that they were making any attack or criticism against the colony, because he did not believe that the Government of Natal really could be said to represent the colony. He was entitled to say that, for he had in his hand what he believed to be an authentic document which purported to be the declaration of combined committees in Natal who asked for redistribution in the Colony. These combined committees pointed out that the Prime Minister of Natal was returned to Parliament by 327 votes, that Mr. Carter, Minister of Justice and Attorney-General only polled 302 votes, whereas both the senior and junior Members for Durban had each polled more votes than Mr. Moor and his whole Cabinet put together.

Earl WINTERTON: Are there any bye-elections in Natal?

*Mr. G. GREENWOOD said he saw no relevancy in that interruption. The combined committees went on to say that—

> "The numbers of the white population are decreasing at a rate that already makes it questionable whether we are entitled to the *status* of a self-governing Colony, sufficient to itself, in maintenance of its authority, unaided."

He thought it would be well to bear that in mind, because, as was pointed out, owing to the gerrymandering of the constituencies in the colony, it could not be maintained that the present Government represented the colony. The question of the treatment of Dinizulu had been often discussed. From the Blue-books which he had carefully read, he found that in September, 1907, the Natal Ministers and the Native Affairs Commissioner had apparently come to the conclusion that cost what it might, he might almost say whether the Chief was guilty or innocent—it was absolutely necessary that Dinizulu should be arrested and deported from the country. That was in strong contrast to what was said during the rising in May, 1906, when Sir C. Saunders and Sir Henry McCallum consistently bore witness to the correctitude of Dinizulu's conduct and his loyalty. But opinion changed and the Ministers and the Commissioner asked that Imperial troops should be sent into Zululand, and they decided that a secret inquiry should be held as to the guilt or otherwise of Dinizulu, and whether he was implicated in the rising of 1906. Lord Elgin replied in September, 1907, that the Government could not possibly become parties to the proposed policy, nor could they defend it in Parliament. Time went on and it seemed to those gentlemen that if they could not get their own way in this matter, there was another expedient open to them: they could suspend the constitution of the colony and govern it at their own sweet will by martial law. Accordingly on 3rd December, 1907, martial law was proclaimed in Zululand, followed by martial law being proclaimed in the Northern districts of the colony. The Governor of the colony when he announced that decision to the Home Government said that in his opinion the proclamation of martial law was premature. And why? Because there was no armed resistance. Lord Elgin on 11th December asked on what charge was Dinizulu to be tried and before what Court, and when the proclamation of martial law would be withdrawn. The Natal Government replied that they would not assent to the withdrawal of the proclamation of martial law, although on 23rd December the Governor telegraphed to Lord Elgin that the forces were to be demobilised, except 200 men, showing that it could not be maintained that there was any danger of a rising. The Governor telegraphed again that his Ministers, against his advice, would—

> "Maintain martial law pending the arrest of criminals and further search for arms."

Lord Elgin telegraphed that it was unjustifiable to maintain martial law for that purpose, and that martial law ought never to be extended where there was no armed resistance, and that he had confidently expected to hear that the proclamation of martial law had been withdrawn. There was one extract which he asked to be allowed to read. On 28th December, 1907, the Governor said that he had urged upon Mr. Moor—

> "(1) The immediate withdrawal of martial law; (2) the release of all men in prison in connection with last year's rebellion except those at St. Helena and those awaiting trial; (3) the proclamation of a general amnesty"

(with certain exceptions), and that he had pointed out to him—

> "that the continued maintenance of martial law tended to bring the civil law into contempt, and to prove the Government devoid of moral power."

Nevertheless the Government of Natal insisted on maintaining martial law although there was no suspicion of a rising and although they knew that it would "tend to bring the civil law into contempt, and to prove the Government devoid of moral power." What was martial law? It had never been better stated than when stated to the Governor of Canada as long ago as 1838 by Sir John Campbell and Sir R. M. Rolfe, the then Law Officers of the Crown, each of whom subsequently became Lord Chancellor. They said:

> "Martial law is stated by Lord Hale to be in truth no law, but something rather indulged than allowed as a law, and it can only be tolerated because by reason of open rebellion the enforcing of any other laws has become impossible. It cannot be said in strictness to supersede the ordinary tribunals, inasmuch as it only exists by reason of those tribunals having been already practically superseded. . . The right of resorting to such an extremity is a right arising from and limited by the necessity of the case—*quod necessitas cogit, defendit.*"

If it was said that that was an old authority he had a more modern one, and one to which the right hon. Gentleman opposite would pay the greatest deference. Lord Alverstone speaking in the House of Lords in April, 1902, quoted Vice-Chancellor Kent to this effect—

> "Martial law is quite different from ordinary military law. It is justified by paramount necessity and proclaimed by a military chief."

And further on Lord Alverstone stated—

> "The acts must be acts done by necessity for the defence of the Commonwealth where there is war within the realm. . . .The whole question is, is there such a state of war or rebellion that it cannot be put down by the civil authority, or by the military authorities acting under the orders of the civil authorities?"

And finally—

> "The limits of what the executive may do under military law are limited by that necessity," because "the foundation of martial law is necessity."

That was in entire agreement with what was stated in Lord Carnarvon's circular despatch of January, 1867, which had been reprinted in the Blue-book of May, 1906, in which he said that to justify martial law there must be men rising in armed resistance to the authority of the Crown. He could hardly conceive why it was said with all these cumulative authorities that there was any doubt upon the point. In Natal it could not be suggested for a single moment that any of these conditions existed. There was no armed resistance, no paramount necessity, and no rebellion. As the hon. Member for Leicester had pointed out, the proposed Act of Indemnity omitted the word "rebellion," so that it really came to this that martial law was applied unconstitutionally and illegally, against the advice of the Governor and the Secretary of State. They continued it in order that they might search for arms and arrest prisoners. They not only flogged natives because they would not give the evidence they required them to give, but they also prevented Dinizulu's solicitor going into Zululand to get evidence. They did exactly what the Stuart Kings did in the past, and which the Petition of Right declared to be illegal—they tried to govern by martial law in time of peace. He had called the attention of the hon. Gentleman, the Under-Secretary, to the fact that in Lord Carnarvon's circular despatch it was stated that the Governor was solely responsible both for the proclamation of martial law, and the withdrawal of that proclamation at any moment—that the responsibility for proclaiming martial law and the power of declaring it at any moment to be at an end must rest with the Governor as the representative of the Crown. He asked the late Under-Secretary whether that applied to the Governor of a self-governing colony, and he was told that it did not because he was bound to act on the advice of his Ministers. He ventured, with respect, to submit that that answer was given on imperfect consideration, because it was perfectly clear that this was a matter peculiarly within the prerogative of the Crown. There were certain things the responsibility for which rested on the Governor alone; there was the prerogative of mercy, and the prerogative of amnesty, and the dissolution of Parliament. Though a Governor ought, of course, to consult his Ministers, the responsibility in these cases was his alone. If they referred to the highest authority in this matter, such as Todd's Parliamentary Government in British Colonies, they would find it laid down that—

> "It must always be remembered that the Governor is not bound to comply with the advice of his Ministers. In the event of a recommendation being submitted to him that involved a breach of the law, or that was contrary to express instructions received from the Crown, he would be obliged to refuse to sanction it. For no violation of the law could be excused on the plea that it was advised by others."

Surely that must be so when the Governor was asked to supersede the civil law in the country in favour of martial law which was no law. This question of martial law was considered in this House by a Committee which sat in 1849, before which Sir David Dundas, then Judge Advocate General, gave evidence, and said—

> "I believe the law of England is that a Governor, like the Crown has vested in him the right, where the necessity arises, of judging of it and being responsible for his work afterwards, so to deal with the laws as to supersede them all, and to proclaim martial law for the safety of the Colony."

He, therefore, submitted that it was for the Governor and the Governor alone on his own responsibility to proclaim martial law or to issue a proclamation putting an end to it. He ventured to point out that the mere proclamation by the Governor did not make anything legal which would be illegal without it. All that such a proclamation amounted to was a notice that in future the country was to be governed by martial law and that was an answer to the suggestion that if this Bill of Indemnity was refused martial law would continue. When it was considered that the ordinary Courts, civil and criminal, were open during the whole time, because there had never been any armed resistance, he should think there was no necessity for accepting that Bill. He respectfully submitted that if the Governor was responsible for proclaiming martial law or putting an end to it, the Government should advise the Governor of the Colony to issue a proclamation putting an end to martial law, which could be done without assent being given to this

Act of Indemnity. The Bill of Indemnity was on the model of the Act of Indemnity of 1906. That was an Act to which, in his opinion, in its present form, the assent of the Crown should not have been given. He did not believe any precedent could be found for such an Act of Indemnity. Not only did it legalise things to be done in the future under martial law, but provided that there should be no appeal from any sentence by court-martial which had been pronounced before the Royal assent was given to the Act. Here he might refer to the case of the unfortunate chief Tilonko, now undergoing a sentence of ten years imprisonment in St. Helena. Martial law was proclaimed on 9th February, 1906. On 12th April the Minister of Justice of Natal, with the knowledge of the Governor, wrote to the Commandant of Militia that in view of the suppression of the native insurrection he thought it undesirable to try any more natives under martial law. It was on 7th July that the Bill of Indemnity passed the Legislative Assembly, and on the 12th it passed the Upper House of Natal. It was not till the 30th that Tilonko was tried by court-martial under martial law. On 13th August Lord Elgin telegraphed to the Governor that he might give his assent to the Bill of Indemnity on the assumption that martial law should be withdrawn. For some reason or other that assent was withheld until 1st October; and the Colonial Parliament was dissolved in the meantime. The result was that this unfortunate chief, because of the delay which had taken place in the assent being given to the Bill of Indemnity, was told when he appealed as he did, to the Privy Council and the Supreme Court of Natal, that he was deprived of his legal remedy, because under the Act of Indemnity there could be no appeal from any sentences by court-martial pronounced before the Royal assent was given to the Act. The same thing was in this present Bill. It was laid down that there should be no appeal from sentence of court-martial, and more than that this Bill did not conform to what the Duke of Buckingham, in his despatch to the New Zealand Government, laid down as being the proper form of a Bill of Indemnity. The Duke of Buckingham in his despatch of 18th May, 1867, said—

> "In my opinion the Indemnity Act should have been limited in its phraseology to an indemnity from acts ordered or approved by some responsible military or civil authority."

That despatch had not been published, but it was to be found in the Colonial Office, and it had been reproduced in the debates of the Parliament of New Zealand at the time. What the Duke of Buckingham said in his despatch applied to this Bill, and the Government ought not to give their consent to it in its present form, for it would be an evil precedent. It would actually provide an indemnity for acts done wantonly and maliciously. They heard a good deal at the present time about Imperialists. He thought they were all Imperialists now. But there were Imperialists of different shades and complexions, and for his part, he thought the best and truest Imperialist was he who was most jealous and sensitive for the honour of the Empire and the sanctity of its obligations, for the justice of its dealings, and for the rights and liberties of all its subjects on British soil throughout the world, whether their colour were white or whether their colour were black.

EARL WINTERTON said he did not propose to touch on the case of Dinizulu, but if he might say so without impertinence, he thought the attitude of the Under-Secretary was entirely correct and proper. Although, of course, he disagreed with a great deal of what the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken said, he did not think he could accuse him of unfair bias in favour of Dinizulu; but they must remember, in dealing with this subject, that whatever view the Committee might hold as to the action and attitude of the Natal Government they could not too much emphasise the special circumstances by which that Government found themselves surrounded. Natal had an enormous black population, with only a small handful of white men. They must remember further, and it was a point which some hon. Gentlemen opposite or their friends in the country apparently had not realised, that the Government of of Natal had been aggravated beyond human endurance. For the last six or nine months, indeed long before the case of Dinizulu came up, every species of innuendo and suggestion had been made against the Natal Government by so-called responsible newspapers in this country, and it could not be wondered at, in these circumstances, having regard to the situation in which the Natal Government found itself, that it had shown natural indignation, and had resorted to measures which did not meet with the support of the people of this country. Moreover, hon. Gentlemen who had taken up the attitude they had done on this question, an attitude which certainly he did not think they could complain of that day, must remember that certain hon. Gentlemen were altogether suspect in the matter of native administration, because they belonged to a body of people who for the last four years had done their very best in England and elsewhere to make native administration an impossibility. Probably they had done it with the best intentions. He did not refer to the hon. Member for Newbury, but to some of the hon. Members below the gangway, and chiefly those below the gangway who had done their very best to make native administration an impossibility. They had not realised that their attitude was not supported by a single section or class of the population of those countries where there was a native question to be dealt with. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Merthyr Tydvil was not supported by a single man of his own class or any other class in the Colonies. Though he thought it was most regrettable, yet the hostility which he was met with in South Africa was a demonstration which represented the very strong feeling which his action had caused, and the entire lack of sympathy on the part of the people who had to deal with such problem with his views on the subject. He hoped the Committee, whatever their views might be as to what Natal had actually done, would not be too hostile in their views towards it. There was another matter which had not been sufficiently ventilated and which had been referred to by his right hon. friend in his speech, viz., the retrenchment of the Civil service in the Transvaal. He did not think the answer which the Under-Secretary had given was at all an adequate reply to the contention put forward by the Opposition. He wished to put aside the question of race prejudice. He was fully aware that it was difficult to form an unbiassed opinion on that subject, and for various reasons he thought it better to leave it entirely alone; but he would say, referring to what had been said by his hon. friend the Member for Gravesend, with reference to the statistics and tables which were put forward, it was abundantly clear, but not sufficiently known in this country, that the vast majority of Britishers, or rather men bearing British names, were renegades in the South African war. A large proportion of them fought for the Boers, and they must remember that circumstance when the hon. Gentleman put forward his figures and tables so triumphantly. The hon. Gentleman had alluded to General Botha, and had paid a great tribute to his loyalty, which he had been surprised to hear loudly cheered by the hon. Members below the gangway. Indeed, it was a very pleasing feature of that afternoon's debate that loyalty should be cheered by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway on the other side of the House, and most pleasing of all by the hon. Member for Newbury. The Under-Secretary finished his speech by saying that he did not think any prejudice had been shown in the matter by General Botha. He thought that if the Under-Secretary went to South Africa and, ascending any platform, Dutch or British, said that General Botha had shown no kind of prejudice towards men of his own race, he would be laughed out of the Transvaal. The hon. Gentleman's suggestion that General Botha had shown no prejudice in favour of men of his own race was ludicrous.

COLONEL SEELY said that General Botha had been freely denounced by people of Dutch extraction because he had not employed enough of them.

EARL WINTERTON said that that was no doubt true, because a large number of Dutch people voted for General Botha believing that when he came into power there would not be a Britisher left in

Africa, apart, perhaps, from some half-hearted men among the Dutch population, but he would find no one really prepared to support him in that contention. The point with which both sides could deal that afternoon with a more or less unbiassed mind was what was to be done with these unforunate men who had been retrenched. They held on that side of the House that there had been unnecessary retrenchment, and that it had not by any means resulted in increased economy. He did not see how anybody on either side could disagree with the statement that those men had been led to believe, both by the late Government and the present Government, that they would have something in the nature of permanent employment and a pension at the end of it. For the first time in British administration the honourable continuity which had lasted for scores of years, the continuity of the relations between many of the Colonial Governments and Civil servants, had been broken. That relationship had been referred to in eloquent terms by the President of the Board of Trade in the life of this Parliament, and by writers on politics. In future, any man sending his son into the Civil Service of Egypt or India or elsewhere would say that he could not trust that some Government would not come into power and at one stroke sweep away the future of the men in its service. It was the bounden duty of the Government to make inquiry into the circumstances and do something for these unfortunate men. His right hon. friend had mentioned that there were many cases of Civil servants, who had been retrenched, a very large number of whom were men who came from other parts of the Empire—New South Wales, Australia, from Canada, and other places, where they had been previously in employment and occupied high positions. [AN HON MEMBER: Not high positions.] These men had filled high and honourable positions. He would like to ask hon. Members to think what His Majesty's dominions beyond the seas would think of the Government of a country which could treat its servants as this country had treated these men in South Africa. These men who raised contingents and did yeoman service to the Empire during the war would now go back to their part of the Empire penniless and broken men, and it would be a warning to the people in those Colonies not to place any reliance upon the gratitude or the good faith of the British Government. What would happen in the next time of crisis when this country relied, as she would have to rely, upon assistance from other parts of the Empire in fighting her battles? What would they say when they remembered these men who fought for their country and were afterwards so badly treated? There had been no attempt made, either by answer across the House, or in the course of debate, to deny the charges which had been brought against them. They knew perfectly well that there had been many hard cases; men had been put out of employment through no fault of their own, pledges had been shamelessly broken, and though they had not perhaps excited the interest of the country as they ought to do he believed when the next election came round the people of the country would not forget the Government's treatment of these faithful Civil servants in South Africa. More especially it would not forget the sneers delivered by the hon. Member for Leicester against men who did more yeoman service for the Empire in a time of stress and crisis, than perhaps had been done for the last 100 years. As a protest against the refusal of the Government to make an inquiry into these circumstances and to treat these men justly, he moved to reduce the Vote by £1,000.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,350, be granted for the said service."—(*Earl Winterton.*)

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said the question on which he wished to say a few words was whether it would not be practicable to have a conference to consider the whole question of oriental immigration as it affected the Empire—a conference in which our Colonial and Foreign Offices could take part, and in which the India Office would be represented, as well as the Governments of the great Dominions and Colonies beyond the seas. It was a matter in which we should properly take the lead, not to dictate, but to endeavour to clear away the difficulties with which the Empire was confronted. We had the greatest responsibility in this matter, both with respect to Imperial as well as foreign affairs, and yet we were apt to look on whilst each Colony in turn had to deal piecemeal with oriental immigration as each incident occurred. It would be well if we upon our side realised more fully the difficulties with which the Colonies had to deal and if they upon their side could realise a little more clearly our responsibilities. If such a Conference could be held we should get a clear statement from them, and even if no solution were in the first instance propounded, if we had to face the facts and obtain a clear statement of them, that of itself would promote a solution and might be the only way to do so. It was not a matter which should be treated piecemeal by the exigencies of each Colony. The Indian was told that everywhere within the Empire he was treated as an equal under British rule. He found out that that was not so, and what they had to find out were the parts of the Empire where oriental immigration could be allowed and those parts where it must be subjected to some restriction or limitation. If they were to have restrictions and limitations they should be applied so as to create as little friction as possible. The matter was put forward in some detail in a letter to *The Times* last April—a letter to which he was one of the co-signatories, but which he did not himself write. He could say, therefore, that it gave a very excellent statement of the case. He would like to know that that matter had been considered at the Colonial Office. As matters stood the questions arising from oriental immigration into the different parts of the Empire hindered in some respects the unity of Imperial interests, and therefore he would urge that they should find out by a Conference whether it was possible or not to have a more comprehensive policy than we had now in the Empire as regarded restrictions or limitations upon oriental immigration. The question was whether these could not be applied with less friction and danger than now existed. He trusted that this very important matter would have received the attention of the Colonial Office and that some information might be given to the House upon it, because he regarded it as one on which the House was entitled to have some information.

*Mr. HAMAR GREENWOOD (York) said he was clearly of the view, speaking as a Colonial, that the attitude of all the self-governing Colonies required no conference to be well known. Hon. Members might take it that Canadians, Australians, South Africans, and New Zealanders, reinforced by the whole of the American people, would not allow any unrestricted immigration, whether the Orientals were Chinamen, Japanese, or our own fellow-subjects from Hindustan. One of the peculiarities of discussing Colonial questions in that House was that the debate seemed to get off on an academic line, leaving out of consideration the strongest instincts of those white men who lived on the frontiers of the Empire, who were not interested in academic definitions of Empire or of martial law; but who were brought face to face with one of the most profound and mysterious problems, the racial problem, as well as the problem of how to keep out, or co-exist with, this Oriental immigration. At present it threatened to swarm on the Pacific edge of both Americas, from Alaska to Patagonia. The Conference would do good in this, that it would show the Home Government once and for all that in dealing with Orientals the mind of the self-governing Colonies was made up, and that made-up mind should receive, as in reference to the Chinese in South Africa it had received, the endorsement of the present Government. He had risen especially to speak on the Natal problem. It presented to him but two points, one a point of detail, namely, the imprisonment of Dinizulu, and the second, a point of substance, namely, the whole of the negro problem in South Africa. As to the point of substance, namely, the relationship of the white people of Natal to the million of negroes that surrounded them, he believed it ought to be the priciple of the Government to endorse the view and uphold the attitude of the

Natal Government in dealing with the black races, unless they had the clearest and most unmistakeable sign that that view would ultimately work against the white population in Natal. He had no sympathy whatsoever with those learned and finely spun discussions as to whether or not there was really a rebellion, or any of those minor matters that in no way touched the great and awful problem of the relationship of the white races to the great and numerically predominant black races in South Africa. There they were discussing in an almost empty House one of the most profound conflicts that the human mind could conceive, namely, of conflict between two races. He believed the consideration of His Majesty's Government of to-day and of the great to-morrow should be primarily the consideration of the Britishers living in those distant Colonies, and they should trust them to see that justice was done between black and black, and between black and white. It was very easy to find fault with the Government of Natal because perchance they had made a mistake in arresting Dinizulu. Whether they had or had not, far be it from him to prejudge the Natal Government. He would rather trust the Natal Government on that question than the Government of any party in that House. There were in Natal about 100,000 white men, women, and children, surrounded by 1,000,000 of the most militant of the black races of the world. To these colonists there was a constant source of impending menace. This black 1,000,000 might for some unknown reason rise up, and that would mean the annihilation of the white people who came within their sphere of operations. The Natal Government was not only the best but the only judge as to the proper action to be taken to repress a supposed riot. He had always held that the return of Dinizulu was a mistake. The return of this hereditary king to the Zulus was an invitation to those great native warriors to resume hope that Natal, or at any rate that part of it which they thought was theirs, would be once more under the dominion of a negro monarch. He hoped that the Government would not continue on the lines on which he was compelled to think they had started, of finding fault with the Natal Government in terms and tones which to his mind, in the first place, were undignified to the Mother Country's Government, and, secondly, detracted from the dignity and self-respect of those Ministers of the Crown in the Colony of Natal. They had to face the problem free from all this threadbare discussion as to whether martial law should be declared to-day or to-morrow afternoon. They had to make up their minds at once because the lives of thousands of men and women were in danger at the seat of trouble. Surely it was possible for this Imperial House to refrain from endeavouring to draw out of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies day by day every little detail in regard to Dinizulu, and the visits paid to him by this man or that woman, the only effect of which might be to make the loyal government of Natal appear unworthy in the eyes of this country and of the world. He thought that more respect should be shown to the views of a self-governing Colony and more consideration paid to the Ministers of the Crown who were faced with difficulties which the Government of this country knew nothing about. He could not see why the communications of the Colonial Secretary like the communications of the Foreign Secretary should not remain private, and not always be made public. If it became necessary for the Home Government sympathetically to complain of the attitude of the Natal Government surely it could be done in courteous terms, and if they must be strong let their despatches remain secret as between this and that Government and not be dragged out in such a way as to make the Government of the Mother Country appear querulous. He had every sympathy with the Government of Natal, and if he were in Natal he would be the first to resent, as that Government had resented, the unfortunate attitude the late Colonial Secretary took up in reference to this matter between the Home Government and Natal. He would go so far as to say that neither the present Government nor any other Government would venture to take up that attitude in dealing with General Botha. They would not write those despatches to Sir Wilfred Laurier, and he was inclined to believe that some unfair advantage had been taken of the fact that the Government of Natal was a small Government of a small white population in a small Colony, although in his opinion that should be all the more reason why they should have greater consideration, more dignified treatment, and more respect shown them than had been meted out to Natal. So much for the relations between the self-governing Colony of white people and the black population. As to the treatment of Dinizulu, that was a point of detail which in his opinion had been exaggerated out of its true position in the proper perspective one should have in dealing with native affairs. He was a Chieftain whom the Government of Natal thought fit to arrest. As to whether they should have withheld his salary or not he did not express any opinion, but that could not be fairly urged as a reason why this Chieftain was unable to prepare his legal defence. He knew something about the Bar and the long time one had sometimes to wait for fees. He knew that in Natal there would never be the slightest difficulty for Dinizulu to get the money necessary for his legal defence. Whether Dinizulu was guilty or not it was not for him to say, and he expressed no opinion as to whether he should have been arrested or not. As a Colonial himself, as a Liberal, and as one who believed that Liberalism had made the British Empire, in spite of the sneers of the noble Lord the Member for Horsham; as one who believed that Liberal principles in dealing with self-governing Colonies alone were the sound and safe principles upon which to continue the structure, he said that this Government had been ill-advised in not more cordially endorsing the attitude of the Natal Government. Even now the Natal Government should be made to know clearly that in their dealings with Dinizulu, which was a point of detail, and in their dealings with the black races, which was a point of substance, they had the whole-hearted and cordial support of the Government, and he would also like to think the cordial support of this Imperial House of Commons.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said that no doubt the powerful speech of the senior Member for York would carry great weight upon the other side of the House. If he did not follow him it was not because he did not appreciate that speech, but because of the fact that the time which remained for the discussion of Supply was so short that a thrice told tale should be avoided. He wanted to bring to the attention of the Government two matters connected with the West Indies and British Guiana. One of those questions related to a question of principle, and the other touched some commercial interests. The first question was in relation to the Island of St. Vincent. Six or seven years ago in that island, in the year 1902, there was a great disaster. There was a violent eruption, the countryside was devastated, and the island laid in ruins, and an appeal was made to charitably-minded persons. A large number of subscriptions were collected in this country towards a fund for the relief of the distress caused by the eruption, and to assist in rehabilitating the industries of that island. This country responded nobly, and a sum amounting to £73,000 was collected for this purpose. He wished to point out that to-day, £25,000 or 40 per cent. of that sum still remained unspent. In view of the purpose for which the fund was collected the greatness of the sum which was left seemed to indicate a rather grave state of affairs. Its gravity had been accentuated by circumstances which he might be pardoned if he pursued a little in detail, because it illustrated the importance of the principle he wished to emphasise. Before the eruption there was a canal called the Carib Canal which conveyed the water to the inhabitants of a country which was otherwise waterless and destitute of any hydraulic power whatever. That canal was constructed he could not say when, and it was almost impossible to ascertain by whom. It had been in existence for a very long time, and its upkeep was borne by various estates through which it passed. There were five estates in all and the upkeep cost something like £500 a year. That canal served a considerable area of the country, and hon. Members would appreciate what a water supply meant in that island. They would also appreciate the benefits conferred by the presence of this canal, because it was now impossible, without the presence of a water supply, to rehabilitate the industries of that part of the country, and continue the cultivation which previously went on there. In the course of the eruption that canal was destroyed. It was blocked up with ashes and broken down by lava. The water supply was cut off, and the country which the canal served was evacuated and became a desert and had remained a desert ever since. Therefore, the importance to the island of reconstructing that canal must be obvious to the Committee. Its importance had been insisted on in Reports presented to the Colonial Office from Sir Daniel Morris, from Mr. Powell, and from a local committee which inquired into the administration of the eruption fund and how the fund could best be employed. All those people recommended that among the objects towards which the money should go was the reopening of this canal. This canal passed in large measure through an estate or upon the borders of an estate which belonged to one person. That was a fact which ought to be stated at once, although it was of no weight in considering the question, because the representations which had been made on the subject came from a very wide area and strata of society which showed that the demand was a genuine one. So far as he was concerned personally, he did not know this gentleman and it was only the other day that he heard his name. He had never had any communications with him, and he was simply stating the facts as they were laid before the local committee. That supply had been lost in consequence of the eruption. Proposals were made by the owners of the land to the Government and they were accepted. The Government gave a grant of £1,600 out of the fund, and the owners spent between £3,000 and £4,000 in advancing the work. At a certain stage it was discovered that the damage done by the eruption had been more serious than was at first supposed. The lava had filled up ravines, and it was found that the water would have to be carried by pipes for irrigation and power purposes, and that must necessarily be an expensive method. The owners were put in the position of being £5,000 out of pocket, and they had to decide whether they would go on or not. They decided to drop the project. So serious did the matter appear with regard to the industries of the island that the matter was considered by the local committee and public meetings were held regarding it. The committee recommended that a loan from the fund should be made for the purpose of carrying on this work—a loan from the fund subscribed by charitable people in this country. The loan was to be terminable and interest-bearing. The Secretary of State refused assent to that course. He was aware that when a colonial in any portion of the British dominions had a grievance to state it was the Colonial Office that was cast for the part of the wicked uncle. He had found that that was sometimes done in circumstances which were entirely undeserved. When there was a conflict of opinion between the official and the non-official members of the legislative council the duty of the Colonial Office was plain, and that was to support the official members. Unless the Colonial Office carried out the policy of trusting the men on the spot there would be difficulty. But that was not the question here, because among those foremost in recommending that a loan should be made for the purpose mentioned were the official representatives of the Government. It was they who had been repeatedly urging this policy on the Colonial Office. The policy had been recommended by the legislative council, by the officials in charge of the island, and by the Governor in charge of the group of islands. The reply of the Colonial Office was that they had no objection to the loan being made, but that if it was made it ought to be out of the floating balance of revenue. He was bound to say that from the point of view of financial theory there was a good deal to be said for that policy, but in the circumstances it was ludicrous, for the floating balance only amounted to £5,000, and from that had to come provision for secondary education, provision for a subsidy to the West Indian Telegraph Company, and a contribution for a new jetty which was now under construction. The floating balance was already earmarked and it was absolutely impracticable to take the loan out of it. When that suggestion was made a special meeting of the legislative council was called to consider the question. Apparently there was an objection to laying the dispatch sent by the Secretary of State on this matter on the Table of the House, but it had already been published in the island. The Governor telegraphed to the Secretary of State asking him to reconsider his decision. The administrator made, a speech in which he quoted a Memorandum setting forth the whole details of the subject. That Memorandum, which had been published in the Colonial papers, was one which the hon. and gallant Gentleman refused to lay on the Table of the House of Commons. He took the greatest exception to the despatch being laid before the legislative assembly, while the representative of the Colonial Office refused to place it before the House of Commons. That was quite a novel proceeding, and he ventured to say that it was unconstitutional. The whole of the legislative council, official and unofficial members, were united in refusing to have anything to do with the scheme which the Secretary of State put forth. He submitted that that constituted a state of affairs which was really in principle rather grave. He would support the Colonial Office in acting on the advice of the officials on the spot, but the position was rather grave when they set up their own view against that of the local representatives and their own officials. He appealed to the hon. and gallant Gentleman to give further consideration to this point. The fund was subscribed for the relief of distress and for the rehabilitation of the industries of the natives, but the Colonial Office desired that a portion of it should be left so as to form an insurance fund against future disasters. That might or might not be a desirable thing to do, but he maintained it was *ultra vires* to devote any portion of the money subscribed for the relief of distress to that purpose. When a fund was being raised for the relief of the people of St. Vincent many of the subscribers pointed out that 40 per cent. of the money subscribed to the Jamaica fund was still in the coffers of the Colonial Office, and they subscribed on condition that the money would be applied to the purpose for which it was given. Referring to the question of cable communication with the West Indian Islands, he said that the cable service with Jamaica was above reproach. There were two competing lines at about 3s. a word, and there had been remarkably few interruptions during the past ten years. With regard to the southernmost islands, Trinidad, Barbados, and British Guiana, the very reverse was the case. The cable service was costly and unreliable. The service had been always and was at the present moment costly and unreliable. The rate to Jamaica was 3s. a word, which was reasonable. It was not a light rate, for a telegram could be sent longer distances for less. The rate to Siam, Australia, and Japan, half-way round the world, was 4s. 10d. a word, while it was 4s. 9d. to Barbados, 5s. 1d. to Trinidad, and 7s. to Demerara in British Guiana. That showed that the service was costly, which was partly in consequence of an agreement with an American company to Cuba to "route" the messages. That the service was unreliable was demonstrated by the fact that during the last six months of this year, to the end of June, or 182 days, cable communication was interrupted between British Guiana and Trinidad and Barbados on forty-five days, or two days out of every five. The best practical evidence as to the unreliability of the service was shown by the way the Colonies concerned had reduced their contributions to the cable company by way of subsidy. The subsidy cost this country nothing; the charge fell only on the exchequers of the different Colonies, amounting in all to £13,000 a year. Barbados had reduced its contribution from £2,500 to £1,500; Demerara from £4,500, to £3,000; Trinidad from £6,000 to £3,000. The hon. and gallant Gentleman would agree that it was time that something was done to improve matters. It was evident that from the commercial and political point of view great use was made of the cables by the Colonies, and from a strategic point of view cable communication would become more important when the Panama Canal was an established fact. The Government of British Guiana in November last made an agreement with a cable company for the establishment of a system of wireless telegrams, but he understood that nothing had been done to carry it into effect. If that were so, would the hon. and gallant Gentleman see that something was done soon? He was far from saying that wireless telegrams would prove less costly than cable messages; all he was anxious to see in the meantime was that something should be done to establish communication between British Guiana and Trinidad. As regarded the link between Trinidad and Barbados and between Barbados and Bermuda, the strongest possible case had been made out for an all-British cable. A direct cable between Bermuda and Trinidad was recommended by an Inter-Departmental Committee which sat in 1902, and by a resolution passed unanimously by the chambers of commerce of the Empire in 1906. The only question that remained to be settled was that of finance; and he wished to make a suggestion. The Colonies used to contribute £13,000 a year; they now contributed £7,000, and had expressed their willingness to make an increased contribution if this direct cable were laid. He had been told that the cost would be £23,000 per annum.

COLONEL SEELY: Including Demerara?

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Yes, including Demerara. Of course a great saving would result in the rates. If the Colonies contributed their original subsidy—which they had practically agreed to do— of £13,000 that left £10,000 to be provided for. Canada at a conference held last year at Ottawa had expressed willingness to contribute towards this cable £5,000, leaving only £5,000 to be borne by the Colonial Office. He did not put forward this financial method as final, but he thought it was worth consideration by the hon. and gallant Gentleman in view of the value such a cable would be from administrative and strategic considerations to the Government. In the meantime he pressed on the hon. and gallant Gentleman the great importance of doing something in regard to the existing state of things, which constituted a burden which could hardly be borne by the Colonies and an injustice which required immediate remedy.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) said that the noble Earl above the gangway had gone out of his way to sneer at the Labour Members, more especially the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil and the hon. Member for Leicester. There was a great deal of difference between the way people looked at things, but he would like to say that if the noble Earl was prepared to change places with the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, and had gone out to the Transvaal to expose how the country was being ruined by men whose only desire was to make wealth, he might not have got a better but rather a worse reception. He had great admiration for officers who did their duty, but men who went into the factory and the mine could be just as great heroes as any man who served under the colours; and whatever might be said in regard to the Transvaal War the Labour Members had felt that they were speaking in the interests of the common workers of the country. Last year on this Vote he had called attention to the Government of the West Indian Islands, but without much effect, and he hoped he would have more success with the hon. and gallant Gentleman than with his predecessor. He asserted that the administration of the West Indian Islands was altogether too costly and that it imposed on the people of those islands an enormous burden of taxation which was altogether out of proportion to what it should be. The revenue of the islands last year amounted to £3,000,000, and how had that been raised? What he was about to state ought to appeal to a free-trade Government. He found that in Jamaica the duty at present on bacon was 20 per cent. He asked the hon. Member what he thought of Customs taxation which ranged from 33 per cent. on biscuits and bread, and 45 per cent. on flour, to 70 per cent. on domestic lighting oil. No one supporting a free trade Government could argue that such a state of things could continue. This taxation, it must be remembered, weighed on the people of these islands very heavily. Of course if reductions in the Customs were to be made it was necessary to find some way of reducing the expenditure, and he suggested that Governors of these islands were considerably overpaid as compared with the Governors of self-governing Colonies. In Tasmania, with an average export of £16 a head the Governor's salary was £2,500. In Jamaica, where the exports were £2 a head the Governor's salary was £5,000. The same remarks applied to other islands. They ought therefore to commence by reducing the salaries of the Governors of these islands. The importation of coolies from the East Indies to these islands had reduced the wages of the agricultural labourers from fifty-five cents to thirty-two cents per day, and they objected to the subsidy of £8,000 taken out of the taxation which they had to pay being given to the planters of these islands in order that they might bring in cheap labour. There were plenty of men to work if the planters only paid a proper price, and it was unfair that these people should be compelled to pay this taxation and that out of that taxation £8,000 should be given to the planters to import cheap labour from the East Indies. Year after year he had applied to the Opposition when in power for this redress, but instead of giving it they did exactly the opposite in 1896. In the Straits Settlements the planters themselves had to pay for the introduction of this labour and the Government should now see to it that they did not subsidise the planters in these islands any longer. He also appealed to the Government again to allow the Port of Spain to have a municipal council. In 1896 they had a municipal council which was suppressed owing to a riot. They had been without now for thirteen years which, he thought, was punishment enough for what had taken place, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would, in his reply, indicate to the Committee that the municipal council would be re-established next year. He also objected to the power which was placed in the hands of the town board of the Port of Spain summarily to sell by auction the property of anybody who was indebted to them. He knew of a case of a man whose house, which was worth £250, was sold for about £17 at auction because there were some £2 or £3 due from him for certain work in the shape of municipal repairs done by the town board. With regard to the Gilbert Islands he had seen a document signed by several chiefs on those islands which stated that the laws were badly administered and flagrantly broken by the Governors; that people were wrongfully deprived of their land; that their trees were cut down; and that there were numerous floggings and other outrages. He asked that these matters should be investigated because, if they were as stated, it was quite time that some reform took place. He also appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to consider the case of Mr. William Davis of Dominica which had now been hanging on for several years. That gentleman had, it appeared, a genuine grievance, and he hoped the hon. and gallant Gentleman would consider the matter and, if he found that the case was as stated, see that justice was done.

*Mr. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) drew attention to the question of the opium consumption in Hong Kong. The people there resented the action of the Home Government in bringing their action upon this question into line with the action of the Chinese Government. All that the Colonial Secretary had done was to say that sooner or later the opium dens must be closed. That was two months ago, and not a single den had yet been closed; so that time was certainly being given for the change. The old argument had been brought up that if opium was bad it was not so bad as drink, as if that had anything to do with it. On 28th May in the Hong Kong Legislative Council a resolution of protest was moved against the dens being closed. In seconding that resolution a Chinese member of the council said he desired to maintain the council's rights, but he described the existence of the dens as "a blot on Hong Kong's fair fame, dragging the splendid Colony in the mud." He "urged that the opium dens and farms should be destroyed root and branch." That was the attitude of the respectable Chinese members of the Colony. The objection to suppression was merely a question of revenue. He begged the Government to persevere in their policy of suppressing the opium habit. The colonists were complaining that there would be a loss of revenue and asked to be relieved of their contribution of $1,250,000 towards military expenditure. The same question arose in the Straits Settlements. Sympathising with this complaint, he supported the Government in giving them a little time, but he implored them to stick to their policy and not to be dismayed in the very least by whatever was said. There were interested parties who helped to create a local public opinion in favour of the traffic, and, though he did not want to overstate the matter, he had the very best evidence for saying that many of the Chinese were afraid to move to show their anti-opium feeling. As a matter of fact, whereas in China the Government encouraged by edict anti-opium societies, the natives in Hong Kong feared to promote these societies because they were afraid to offend the British there. He had good ground for stating even more than that, and he was quite certain there was in this Crown Colony, owing to the fact that a large proportion of the revenue depended upon the opium dens and habits, a considerable European opinion in favour of the continuance of them. The question affected not only Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements, but the other day they heard of it in connection with Ceylon. He thanked the Government for the action they had taken there. Contrary to common belief there was not only opium-eating but opium-smoking in Ceylon. He had a letter written by the late Sanitary Officer of Colombo to a local newspaper stating that, "as the Sanitary Officer, he was well acquainted with all the slums in Colombo, and there was no part of the city when making inspection of the poor parts where he did not find opium-smoking; the pity of it being that the habit was prevalent among the women." It was very important that they should not allow this habit to grow. They had the same story from South Africa. A memorial lately presented by the Witwatersrand Church Council in the Transvaal stated that there were twenty opium dens with 300 regular customers, whilst the number of victims was increasing and included white people as well as coloured. The Secretary of the Transvaal Government replied that they could not do anything this year. Mr. Mackenzie King's inquiry for the Canadian Government into the damage resulting from the anti-Asiatic riots of last September discovered that a large trade was being carried on in the manufacture of opium. There were seven factories in Victoria, Vancouver, and New Westminster, the majority of them only recently established. The opium was mostly consumed by Chinese, but the habit was making headway among white men and women, and even among white boys and girls. The Canadian Parliament had just passed a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of the drug except for medical purposes; and that was the kind of thing they wished to press upon the British Government. They wanted the non-medical use of opium prohibited, whether inside or outside dens. It was not a question of opium dens merely. If the opium dens were closed the practice would be carried on in private houses, though no doubt to a less extent. They had to follow the practice wherever they found it. Australia and New Zealand had stopped it, and in every country public opinion was waking up on this question, and it was becoming the policy of the civilised world to suppress the traffic. He urged the Government not to fall short of that policy, lest we should soon find more opium dens in our own country. There were a few already. They largely existed in Crown Colonies for which we were specially responsible. In the United States, in Japan, in our own chief self-governing Colonies, and elsewhere public opinion now apprehended the seriousness of the matter, and it was becoming the policy of the world to stop the smoking of opium. They were told by those who excused this easy method of raising revenue that they might follow it wherever they liked, but they would not stamp it out. It was no doubt very easy to smuggle. He remembered when our own sugar duty was imposed, the Government had to take very stern measures to stop the smuggling of saccharin, an article of high value and small bulk; and if the Government meant business, the opium traffic could be stopped. Where there was a will there was a way. There was no need for the Government to be mealy-mouthed. Why should it deal more gently with the traffic than Japan? They only needed a thorough-going law and to have it properly administered. If the Government was determined and passed stringent laws and saw they were rigidly enforced, the traffic could be put down in our territory as it had been put down in Japanese territory and in our own self-governing Colonies. The United States also were about to pass a law prohibiting the traffic.

*MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) said the Opposition had laid down a new and extraordinary doctrine, and they were making the most of it inside and outside the House: they said that the Government were acting in an anti-Imperial way when they made suggestions in the mildest form to the Natal Government, and refused to take any steps to interfere in the internal policy of the Transvaal. The Opposition drew a great distinction between Natal and the Transvaal and Orange River Colony. It was wrong to interfere in the slightest way with Natal, but it was right to interfere with the Transvaal. That, in his opinion, was absurd. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, the late Colonial Secretary, had suggested that the Government should appoint a Committee to investigate the local policy of the Transvaal. He had never heard of a precedent for doing anything of the kind. The local affairs of a self-governing Colony had never been investigated in such a way as the right hon. Gentleman suggested in the history of the Empire, and the suggested Committee of Inquiry would be entirely unconstitutional and quite uncalled for. At the same time, the Opposition attacked the Government for making a mild suggestion to the Natal Government in a matter of exterior policy—the question of the government of the natives. It had been suggested that the Government had entered into some sort of disgraceful conspiracy with the Transvaal by which they lent a large sum of money in consideration of the Transvaal Government doing away with Chinese labour. The Transvaal Government had decided to do away with Chinese labour before any negotiations were opened for a loan. It was, in his opinion, a disgraceful charge to bring against His Majesty's Government and the Government of a self-governing Colony. There had been some strong language used, and he thought the words of the Under-Secretary were largely justified. He protested against any such suggestion. It never ought to have been made. He had felt a considerable amount of doubt about the retrenched officials of the Transvaal, but the speech of the Under-Secretary had satisfied him that the position in the Transvaal was not at all unsatisfactory. That was a matter of satisfaction on that side of the House. He was very glad to hear that steps were being taken to find positions for these unfortunate men. He knew several of them who came from Canada, and got positions after the war was over, and had now lost them. At the same time knowing something about those gentlemen and their capacity he could understand perhaps that while capable for positions while the war was going on they were not altogether suited to fill very responsible positions in the civil administration of a self-governing Colony. That might of course have had something to do with their retrenchment. At any rate it was perfectly obvious from the start that the Civil Service of the Transvaal was very much overstaffed and would have to be very largely retrenched, and consequently what happened was only what might have been expected. They were satisfied that the retrenchment had been principally under the last Administration—under the Administration of Lord Milner—and not under this, and further he felt very great satisfaction that the new appointments had been made without any respect to race. In these great Colonies where they had two races side by side, the only chance of amalgamation and fusion of the races was to treat them as Transvaalers, and not as Boers and Englishmen, and in that way they might hope some day to have one race in the Transvaal, a race of Transvaalers living under the Union Jack. The speech of the Under-Secretary would give great satisfaction to the country generally.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) asked how the authority of Parliament was to be obtained for the payment of the salary to Dinizulu. It was a new service, and could not be paid out of any economies in the Votes they were going to pass that evening and the next day, and it could not be done by Supplementary Estimate. He did not know how the authority of the House could be obtained. The proper thing was a Supplementary Estimate, but if it was introduced during the autumn session a Consolidated Fund Bill would be necessary.

COLONEL SEELY said the proposal was to take a Supplementary Estimate in the autumn session. In any case they would have had to come to Parliament for a supplementary sum, and this small sum of £400 for Dinizulu would be included. The money would be paid and would be forthcoming, and he thought he could undertake that it should be done in due form. With regard to the opium question, he had been asked whether some action would be taken to deal with the evil effects of opium derivatives as well as of opium itself. That was no doubt most important. There could be no question that, bad as was the effect of smoking opium, the injection of morphia was even more injurious. He had received a most interesting letter from one of the Governors of the Straits Settlements, in which he pointed out from personal experience how awful were the effects of the injection of morphia, making a man a wreck in a year if he once took to it. He trusted the International Commission, which was to assemble shortly, would include in its purview these opium derivatives. He understood, though he did not know this officially, that the American representatives were anxious to take this course. The Government would of course agree on that point. The International Commission would meet in Shanghai, on 1st January next. Our representatives would be present and would take part in the deliberations with a view to at least coming up to the standard of China, if not of going beyond it. The hon. Member for Lanark had devoted some time to the question of St. Vincent and the Carib Canal. He was sorry to find himself in disagreement with the hon. Gentleman on the subject, because on the whole of the other matters connected with the West Indies he gladly availed himself of his help and saw eye to eye with him. If the hon. Member was of opinion that they were wrong about the Carib Canal he must continue to endeavour to convert them. They were not converted yet. The situation was this. A benevolent public subscribed £73,000 to repair the damage done in St. Vincent at the last eruption and in general terms to relieve distress. It seemed good to Lord Elgin that of this amount £25,000 should be retained as a nest egg for future eruptions. A gentleman who was specially concerned in these matters, and had personal acquaintance with the West Indian Islands, had said regretfully to him that he could guarantee either an eruption, an earthquake, or a hurricane within ten years. It was very unfortunate that this should be the case, but if there was any truth in it surely it was wise to keep this sum of £25,000 for the moment when the next disaster occurred. They trusted it might never occur, but unless a fresh cataclysm of Nature occurred, which should transfer the earthquakes and eruptions to another part of the world, something of that kind, or even a drop in the price of sugar of a phenomenal kind might occur which would need immediate application of relief. They would then have this £25,000 available under the scheme laid down by Lord Elgin. The hon. Gentleman said—"But the Carib Canal will remain full of ashes, and without a fresh water canal you cannot expect to have the island properly cultivated." This Mr. Porter who owned the land at the edge of the canal was digging out the ashes as fast as might be, and if the hon. Member said in point of fact he would give up digging, his only answer was that he was coming over to this country, and they hoped to have an opportunity of seeing him, for they would then know just how they stood. They would, of course, see Mr. Porter and learn all he had to say; but as at present advised they were not disposed to devote this sum to the digging of the ashes out of the canal believing as they did that Mr. Porter would do it.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said his point was that although it might be desirable to provide a fund for future contingencies, they had no power to divert this sum, which was subscribed for the relief of immediate necessities and earmarked for that particular purpose.

COLONEL SEELY said he knew the legal aspect of that matter had been considered, and he himself had looked into it, and he was of opinion, speaking as a lawyer, that they were fully justified in the action they had taken. If it should turn out that they were bound to expend the sum, they would have to reconsider their attitude, but they had taken the best advice and were quite sure they were right. He thoroughly agreed with what the hon. Gentleman had said as to the importance of doing something to improve the cable communication both between the West Indies themselves, and between this country and the West Indies. It was certainly a most remarkable fact that the cost should be so great. The hon. Member told them it cost 7s. to Demerara, and that it cost to telegraph to the West Indian Islands, which were only a fortnight's steam from here, within a penny what it cost to telegraph to Japan, which was half-way round the world. He agreed that they ought to do something, and the Secretary of State proposed to take what action he could. There was this difficulty, that there were the two competing systems of submarine cable and wireless telegraphy. The hon. Member was quite right in what he told the Committee about the superior efficiency of cable communication, and the fact that they had taken to it in one case if not two. This made it difficult, because the inhabitants of the Islands themselves, who had subscribed the money, were not at one as to which was the best method. There must come an end to knocking people's heads together, and the Secretary of State was anxious to try the experiment of wireless telegraphy in one place, and, it might be, to increase and improve the cable communication elsewhere. These Islands were not very rich, and although it might be desirable to improve cable communication, when any concrete proposal was made, the Islands frequently took exception to making a contribution. But they had shown a disposition to join together to increase their contributions for a particular cable, and although he could not give any assurance on that particular point he could tell the hon. Gentleman on the authority of the Secretary of State that they were anxious to improve communication with the least possible delay. The hon. Member for Sunderland had addressed them on the subject of the finance of the West Indies. It was true that the salaries paid appeared to be large, but they must take into account the climate and the liability to earthquakes in estimating the salaries of Governors. The hon. Member had also referred to the coolie question and to the fact that in some of the West Indian Islands there was assisted immigration. It seemed to him that there were sound grounds for protesting against that system. It did not seem reasonable on the face of it to assist immigration which might be supposed to cut down wages. He consulted the Governor of Jamaica on the question of indentured coolies when he was over here, and with regard to the cutting down of wages he assured him that wages had gone up, and that the work done by the coolies was work which would not be done by the natives of Jamaica.

MR. SUMMERBELL: Not at the same wages.

COLONEL SEELY replied that he was convinced that the system did not operate in Jamaica in the way it might be expected to operate in other parts of the world; but the Government did not propose to extend the system, and they would watch the experiments closely. His Majesty's Government were not in favour, as a rule, of indentured labour, but such indentured labour as existed they could not sweep away except in South Africa where it would be swept away; but in other parts of the world they could not sweep it away. He would return to that subject later on. As to the Gilbert Islands, there was in the Pacific a gentleman well known for his sympathy with the natives, Sir Everard im Thurn, and his Report did not bear out the statements that had been made. That gentleman was on his way home, and he would bring before him what his hon. friend who raised the question had said. Although it might be very unfortunate that people should have to work four days a week when three days work was enough, and that they should be only allowed to dance on Saturday afternoons, he hardly thought his hon. friend was justified in viewing the situation in the Islands with the alarm which he professed.

MR. SUMMERBELL said he had only asked the hon. and gallant Gentleman to give his attention to the state of things alleged to exist by the chiefs.

COLONEL SEELY said he understood that the people alluded to were what were called "the old men." He did not wish to appear to be in any way throwing ridicule upon this question, but he wished to defend those whom he had reason to believe were administering affairs with due regard to the conditions under which those people were working. With regard to West Africa and the liquor traffic, he admitted that there they were by no means on strong ground. The hon. Member for Gravesend had pointed out that 60 or 70 per cent. of the revenue in some Colonies was drawn from drink. That was, no doubt, approximately accurate. The Secretary of State viewed with concern the immense amount of liquor imported into West Africa and the immense ratio which the liquor tax bore to the rest of the revenue. That was not a desirable state of finances in the interests either of the natives or of the country, and the Secretary of State was anxious to amend it. They were of opinion that demoralisation followed from the importation of this spirit, and as he understood that it only cost 8d. a bottle he was not at all surprised at that. One would suppose from what had been said that this spirit was highly injurious and was killing the natives in great numbers. To his great surprise he found on inquiry from persons who were qualified to judge that the actual harm done was slight. It seemed to him that that was very unlikely, but the Secretary of State had decided to appoint a Committee to investigate the matter. That Committee would be appointed without delay to investigate the matter on the spot, first, to find out the extent of the evil, and secondly to make suggestions as to a remedy. Of course the hon. Member for Gravesend was aware, and other hon. Members who had spoken on the Ministerial side were also aware, that the Government were somewhat tied in this matter by the contiguous frontiers of foreign countries. They had entered into engagements with foreign Powers to raise the duty in order to check the traffic. Some of those Powers were anxious to go much faster and some of them were not anxious to go much further. Unless they could come to some agreement with those foreign countries which had contiguous frontiers the drink which was being smuggled in might cause as much damage as the other drink evil. Unless they could get the consent of foreign Powers in this direction they could not check the sale of the article. He could assure hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Secretary of State viewed the whole situation with concern, and he proposed to appoint this Committee to consider what action was possible.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) asked if the hon. and gallant Gentleman could say of whom the Committee would consist?

COLONEL SEELY replied that he could not. The association of which the right hon. Baronet the Member for Honiton was a leading light had been asked to communicate their proposals on this subject, and he was now waiting to hear from them as to their suggestions.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): They are now on their way.

COLONEL SEELY said he was glad to hear it, and as soon as they were received they would be considered without delay.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked if the Government had considered the suggestion to appoint someone from this country to act as Chairman of the Committee?

Colonel SEELY said he would bring that suggestion to the notice of his noble friend, and ask him if he could see his way to follow it. With regard to Natal his hon. friend the Member for York had addressed the House at some length on this question, and he had begged of the Government not to interfere. They had endeavoured not to interfere in Natal; for over seven months they had endeavoured to avoid any undue interference and he did not believe that any words which had been addressed to the House from that box could give offence to anyone in Natal. He had always endeavoured that that should be the case. With regard to Natal, the Home Government had endeavoured to avoid any undue interference. It was necessary for them to take the action they had taken. He was glad to have the approval of every Member of the House who had spoken on this subject. It augured well for the bringing of Colonial matters out of the scope of ordinary party politics. In this matter every hon. and right hon. Gentleman who had addressed the House had expressed himself in the main satisfied that His Majesty's Government had acted in this matter with every wish not to offend the Natal Government, and they desired that the promise of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham should be fulfilled. Points had been raised in regard to the Act of Indemnity by the hon. Member for Gravesend, the hon. Member for Leicester, the hon. Member for Huntingdon, and the hon. Member for Peterborough, and they had given a long and accurate account of the circumstances which had led up to the present situation. The omission of the word "rebellion" from the Act might be, in the view of the hon. Member for Peterborough, an indication that the state of affairs did not amount to rebellion. He submitted respectfully to the Committee that that made no difference whatever as to the policy of assenting to the Indemnity Act itself. It was a fact that the operation of martial law had not been attended with violent measures, and it was admitted that it had not been attended with much disturbance. If the Government were in any way to demur to assenting to the Act, the practical effect would be to the disadvantage of the natives. It was said that the Governor had an absolute right to proclaim martial law; but some things were possible which were not expedient. He wished to say a word or two about the Transvaal officials. It had been assumed in the course of the debate that although the figures were more or less conclusive that General Botha's Government had not unduly favoured the Dutch, there was an impression that those officials who had been retrenched had not been adequately compensated, and one hon. Member had said that they had received nothing. Altogether the retrenched officials, 345 in number, had received £87,000 from the Transvaal Government. That might not be enough to compensate them for the loss they had sustained, but at least any obligation undertaken by the Transvaal Government had been loyally fulfilled. He had no time to deal with Asiatic exclusion. It must be the subject of careful consideration, and the Government were most anxious to co-operate with the Colonies in finding a solution of the difficulty.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 92; Noes, 247. (Division List No. 228.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, RtHn. Sir Alex. F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G(Winchester
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan)
Faber George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey

Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gill, A. H.
Gordon, J.
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seddon, J.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Snowden, P.
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Warlde, George J.
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Earl Winterton and Mr. Gretton.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Carr-Gomm, H.; W.
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, H. W.
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson, E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.,
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.

Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P.(Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Malley, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs,Leek)
Pearce, William(Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W.D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell, (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts,SirJohn H.(Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh'e
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,David Arthur(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne,G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt Hn. SirThomasP
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras,S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

And, it being after Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 15, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Vote under consideration.

Question "That a sum, not exceedng £31,450, be granted for the said Service," put, and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded to put severally the Questions, "That the total amounts of the Votes outstanding in each Class of the Civil Services Estimates, including Supplementary Estimates, and the total amount of the Votes outstanding in the Estimates for the Navy, the Army (including Ordnance Factories), and the Revenue Departments, be granted for the Services defined in those Classes and Estimates—

CLASS I.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £608,168, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.—

		£
1.	Royal Palaces - -	42,500
2.	Osborne - - - -	7,300
3.	Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens - - -	79,900
4.	Houses of Parliament Buildings (including a Supplementary Sum of £5,000) - - -	37,000
4A.	Salisbury Memorial - -	1,100
5.	Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain -	48,000
6.	Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain -	55,000
10.	Surveys of the United Kingdom - - -	116,815
11.	Harbours under the Board of Trade - - -	32,840
12.	Peterhead Harbour - -	22,000

	£
14. Public Works and Buildings, Ireland - -	134,259
15. Railways, Ireland - -	31,454
	£608,168 "

Question put, and agreed to.

Class II.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,145,045, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.—

	£
1. House of Lords Offices -	15,956
2. House of Commons Offices - - - -	19,900
3. Treasury and Subordinate Offices - - -	62,917
4. Home Office - - -	139,967
7. Privy Council Office -	6,217
8. Board of Trade - -	213,169
9. Mercantile Marine Services - - - -	80,347
10. Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade -	5
11. Board of Agriculture and Fisheries - - -	83,124
12. Charity Commission -	15,308
14. Exchequer and Audit Department - - -	39,900
15. Friendly Societies Registry - - - -	5,819
16. Local Government Board	156,500
17. Lunacy Commission, England - - - -	11,384
20. Public Record Office -	14,820
21. Public Works Loan Commission - - -	2,507
22. Registrar-General's Office, England - - -	26,825
24. Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, &c., Office - - -	13,613
25. Works and Public Buildings Office - - -	53,693
26. Secret Service - -	10,000
Scotland.	
27. Secretary for Scotland's Office - - -	11,600
28. Fishery Board - -	14,998
29. Lunacy Commission -	3,901
30. Registrar-General's Office	3,063
31. Local Government Board	11,592
Ireland.	
32. Household of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland -	2,627
33. Chief Secretary for Ireland - - - -	18,101
35. Charitable Donations and Bequests Office - -	1,053
36. Local Government Board	52,616
37. Public Record Office -	3,625
38. Public Works Office -	27,413
39. Registrar-General's Office	7,338
40. Valuation and Boundary Survey - - -	15,147
	£1,145,045 "

Question put.

The Committee divided; Ayes, 282, Noes, 81. (Division List No. 229.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight

Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.

Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)

Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,SirJohn H.(Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw.(Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.

Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. George Faber and Sir Frederick Banbury.

CLASS III.

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,685,768, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.—

	£
1. Law Charges - - -	54,190
2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses - - -	22,564
3. Supreme Court of Judicature - - - -	189,867
4. Land Registry - -	21,750
5. Public Trustee - -	1,500
6. County Courts - -	3
7. Police, England and Wales	24,858
Scotland.	
11. Law Charges and Courts of Law - - -	51,316
12. Register House, Edinburgh - - -	26,966
13. Crofters' Commission -	2,345
14. Prisons - - - -	60,790
Ireland.	
15. Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions - -	38,078
16. Supreme Court of Judicature and other Legal Departments - -	60,446
17. Irish Land Commission -	160,978
18. County Court Officers, &c.	70,475
19. Dublin Metropolitan Police - - -	36,632
20. Royal Irish Constabulary	739,902
21. Prisons - - -	64,661
22. Reformatory and Industrial Schools -	55,225
23. Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum -	3,222
	£1,685,768"

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 299; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 230.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSir J.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon John
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHn.Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dobson, Thomas W.

Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards,Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, RtHn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A.G.C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert,T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson, E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)

Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
K'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford,W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A.E.W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare,N.)
O'Connor, T. P.(Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs,Leek)
Pearce, Willliam (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A.W.H.
Power, Patrick Joseph

Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell,(Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs.
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V.H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw.(Stafford)
Shaw,Rt.Hon .T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert(Staffs,N.W.)
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James(Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor,Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G.R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,John(Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W. Dudley (S'thampton)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.SirThomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.H.(Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh,N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt.Hn.G(Winchester
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
McArthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,Sir Gilbert(Gravesend)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E. R.
Winterton, Earl
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Roberts and Sir William Bull.

CLASS IV.

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,217,512, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.—

	£
1. Board of Education -	6,594,150
2. British Museum - -	115,137
3. National Gallery - -	7,414
4. National Portrait Gallery - - -	2,621
5. Wallace Collection -	4,173
6. Scientific Investigation, &c., United Kingdom	28,295
7. Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales - - -	146,800
8. Public Education, Scotland - - -	1,198,557
9. National Galleries, Scotland - - -	2,497

Ireland.

	£
10. Public Education (Supplementary) - -	114,000
11. Endowed Schools Commissioners - -	515
12. National Gallery - -	1,153
13. Queen's Colleges - -	2,200
	£8,217,512"

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 261; Noes, 129. (Division List No. 231.)

AYES.

Abraham, William(Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams-Devonp'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooks, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
CaustonRt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar,Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Waltson
Henderson,J. M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
HopeW.Bateman(Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)

Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Malley, William
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rendall, Athelstan
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs.
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn Sir Thomas P
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Coates, Major E.F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)

Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hope,James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joynson-Hicks, William
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Dublin,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Grady, J.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Leverton Harris and Mr. Bertram Straus.

CLASS V.

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £366,236, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.—

	£
1. Diplomatic and Consular Services	323,103
3. Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	42,133
4. Cyprus (Grant in Aid)	1,000
	£366,236 "

Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS VI.

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,684,845, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.—

	£
1. Superannuation and Retired Allowances	375,022
3. Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	110
4. Savings Banks' and Friendly Societies' Deficiencies	109,713
5. Old-Age Pensions	1,200,000
	£1,684,845 "

Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS VII.

8 "That a sum, not exceeding £382,104, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.—

	£
1. Temporary Commissions	25,000
2. Miscellaneous Expenses	7,867
3. Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	4,404
4. Ireland Development Grant	85,342
5. Repayments to the Civil Contingencies Fund	41,491
6. Expenses under The Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905	200,000

	£
7. Relief of Distress (Ireland)	13,000
8. Government Hospitality -	5,000
	£382,104 ”

Question put, and agreed to.

Navy Estimates, 1908–9.

9. “That a sum, not exceeding £5,562,700, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Navy Services, viz.—

	£
2. Victualling and Clothing for the Navy - -	2,286,400
4. Martial Law - - -	13,900
6. Scientific Services - -	66,000
7. Royal Naval Reserves -	368,300
9. Naval Armaments -	2,048,700
11. Miscellaneous Effective Services - - -	409,200
12. Admiralty Office - -	370,200
	£5,562,700 ”

Question put, and agreed to.

Army Estimates, 1908–9.

10. “That a sum, not exceeding £13,505,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Army Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories), viz.—

	£
2. Medical Establishment, Pay, etc. - -	451,000
4. Territorial Forces -	2,005,000
5. Establishments for Military Education -	142,000
6. Quartering, Transport, and Remounts -	1,839,000
7. Supplies and Clothing -	3,912,000
8. Ordnance Department Establishments and General Stores - -	498,000
9. Armaments and Engineer Stores - -	1,490,000
10. Works and Buildings -	2,515,000
11. Miscellaneous Effective Services - - -	73,000
12. War Office and Army Accounts Department -	580,000
Ordnance Factories -	100
	£13,505,100”

Question put, and agreed to.

Revenue Departments Estimates, 1908–9.

11. “That a sum, not exceeding £11,821,531, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs, and Telephones.”

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolved, “That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, the sum of £69,157,274, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL [LORDS].

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL [LORDS].

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 29 agreed to.

Clause 30:

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.) moved a verbal Amendment providing that the reference in Clause 30 should be, not to the Acts of "1883 to 1906," but to the "Act of 1908." This Amendment was made necessary in consequence of the Consolidating Bill which had just been read a third time.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 7, to leave out the words 'Acts of 1883 and 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act of 1908.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

EARL WINTERTON thought the Committee were entitled to some further explanation of this Amendment.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY made some further remarks which were inaudible in the Press Gallery.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he could not quite understand the explanation which had been given. [An HON. MEMBER: Tell us what it was.] He understood that the hon. Member told them this Amendment was necessary in consequence of the passing of the Consolidating Bill which had only just passed through the Report stage. The House ought clearly to know whether they were entitled to include a Bill which had not actually passed this House or at any rate which had not yet received the assent of the Crown. He had for a long time been a careful student of Parliamentary procedure and he did not remember anything of this kind having been done before. It might be necessary to do this when they were approaching the end of the session, and when they were anxious to get the business through. The reason given by the hon. Member for taking this course had no solid foundation, and he believed that this was the first time such a proposition had ever been made to the House of Commons. Until they had the authority of the Law Officer of the Crown upon the point he had raised he did not think they ought to pass this Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said they were dealing here with a simple question of drafting. In the first part of the Bill now under discussion there was a reference to the Agricultural Holdings (England) Acts for 1883 and 1906. They had now passed a stage of the Consolidating Bill which made it unnecessary to refer to all the previous Agricultural Holdings Acts, and, therefore, it was much more convenient that the one Act of 1908 should take the place of the preceding Acts. They were now proposing to strike out the old reference which had now become inaccurate and to put in the new reference. That was all the Committee were being asked to do. Both these Acts would become law together, and no difficulty was likely to arise from making the reference more convenient.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said the hon. and learned Member had given them a very lucid explanation of the object of this Amendment, but he had made one mistake. It had always been held that they could not move an Amendment which would make nonsense of a Bill. The words which it was proposed to insert were "Act of 1908." Now as a matter of fact there was no Act of 1908, and, therefore, they could not insert it. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the Bills were going up together, and that probably they would receive the Royal Assent. The hon. and learned Gentleman could not tell whether the Crown would give the Royal Assent or not. Supposing that the Royal Assent was given in one case and not in the other, this Bill would be nonsense. In that case the words in regard to the Act of 1908 would be meaningless, because there would be no Act of 1908. It was really only a question of form. He was sure that hon. Members on both sides of the House would agree with him that they ought to do things in proper and orderly form. Nobody objected to these Bills passing. If they were objected to, they would be discussed. It should not be assumed that the Crown would give its assent, and, therefore, the Amendment was out of order and could not be put.

*THE CHAIRMAN: On the point of order I think the hon. Baronet is not quite correct. There are precedents for this kind of thing. I do not see how what the hon. Baronet wants can be achieved except by the method proposed or by the putting off of the Bill. That however is not a question for me. The Amendment is not out of order.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) congratulated the hon. Baronet on having made a good point. Technically, the Consolidating Bill, which had received a Third Reading, was not an Act of Parliament until it had received the Royal Assent, but it was put down first in order that it might receive the Royal Assent a moment before this Bill. When this Bill received the Royal Assent the previous Bill would be "the Act of 1908." In these circumstances he put it to the hon. Baronet whether it was worth while pressing his point. If it were pressed he would be obliged to move to report progress on the Bill, and the passing of a useful measure would have to be postponed for two or three months, when it was desirable to have the two Consolidating Bills on the Statute-book at the same time.

MR. WALTER LONG thanked the Prime Minister for the fullness of his reply and the clearness with which he had dealt with the technical point raised. He ventured to say that it was rather more than a technical point which they were now discussing. The Prime Minister had appealed to them not to press the point on the ground that it was very desirable that these two Consolidating Acts should be passed into law. He entirely accepted the statement on the part of the right hon. Gentleman that they should be passed in order to consolidate a number of measures affecting one of the greatest industries in the country. But the Prime Minister knew better than anybody—certainly as well as anybody in the House—the danger of creating a bad precedent in regard to the business of the House. They were all in favour of the passing of this Consolidating Bill, and they had no objection whatever to the insertion of Amendments in order that the Statute should be intelligible after passing into law, but the Prime Minister had admitted—and he thought note should be taken of that admission—that this procedure was exceptional. When the learned Attorney-General dealt with the case a few moments ago he began by asking whether the objection which he had raised was a serious one. Having stated that it could easily be disposed of, the hon. and learned Gentleman showed the force of his own conviction by evading altogether the point raised. The hon. and learned Gentleman did not deal with the difficulty at all. He appealed to the Attorney-General, as the highest authority on constitutional law in the House, to state whether there was any precedent for the House, when dealing with that which was only a Bill, calling that Bill an Act of Parliament. While the hon. and learned Gentleman said he had no doubt there were many precedents, he did not cite one. He doubted whether the hon. and learned Gentleman was able to do so.

SIR W. ROBSON said the right hon. Gentleman had invited him to give a specific precedent. There was one exactly to the point. [The Attorney-General gave the name of a Bill, but it was inaudible in the Press Gallery.]

MR. WALTER LONG: Was that an Act passed by the present Government?

SIR W. ROBSON: Yes.

MR. WALTER LONG said the only precedent was one created by the present Government. The fact remained that the Prime Minister had admitted that if the point was pressed, the only course he could adopt would be to move to report progress and leave the fulfilment of this scheme of legislation to another period. That was a course which he had no desire to press on the Prime Minister, and he was sure that his hon. friends did not desire to press it. They had justified the raising of the question. As an old Member of the House, and one who was more jealous of its traditions than some who had not been so long in the House, he still believed that this was a matter of first rate importance. The Prime Minister had not only dealt fully with the case, but had frankly offered to postpone the Bill, and in the circumstances, he had no desire to press the point. The right hon. Gentleman had met him and his friends in a perfectly fair and courteous spirit, and they were willing to meet him halfway by withdrawing their opposition.

MR. ASQUITH said that this was a situation which could only occur when two Consolidating Bills were being passed side by side. Obviously it was not in the interest of the public generally, and still less in the interest of agriculture, that one should be passed into law and the other not. It was on that ground alone that he asked the House to accept the advice given by the right hon. Gentleman opposite and not to press the point which had been raised.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he would point out that this Bill as it stood now did not come into operation until 1st January next year. This certainly ought not to become a precedent, and it was obviously a matter on which, if the other House did it, many Members would make it a subject of complaint. [AN HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Benches: Why do not you divide? Further, he asserted that the necessity the Prime Minister referred to would bring out many other inconveniences. For instance, here were two Bills which they were passing that night. In the first there was a definition of a provision about small holdings referred to in the Small Holdings and Allotments Act of 1907. This Bill repealed that Act altogether, so that they were introducing quite the worst form of legislation—legislation not by reference, but by anticipation. This must lead to complexity and difficulty on the part of many people. He did not wish to go back on anything said from the front bench, but it was a bad precedent, was constitutionally wrong, and would cause inconvenience.

MR. ASQUITH said he would point out most respectfully to the hon. and learned Gentleman that the Government would not have taken this course except in the case of two parallel Bills. His hon. and learned friend and he both belonged to a profession in which they knew many people who brought out text-books to inform the public what was the state of the law, and it was very desirable that they should have the whole subject before them so that they might occupy their time in the Vacation.

SIR F. BANBURY said that during the speech of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Cambridge University an hon. Member opposite said: "Why don't you divide against the Bill?" He only rose on account of that interruption. They on that side of the House had accepted the very courteous assurance of the Prime Minister that he did not regard this as a precedent and that he would like the House to allow it to pass now. He always thought that if they on that side of the House were met in a considerate way, they waived a point. The Prime Minister had acknowledged that this was not a good form of procedure, and that he did not wish to make a precedent of it; and on that understanding the Party on that side of the House did not divide. He would point out that there would be no necessity to divide because the Prime Minister had assured the House that without a division, if they chose to press the point, he would accept it.

Amendment—

Clause as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 31 to 46 inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 47:

Amendments proposed—

"In page 30, line 6, to leave out the words 'three of the Market Gardeners' Compensation Act, 1895,' and to insert the words 'forty-two of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908.'"

"In page 30, lines 19 and 20, to leave out the words '(England) Acts, 1883 to 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act, 1908.'"

"In page 30, lines 24 and 25, to leave out the words 'three of the Market Gardeners' Compensation Act, 1895,' and to insert the words 'forty-two of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908.'"

"In page 30, line 28, to leave out the word '1900,' and to insert the word '1908.'"

"In page 30, line 38, to leave out the words '(England) Acts, 1883 to 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act, 1908.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 48 to 54 inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 55:

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Clause 55."—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 56, 57, and 58, agreed to.

Clause 59:

Amendment proposed—

"In page 37, line 25, to leave out the words '(England) Acts, 1883 to 1906.' and to insert the words 'Act, 1908,'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey,*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 59 to 64 agreed to.

Schedule:

Amendments proposed—

"In page 42, line 22, to leave out the words '(England) Acts, 1883 to 1906,' and to insert the words 'Act, 1908.'"

"In page 42, line 23, to leave out the words 'those Acts,' and to insert the words 'that Act.'"

"In page 42, lines 24 and 25, to leave out the words 'those Acts,' and to insert the words 'that Act.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendments agreed to, and the Bill, as amended, reported, and to be considered To-morrow.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (MASTERS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. RAWLINSON said he did not oppose the Second Reading of this Bill altogether. He merely desired to draw attention to the provision relating to the time of dismissal of a master as being contrary to the ordinary practice of the common law and as being liable to lead to considerable inconvenience. He also desired to draw attention to Clause 2, which contained a peculiar provision stating that nothing in the Act should prejudice the operation or enforcement of any judgment pronounced or made before 1st April, 1908. Why had that date been chosen for the beginning of the Act? He suggested that it should be altered to the day of the passing of the Act.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, (Dewsbury) said that he agreed with the points which had been put by the hon. Member; but the Bill had been the result of agreement between the assistant and head masters' associations and others interested in endowed schools. The words mentioned were pressed for by the assistant schoolmasters, and the date mentioned was about the period when an agreement was fixed. He hoped the hon. Member would not press his objection. An agreement had been arrived at after long and intricate negotiations, and he would be very sorry if it was disturbed.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said the effect of the Bill was to alter the rights of parties, and it might be that somebody had brought an action on the basis of the existing law and had not got judgment. If that had been the case, he did not think the other party to the action should be prejudiced by legislation. The two associations were no doubt representative bodies; but they did not represent every member of the profession, and they ought to consider everybody when altering an Act of Parliament. He ventured to think that Clause 2 required careful consideration and possibly radical alteration. The Bill ought not to prejudice any judgment pronounced before it was passed, nor ought it to prejudice the rights of any parties who had already commenced proceedings.

MR. RUNCIMAN thought he could reassure the hon. Gentleman. There had been no case in recent years under the existing law except that of the Marquess of Zetland.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) hoped the Bill would be allowed to pass before the adjournment. It was the result of the settlement of a long-standing difficulty arising out of the power of a new head master to dismiss without notice upon his appointment the whole of the staff of a school. If the Bill was not passed, the trouble would be accentuated.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give careful consideration to the second clause. If the Bill was not designed to take away the rights of somebody who had already commenced an action at law, why was it not in the ordinary form? Such a clause, if it got into an Act of Parliament, was apt to become a precedent, and might be inserted in another Act where there was no excuse for it. It was not desirable to have this kind of clause unless there was some over-mastering reason.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1906-7.

Resolutions reported.

I.—Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Navy Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - -	1,041,698	8	7
Total Deficits - -	644,285	12	7
Net Surplus -	£397,412	16	0

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services be sanctioned.

1. "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

Schedule.

Number of Vote.	Navy Services, 1906-07. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1	Wages, &c., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines - - - -	—			254,136	17	1
2	Victualling and Clothing for the Navy - - - - - -	187,206	2	8	—		
3	Medical Establishments & Services	22,225	13	8	—		
4	Martial Law - - - - - -	1,842	18	0	—		
5	Educational Services - - -	9,894	19	7	—		
6	Scientific Services - - - -	2,771	14	8	—		
7	Royal Naval Reserves - - -	80,309	1	6	—		
8	Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c.:						
	I. Personnel - -	—			82,848	1	11
	II. Matériel - - -	—			264,933	12	10
	III. Contract Work -	199,886	1	10	—		
9	Naval Armaments - - -	260,541	17	5	—		
10	Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad - - -	194,528	0	11	—		
11	Miscellaneous Effective Services -	78,025	9	9	—		
12	Admiralty Office - - - -	4,466	8	7	—		
13	Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay	—			20,078	19	7
14	Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances - - - - - -	—			19,838	9	4
15	Civil Pensions and Gratuities -	—			895	11	4
...	Amount written off as irrecoverable	—			1,554	0	6
	Total - - -	1,041,698	8	7	644,285	12	7

Net Surplus - £397,412 16 0

II.—Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Army Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - -	1,336,708	4	1
Total Deficits - -	42,029	13	4
Net Surplus -	1,294,678	10	9

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services be sanctioned.

2. "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

Schedule.

Number of Vote.	Army Services, 1906–7. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1	Pay, &c., of Army - - - -	358,433	12	9	—		
2	Medical Establishment: Pay, &c. -	44,876	13	4	—		
3	Militia: Pay, Bounty, &c. - -	41,127	7	2	—		
4	Imperial Yeomanry: Pay and Allowances - - - - - -	16,943	14	7	—		
5	Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances - - - - - -	30,198	4	1	—		
6	Quarterings, Transport, and Remounts - - - - -	107,764	3	7	—		
7	Supplies and Clothing - - -	105,665	13	2	—		
8	Ordnance Department Establishments and General Stores - -	128,775	0	10	—		
9	Armaments and Engineer Stores -	366,429	11	4	—		
10	Works and Buildings - - -	87,310	0	6	—		
11	Establishments for Military Education - - - - - - -	—			2,323	6	8
12	Miscellaneous Effective Services -	24,390	16	4	—		
13	War Office and Army Accounts Department - - - - -	4,229	10	11	—		
14	Non-effective Charges for Officers, &c. - - - - - - -	20,563	15	6	—		
15	Non-effective Charges for Men, &c.	—			32,744	16	2
16	Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities - - - - - -	—			2,855	2	7
—	Balances irrecoverable - - -	—			4,106	7	11
	Total - - - -	1,336,708	4	1	42,029	13	4

Net Surplus - £1,294,678 10 9

Resolutions agreed to.

CRAN MEASURES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

LORD R. CECIL said the clause was very strangely drafted. It seemed extraordinary that it should be necessary to enact that four times a quarter cran measure was equal to a cran measure.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said they were following the precedent of the Scottish Bill, and the Government draftsman had no doubt been very wise in doing so, in order to make it perfectly clear what was meant. The whole object of the Bill was to give the local authority power, if they thought fit, to adopt the cran measure and to allow the fisherman to use his cran and quarter cran measure.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; Bill read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nineteen minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 29th July, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill.—Committed.

Thames River Steamboat Service Act, 1904 (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Holderness Water Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill; Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendment considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

DOVER GRAVING DOCKS BILL.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH): My Lords, I have to ask your Lordships to consider Standing Order No. 143 in order to its being dispensed with in respect of this Bill, and that the Bill be read a third time. Your Lordships had the circumstances which had caused the delay explained the other day. All that is asked now is that this Standing Order, which provides that the print of an amended Bill must lie three days with the Departments concerned before the Bill is read a third time, should be suspended. If that were not done, it would be impossible to get the Royal Assent given to the Bill this week. I may add that the Board of Admiralty, the Department concerned, consent to this course.

Moved, "That Standing Order No. 143 be considered in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said Bill, and that the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to; Bill read 3ª, and passed.

THE STANDING ORDERS.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I have to ask your Lordships to agree to the Amendments to the Standing Orders which appear in my name on the Paper. I think a short explanation is due to the House, having regard to the postponement of this notice for some days. It was a matter of conversation between myself and the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees and I undertook to move the Amendments to the Standing Orders in the form in which they were left by my noble friend. In that form they proposed to extend to Ireland the provision which obliges municipal corporations to deposit the estimates of any work they propose to undertake by private Bill or provisional order with the Government offices concerned. I still adhere to the view that that provision ought to be extended to Ireland, and I understood it was practically agreed that it should be so extended. But since my noble friend the Chairman of Committees has gone away, representations have been made to the Chairman of Committees in the House of Commons by hon. Gentlemen from Ireland objecting to the proposed extension, and as it is not customary to make alterations in the Standing Orders of the House of Commons so near the end of the session, the Chairman of Committees in the other House has resolved not to press the matter at this moment, but in all probability he will renew it at an early period in another session of Parliament. In these circumstances, although we have not the same understanding here, I think your Lordships will agree that this House should not make a change in the Standing Orders which would make them different from those of the House of Commons except for grave reason. I am of opinion that, in all the circumstances, it is advisable to postpone making the change for another year, and therefore I have not renewed the notice as it was left by the Lord Chairman. As I had to act on my own responsibility, I thought it due to your Lordships to make this explanation. I move the Motion in the amended form.

Moved, "That the Standing Orders be amended as follows:—*Note.*—The words struck through are to be omitted, and the words printed in Italics are to be inserted. 30. Where by any Bill power is sought to take *or interfere with* any churchyard, burial ground, or cemetery, or any part thereof, or to disturb the bodies interred therein, or where power is sought to take any common or commonable land, as the case may be, a copy of so much of the plans, sections, and books of reference required by these Orders to be deposited in the office of the clerk of the Parliaments in respect of such Bill as relates to such churchyard, burial ground, or cemetery, common, or commonable land, shall, on or before the thirtieth day of November, be deposited at the Office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and a copy of so much of the said plans, sections, and books of reference as relates to such common or commonable lands shall, on or before the said day, be deposited at the office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. 134. In the case of any Bill whereby any municipal corporation, district council, improvement commissioners, joint board or joint committee, or other local authority in England or Wales are authorised to borrow money for any purpose within the jurisdiction of the Board of Trade or the Local Government Board, estimates showing the proposed application of the money for permanent works shall, except so far as the exercise of the borrowing power is made subject to the sanction of the respective Board, be recited in the Bill as introduced into Parliament and proved before the Committee. Copies of the estimates and statements deposited in accordance with Standing Order 36*a or under General Order made in pursuance of the Private Legislation Procedure* (*Scotland*) *Act*, 1899, shall be laid before the Committee for the purposes of this Order."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*).

On Question, Motion agreed to.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Order of the Day read for the consideration of the Commons' Amendments.

Moved, "That these Amendments be agreed to."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Will the noble Earl tell us what the Amendments are?

EARL BEAUCHAMP: In the absence of my noble friend Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, I am unable to explain the technical details; but I understand there is no opposition to the Amendments. Of course, if the noble Earl desires it, I will put the Bill off till another occasion and give him a complete exposition on the subject.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: We have an enormous number of Bills on the Paper, and really His Majesty's Government, if they put Bills down, ought to know something about what is in them. I do not wish to delay the progress of this Bill, but the noble Earl appeared to think it unreasonable to ask what the Amendments were. He seemed quite injured at being asked such a question. I do not wish to oppose the Motion, but I think it would be well if for the future the noble Earl would learn what the Amendments are which he is asking the House to agree to.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Amendment reported (according to order) then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order), and dispensed with. Bills read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order), then Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order), and dispensed with. Bills read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOTTERIES AND INDECENT ADVERTISEMENTS.

Report from the Joint Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. [No. 198.]

Minutes of Evidence, together with an Appendix, laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Interim Report of proceedings under the Small Holdings and Allotments Acts to 30th June, 1908.

TRAMWAY ORDERS.

Report by the Board of Trade of their proceedings under the Tramways Act, 1870, during the session of 1908.

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1898.

Return showing the total payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Accounts for the financial year 1907–1908.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF DURHAM).

Order made by the council of the county of Durham altering certain polling districts in the Chester-le-Street Parliamentary Division.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.

University Court Ordinance, No. 28 (Edinburgh, No. 10). Regulations for higher degrees in arts and science. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. [No. 193.]

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Brought from the Commons; to be read 2ª To-morrow.—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

CRAN MEASURES BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment to be printed, and to be considered To-morrow. [No. 191.]

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment to be printed, and to be considered To-morrow. [No. 192.]

MOTOR CAR LEGISLATION.

*LORD WILLOUGHBY DE BROKE rose to ask His Majesty's Government whether the question of motor-car legislation was being considered, and to call attention to the dust nuisance in country districts. The noble Lord said: My Lords, I rise to call attention to a matter of considerable public importance. I am very sorry to detain your Lordships on this question at this period of the session, but I will make my remarks as short as I possibly can. It is useless to expect the Government to produce any legislation dealing with the motor-car question, in view of the large amount of work which Parliament has before it; but I submit that this question is at least as important as the proposal to get everybody out of bed an hour earlier between the 1st April and 1st September. That, however, may be a matter of opinion.

Your Lordships will remember that the Royal Commission reported in July 1906. Nothing was done during that session of Parliament, but a debate on the question was raised in your Lordships' House in July, 1907, when Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, who I am glad to see in his place, said the use of the automobile was becoming less unpopular every day. I think that was a particularly fortunate time for introducing a discussion upon automobiles, because we had had a very wet summer, and the dust nuisance was not so apparent as it usually is at that time of the year. The noble Lord further said, I think, that he hoped legislation would not be produced in the dog days when the dust nuisance was at its highest and motor cars were not enjoying that popularity which perhaps they ought to enjoy. The question was again raised in March of this year when Lord Allendale informed your Lordships that no general legislation was contemplated.

I know, of course, that in calling attention to this matter nothing that I say can possibly injure the very powerful motor industry. It is only repeating a platitude to say that the introduction of motor-propelled traffic is in most cases good for the country at large, but, of course, it has its drawbacks. It has had a very bad effect on horse-breeding, and the displacement of a large number of horses will probably give serious cause for alarm to those who are interested in maintaining the armaments of this country; but there is one crumb of comfort to those interested in the horse question, and that is that the introduction of motor-cars has put an end to the breeding of the hackney horse, which has had such a deleterious effect on horse-breeding generally in this country.

I think your Lordships will agree with me that some legislation on this question ought not to be very long delayed. I venture to call attention to it because motorists have got every possible social and financial influence behind them. Their principal protagonist the noble Lord behind me (Lord Montagu of Beaulieu), has very properly been lifted to the dignity of big print in *The Times*, and consequently his views claim the attention of the nation, while the poor people who dwell by the roadside are, to the extent to which they are harassed by motor cars, dust, and so forth, really absolutely defenceless, and it is on their account that I wish to say one or two words on this subject this evening. As to motor 'buses in London, I think the people of London are quite able to take care of themselves. I do not propose to address myself to the motor bus question at all. Parliament has been already very influentially memorialised by those who dwell in the City, and it is to be hoped that something will be done in that matter. It is the country districts to which I particularly desire to call attention.

When we begin arguing about the dust nuisance and the danger, and so forth, the usual line of defence taken by motorists is that it is only the wicked owner of motor cars, the scorcher and the inconsiderate man, who gives offence, and that they would willingly join the rest of the public in putting that down. That may be true with regard to many accidents, but the dust nuisance is absolutely inherent to the use of any kind of motor car. I think I shall not be overstating the case when I say that it is almost impossible for anybody, however philanthropic he may be, to drive a motor car on a dusty or muddy day without inflicting some annoyance and discomfort on somebody. And to that extent they are trying to adapt to the roads of this country a form of traffic which in their present state they are not intended to carry.

It is quite easy to produce figures to show that there have been an enormous number of accidents owing to motor cars being driven at a high rate of speed. I have had compiled from the newspaper reports of 1907 figures which show that 932 accidents resulted from motor traffic of all kinds, in which 215 people were killed. Accidents are inseparable, it is contended, from this kind of traffic, and will eventually become fewer and fewer. I may be asked what remedy I propose. Well, I have a suggestion to make. If the use of the horn or warning signal by motorists was forbidden, they would have to take the same chance as drivers of horse vehicles; they would have to go much slower round corners and through populous places, and would not be able, by blowing a horn, to order everybody else out of the way. Their speed would be greatly reduced, they would have to pull up oftener, and they would be forced to be a little more considerate of other people. I know what the answer to this argument is. It is said that if motorists were prevented from using the horn they would have continually to shout when coming behind a covered van or vehicle of that kind. But I have to shout when I am driving a horse vehicle, and why should not motorists? Personally I do not think there is such a great deal in that as many people try to make out.

As to the dust nuisance, we have some very telling evidence in the Report of the Royal Commission. A market gardener at Brentford said that the effect of the dust was to destroy the value of his produce, and other evidence of a similar kind was given by persons residing in the vicinity of the main roads. It is to the dust nuisance that Parliament ought, I maintain, to address itself very strenuously. There is no doubt whatever about the dust nuisance. It is abundantly complained of on all sides, and is admitted by motorists themselves. It would not be difficult to work up a case and to speak in language of emotion of the terrible scourge inflicted by motor traffic on roadside dwellers and cottagers on dusty days, and more particularly on Sunday afternoons, their only holiday. The Royal Commission declare that there is no doubt all at about the dust nuisance, and that it causes material damage, discomfort and annoyance to users of and dwellers by the highways.

The Royal Commission went on to say that there were three ways in which the dust nuisance might be mitigated—first by an alteration in the structure of the car; secondly, by the treatment of the roads: and, thirdly, by some regulation with regard to speed. I am not an expert in regard to the construction of motor-cars. Perhaps my noble friend Lord Montagu will be able to tell us something about that later. But I think it is not unfair to say that the motor car which does not raise dust when driven at twenty miles an hour remains yet to be invented. I think the same argument applies with reference to the remedy of treating the roads. It is in the first place an exceedingly expensive thing to carry out, and though tarred roads do not raise such clouds of dust as ordinary roads, they do raise black dust of a particularly venomous, hurtful, and mischievous kind. I do not think I am going too far when I say that, however thoroughly you may prepare the surface of the road, and however much money you may spend upon it, the enormous width of the steel-shod tires will wear through any specially-prepared surface in a comparatively short time. Therefore, I think we may dismiss that suggestion as impracticable.

There is no doubt whatever, if we are to place credence in the Report of the Royal Commission, that dust does increase in a corresponding ratio to the increase of speed. This is what the Commissioners say—

> "Speaking generally, we came to the conclusion that at a speed below ten miles an hour the dust raised is comparatively slight, that it increases very greatly at from twelve to twenty miles an hour, and continues to increase, but in a smaller proportion, at higher speeds. It, therefore, follows that the dust nuisance is largely within the power of the motor driver to control if he be content to reduce the speed of his car to that of ordinary horse-drawn traffic."

It is speed which, in my humble opinion is the real mischief. I do not want to recommend anything savage or Draconian with regard to the speed-limit, but there is no doubt whatever that dust will increase in corresponding ratio to the increase of speed. I am not going to propose that Parliament should require that anybody who has a motor car should go no faster than anybody who has a dogcart. That would be ridiculous and impossible to enforce. I was one of the few who went into the lobby in favour of the twenty miles per hour speed-limit, which was subsequently adopted by the other House, but it has been found impossible to enforce that in the open between one village and another.

I do not wish to lecture any Member of your Lordships' House or anybody else. I may say that I have not got a motor car of my own, but have constantly been in one, and I am not sure whether breaking the law in somebody else's motor car is not more disreputable than breaking it in your own. But I do think that it is very deplorable that at this time of day society should have set itself to thwart and embarrass the police in the execution of their duty and in trying to enforce the law and obey the orders of their superiors. I think that to bring the Executive into discredit as has been done is a very regrettable thing indeed. It is no use for Parliament to attempt to pass a law if society generally has resolved not to obey it. You produce an *impasse* from which it is impossible to get out. But I do urge upon His Majesty's Government, most respectfully and most strongly, that if they would only let it be made clear that the central authority intends to enforce a reduction of the speed limit to something like ten miles an hour in villages and populous places, they would have the support of the whole of the better kind of opinion among both motorists and non-motorists, and would earn the thanks of the very much oppressed dwellers in country districts. This ought not to be difficult to do.

At the end of this Blue-book there is an extremely able report by the Secretary of the Royal Commission upon motoring in other European countries, and in every one of the countries mentioned there is a provision that motor-cars shall not go beyond a certain speed—the highest is twelve miles an hour—through villages and populous places. It may be said that this ought to be done by the local authorities. I believe the local authorities in several places have done what they can to mitigate this nuisance by placing notices outside the villages, but I think that in a very short time familiarity with the notices of the local authority without any extra penalty behind them will breed contempt, and that these notices, though possibly efficacious here and there for a short time, will soon come to be disregarded and will not have the same authority as they would have if placed there by the central Government. I ask the noble Lord whether he cannot send round some kind of requisition or instruction to each local authority to schedule all villages and populous places; but unless a more stringent penalty is enforced for driving through villages at a high speed, the dust nuisance will still continue and be just as bad as ever. Noble Lords opposite know quite well how to deal with local authorities who do not do their duty, and if they would only "ginger" the local authorities a little bit with regard to enforcing penalties and scheduling populous places in rural districts, their action would receive a great amount of support.

Noble Lords who live in the country know that this is a very serious matter. It may be thought a trifling domestic affair, but it is a matter which is very likely to have a serious effect upon society at large. I am told, and I know from my own experience, that there is nothing which sets the poor against the rich and class against class so much as the practice of driving through their villages and smothering them with mud in the winter and dust in the summer. These people who live by the roadside have a right to be protected, and I trust that we shall hear that attention is being given to the matter by His Majesty's Government.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: My Lords, this debate is very similar in tone to those we have had on two or three previous occasions on which I have had the honour to address your Lordships. But to-day we have had an able and conciliatory speech from the noble Lord, and with many of his conclusions, although I am a very keen motorist, I am bound to agree. I thoroughly agree as to the ill-feeling which might be caused between motorists and the general public, especially those who dwell along the roadside, by the inconveniences to which they are put; but, on the other hand, I am bound to say that the number of careful drivers is very largely on the increase. I think people offend in these matters more from thoughtlessness than anything else; but I have seen an immense improvement in this respect within the last year or two.

The Government are continually being given good advice from the parties interested on both sides. No doubt they can take care of themselves perfectly well. Everyone who has followed the Answers given by the President of the Local Government Board must be convinced that he is trying to find a solution to the question, and that pending a solution he is prepared to consider any suggestion that may be submitted to him. The noble Lord made one suggestion which, if he would extend it a little, I should be prepared to agree to. He said that there should be a reduced speed limit in villages and populous places. If he would add to that, that we might outside villages and populous places, where obviously there is no danger and no risk of life, exceed the twenty miles limit, we should be quite prepared to give that suggestion very careful and friendly consideration.

It is really in populous places, streets, and villages, where the danger and nuisance exist. There are a great many miles of main road in this country where no nuisance or danger can be said to arise except when you are meeting vehicles, and then every reasonable person—and I am glad to think they are in the majority—slows down. In the dog days we are apt to think that dust is always with us, but, as a matter of fact, a friend of mine at the Meteorological Office informs me that on the average there are only fifty dusty days out of the 365 in the year, or one in seven. Therefore, it is not so serious a question during the greater portion of the year, and I think more impartial consideration is likely to be given to the discussion of the subject if it takes place in February rather than in July.

As to accidents, everybody, of course, deplores them, but they are bound to occur with every kind of vehicle. Though I do not wish to say that motor vehicles are not driven sometimes much too recklessly, on the whole I do not think the motor car can really be called a dangerous vehicle. I made a rough calculation while the noble Lord was speaking of the number of miles which would be likely to be run in a year by motors and motor cycles. There are to-day, in this country, roughly about 60,000 motor-cars and 40,000 motor cycles. If anything that is an under-estimate. Let us assume that they run 100 miles a week apiece. On that basis they would run over 500,000,000 miles a year, which is a very considerable mileage, and the number of accidents is only about 1,000 a year. That is small in proportion. I am not such an efficient mathematician as to be able to work out the exact percentage, but it is very low indeed, and probably far lower than the percentage in the early days of railways. If one considers the great mileage run, I do not think the number of accidents, although deplorable, anything out of the way.

Then the noble Lord referred to the horn, and suggested that if horns were done away with there would be less furious driving and fewer accidents. I do not agree with him. All vehicles which go at any speed have a means of signalling their approach. Hansom cabs that were fitted with rubber tyres had to have bells on the harness; that was only another way of giving a signal to the public of their approach. The use of horns was prohibited in Paris, but the Paris authorities admitted that their abolition had not added to the safety of the public. I do not think that in the present state of our roads, with high fences at each side and children making mud-pies in the middle, it would be safe to do away with the use of the horn. Then there is also the difficulty in driving at night and meeting carmen asleep. I have often had the misfortune to meet sleeping carters whom it has been most difficult to wake. A sleeping driver on the road in the country is by no means rare. Then there are carriers' vans filled with clattering parcels, and the driver, with the best will in the world, is frequently not able to hear traffic approaching from behind. The abolition of the horn would lead, I am afraid, to a noisier form of engine, whereas the present tendency is to secure a quiet form.

The arguments for and against all these questions are so well known to your Lordships that I will not detain you upon them, but if the Government intend to bring forward any legislation on this subject, they ought to do so very carefully indeed. At the present moment the industry is not by any means in a flourishing condition, and any really drastic legislation would affect a large number of workers and a large amount of capital, and would strike a very serious blow at what is a great and growing trade. As regards dust, I have hopes that we are on the eve of a solution of this question. I have spent a good deal of time during the past year in visiting places where dust material has been put down on the roads, and I have come to the conclusion that a great deal of progress is being made in this direction. In a great many counties, notably in Hampshire, great portions of the villages, by public and private money, have been laid with dustless paving with excellent results, and I believe we shall in that way do a great deal to abolish the dust nuisance. We certainly should not stand in the way of the Government in the matter of fresh legislation. But while I do not think considerate motorists would oppose a reduced speed limit in populous places, they would ask for some relaxation in regard to those parts of the country where there is no danger, and also that the penalties under the Act of 1903 should be reconsidered and revised. The desire among motorists generally is to be considerate to the public and to minimise the nuisance which we are quite aware in some places we are guilty of creating.

*LORD ALLENDALE: My Lords, I have no reason to complain of this question having been raised again, or of the tone of the speech of the noble Lord who introduced it. If I have any complaint at all to make, it is rather that the question was not raised earlier in the session, as we have had a good many sittings occupied with only minor matters when we might have discussed this subject with advantage. To-day, however, there is a great deal of business on the Paper.

There was, as Lord Willoughby has reminded us, a debate on this question earlier in the session, initiated by Lord Montagu, to which I had the honour of replying. That discussion dealt with another aspect of the question—that of the taxation of motor-cars—there being at the time some apprehension as to possible increased taxation being announced in the then forthcoming Budget. I intimated at the time that the Government were not contemplating any legislation during the present session amending the Motor Cars Acts. However, the Government and the Local Government Board have not lost sight of the question, nor of the fact that the existing Acts require amendment in many particulars. The working of these Acts is being considered. Although the noble Lord who raised this discussion did not allude to any personal grievance, he has, I know, a personal and justifiable grievance against motor cars, for a year or two ago serious damage was done to some very valuable horses. The noble Lord has my fullest sympathy as a hunting man.

As to the suggested abolition of the horn, I think it is the abuse of the horn or siren which has led to complaint. I quite agree with what fell from my noble friend Lord Montagu on this subject. I daresay your Lordships, in reading the reports of prosecutions for excessive speed or accidents, have noticed that the question is often asked: "Did he blow his horn?" Very often the driver is told that he ought to have blown his horn; and, if a man is nearly run over, one of the first things he says is: "Why on earth"—or something stronger—"did not you blow your horn, and let me know you were coming?" Therefore, with regard to the abolition of the horn, there are two sides of the question to be considered. The use of motor cars was, as your Lordships know, first made possible in this country by the Act of 1896, which was amended in many particulars by the Act of 1903. Heavier motors have been allowed, identification plates and registration insisted upon, and the speed limit raised to twenty miles an hour. It was felt then that the motor car industry was still in its infancy, and, in view of further legislation, a Royal Commission was appointed. Most of your Lordships are aware of the recommendations of this Commission.

The question of the speed limit is undoubtedly one of the most important dealt with by the Royal Commission; but, at the same time, the Royal Commission were by no means unanimous in their recommendations. On this question precisely opposite opinions are held by motorists and the general public, and I can only repeat that the matter is receiving the attention of the Local Government Board. Other business, however, has made it impossible to introduce legislation up to the present. The existing Act is, therefore, scheduled again in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. The Government are not without hope that the delay which is taking place in the introduction of legislation may meanwhile result in more general agreement being come to on many points in order that fresh legislation when passed may be permanent and not have to be tinkered with continually.

I should like to support what my noble friend Lord Montagu said, that there is not now so much opposition to motor cars as there was formerly, and that as a rule the drivers are much more careful and the owners much more considerate than was formerly the case. Whatever may be the difference of opinion as to the speed on open roads, I think all reasonable persons will agree with Lord Willoughby that the greatest care should be exercised in populous places and when going through towns and villages. The local authorities have certain powers, with the sanction of the Local Government Board, of limiting the speed, and I understand that when this question of the continuance of the Motor Act was raised two days ago in another place the President of the Local Government Board intimated his intention of issuing a Circular drawing the attention of local authorities to the provisions of the existing law which may be put in motion in order to control the inconsiderate and dangerous use of motor cars. I am sure that if the noble Lord has any suggestions to make to my right hon. friend as to anything that could reasonably be embodied in this Circular, it will receive most careful consideration. The Local Government Board have certain drastic powers under the Act of 1903, but of course, they naturally do not take action until they are asked to do so by the local authorities. Speaking for myself, I certainly think that the minor authorities, the urban district councils and rural district councils, might also have power, without having to go to the county council, to schedule certain districts where motor traffic is dangerous. I should like to see the speed-limit considerably reduced in crowded and populous places, and in villages.

A good deal of the noble Lord's speech was taken up with the question of the dust nuisance. I do not think there can be any doubt in the minds of your Lordships that the dust nuisance is one of the greatest disadvantages of motoring, both to the general public and to motorists themselves, but there are, as the Royal Commission states, obvious difficulties in making dust production a statutory offence. As Lord Willoughby said, the dust nuisance is to a considerable extent aggravated by excessive speed. Then the question of road-making was alluded to. I think it is obviously impossible to have a uniform system in all localities. Various experiments have been tried, but, largely owing to the expense, they have been tried only on a small scale, and the attempt has not been sufficient to secure reliable information. Anyhow, whatever system is adopted it must increase the cost of road-making considerably. The type of car has also been alluded to. Although some cars throw up more dust than others, I am afraid that any motor-car driven, even at a moderate speed, on a dusty road would throw up a considerable amount of dust.

There is to be a congress shortly in Paris to consider the subject of road construction, at which a number of experts from this and other countries will meet. One of the engineering inspectors of the Local Government Board has been deputed to attend on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and it is hoped that some information on this important subject may be forthcoming. As I have said, I have no complaint to make of this question having been raised. All I will say in conclusion is, that the whole development of motor traffic in this country is being watched with a view to supplementary legislation, and that I will represent the views which the noble Lord has put forward to the President of the Local Government Board.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I cannot help feeling a little disappointed at the noble Lord's statement, because I think there is serious and urgent necessity for the protection of life in the Metropolis. I observed that both the noble Lord who raised this question and the noble Lord who followed him disclaimed any interest in London. They devoted the whole of their remarks to country districts. I am a Londoner; I see a great deal of what goes on in the streets of the Metropolis, and I cannot help thinking that it is a matter which urgently demands attention. It is impossible to doubt that a great number of people are deterred from ordinary circulation in London by reason of the state of the traffic in various streets. There are certain streets which it is manifest cannot be crossed without peril to life unless one has a policeman with him.

Although I have been a Londoner all my life, and am used to the streets, I find it difficult to cross some of them except at points at which are stationed the police, who so admirably discharge their duties. I walk a great deal; I always walk if I can, and from time to time I find a whole procession of motor vehicles on both sides of the road, following each other in rapid succession, and going at such a pace that to attempt to cross is a very rash thing. Surely this is not a question that need demand long deliberation before an end is put to the present state of things in the Metropolis. I can quite understand that there may be some difficulty in dealing with the question of dust, although in my opinion, I think the dust question might be solved very well by an indictment for causing a nuisance. But that is not the question which at present seems to be so urgent. As far as the cost of road construction is concerned, I think those who use the roads should be made to pay. My own view is that we shall have to go back to the old turnpike system. But, as I say, that is not what seems to me the most urgent matter.

Day by day one is struck by the number of accidents caused. A speed limit may be applied to vehicles travelling over a country road; but it would be absurd to apply the same limit to such thoroughfares as Piccadilly or the Knightsbridge Road at three o'clock in the afternoon. If there were no speed limit applicable to such streets, it would be clear that a driver would be responsible for travelling at a rate which was injurious to the public in the sense that it made it dangerous to pedestrians to cross the road. That view unfortunately was over-ruled, and it was determined to fix a speed limit; but I think everybody must be struck by the absurdity of making the rule apply equally to such places as Piccadilly and a country road.

There is another matter which seems to me to call for consideration. In regard to bicycles, the use of which by boys in the employ of traders has become general, it is not so much a question of the bicycle doing mischief, but a question of the cyclist dodging in and out and preventing the ordinary passenger using a crossing, because he has to calculate what will probably happen before he can reach the other side of the road, and before he had finished he would probably be run over. These are difficulties which exist in fact now, and to remit them to a general consideration of the whole motor industry and what may be done in country roads is small consolation to those persons who have to cross thoroughfares in London. It appears to me that some drastic measure is needed in respect of the mode in which motor cars can be driven on London streets.

I rather doubt the value of the motor horn in this respect. I think it acts as a deterrent against people crossing the road, and the effect is that the horn-blowers have established a reign of terror. It is all very well to say they have no right to drive you off the road, but people do not wish to try the experiment at the risk of their lives; they therefore have recourse to the ignominious expedient of running out of the way. I think the public convenience in that matter ought to be considered, and I am very much disappointed that this should only be the subject of contemplation by the proper authorities. I should have thought that something for the convenience of the public could have been done at once, and that the other and remoter questions might be left for future consideration. It appears, however, that until the number of accidents reaches a still larger figure and exceeds what is considered a fit proportion in comparison to the number of miles run, nothing will be done. I protest against its being supposed that nothing is to be done, and that the state of the London streets is to be permitted to continue as at present.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I have not much to add to the remarks of my noble friend Lord Montagu, but I should like to call your Lordships' attention to one or two general considerations of this question which I think are perhaps a little lost sight of. First of all, I suggest that the figures which were given by Lord Willoughby de Broke of the number of persons killed should be accepted with a good deal of reserve. They were, as the noble Lord said, extracted from the newspapers, and I think your Lordships ought to be assured that they did not include accidents from traction engines and tramcars and vehicles of that kind. Your Lordships will no doubt remember that before the Royal Commission many instances were brought forward of supposed deaths from motor car accidents which were reported in the newspapers, but the accuracy of which the local police, on being approached, denied. In one case a large motor car was said to have crushed a man to death in Oxford Street; but the Commissioner of Police said he had heard of no such accident and no man had been killed. Therefore, I suggest that the figures taken from the newspapers should be accepted with reserve.

Much has been said as to the abolition of the horn. I think it might make careful men drive more carefully, but the drivers who are to be feared are the reckless and inconsiderate drivers. They would not, I am afraid, be led to drive any slower in consequence of the abolition of the horn, but would be inclined to take the risk. Personally, if I were coming to a cross road, at whatever speed I was approaching it, I should not think that I was doing my duty without sounding the horn; and I think the abolition of the horn would place people in a danger they need not be placed in.

As to the question of speed, I think the noble and learned Lord opposite has sounded the right note. You will not attain public safety by imposing any artificial limit of speed, because when traffic is congested ten miles an hour is as ridiculous a speed as twenty miles an hour. It is not wise, I venture to think, to distract people's attention from that which should always be present to their minds—driving safely, having regard to the traffic, the state of the road, the condition of the car and the amount of control over it—by directing their attention to any artificial limit of speed. It may be perfectly safe in many streets in London at certain times of the day to drive at fifteen miles an hour, and it may be extremely dangerous in other streets to drive at four miles an hour. It is quite true, as the noble Lord opposite has said, that it is difficult to cross a continuous line of traffic, but I suggest that that is not a characteristic of motor cars alone. The same thing might have been observed in the early morning on the Embankment before motor cars became so fashionable, when City men were driven to business, and I am afraid that that is really an incident not of motor cars but of the ordinary congestion of traffic. It could, of course, be overcome by making it the law that the driver of a motor car should stop if a pedestrian desiring to cross held up his hand. Personally, I should not think of interfering with the progress of a pedestrian who had begun to cross, but should give him plenty of time.

Lord Montagu is right when he says that the proportion of considerate drivers has very largely increased, and is continually increasing. Your Lordships, I am sure, will not lose sight of the fact that the three largest organisations to which motorists belong are continually impressing on their members the necessity not only of safe driving, but of considerate and courteous driving. That is being done by example, by individual cases of discipline, and by the issue of pamphlets and circulars. The drivers' organisation is also directing its attention to the same subject.

As to the suggested speed of ten miles an hour, I think the Local Government Board ought to reflect that that is not, as a rule, a reasonable speed. Figures were placed before the Royal Commission which showed that a horse-drawn omnibus in Victoria Street, Westminster, was going at a speed of thirteen miles an hour, that hansom cabs travelled at a speed as high as sixteen miles, and that tramcars went at sixteen and seventeen miles an hour. I submit that a tramcar, which is on rails and cannot swerve, travelling at seventeen miles an hour is almost necessarily more dangerous than a light motor car travelling at that speed. If rates of speed are to be fixed, I would suggest, in the interests of having them observed, that they should be fixed at some reasonable rate. Ten miles an hour is almost impossibly slow for an ordinary motor car. It appears hardly to be moving. Those of your Lordships who drive in the Royal parks, where the speed of ten miles is rigidly enforced, know perfectly well that you are constantly passed by hansom cabs and even by four-wheelers. I think your Lordships will see that that is putting a very considerable strain on human nature.

Then with regard to the dust problem, what can be done in the way of speed and of construction is, I fear, only in the nature of a palliative. A pair-horse van ambling along at six miles an hour on a dusty road will cause a large cloud of dust to rise. I fear that the tarring of the roads would also be only in the nature of a palliative. I do not think the noble Lord who initiated this discussion was quite right when he said that the effects of tarred roads were injurious. If they were, it is strange that those who live in villages should themselves subscribe to the cost of tarring the roads. The real remedy, I venture to suggest, is to put the main roads under a central board and to assist them with national money—to create in this country something corresponding to the *routes nationales* in France. The real remedy is to adopt the suggestion made by two Departmental Committees and one Royal Commission—to make these main roads a national charge and to construct them in the best possible way. A good many experts have said that if once a road is made up in a proper and satisfactory manner the cost of maintenance will be enormously reduced, and I venture to think that that will be the ultimate remedy for the dust nuisance.

Earl Russell.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I want very strongly indeed to support the general contentions which were put forward by the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Halsbury). The noble Earl who has just sat down talked about considerate drivers. The difficulty is, when you want to cross the road, that you do not know whether the driver is going to be considerate or not, and you do not find out that he is inconsiderate until you have been run over, and that is rather late. I think the noble Earl must have been fortunate in his choice of four-wheel cabs. My experience of them, and I go about a good deal in them, is that they never exceed the limit of ten miles an hour. I think that statement, if I may use a colloquial expression, is rather too thin to be of much weight in a discussion af this kind. The noble Earl used the expression, "Driving with safety, having regard to the circumstances of the traffic." I think that is a rather dangerous provision, because it is generally the more experienced driver who takes the greater risks. Many of those who are skilful think that they can take great risks, and, though they may succeed many times, when they fail there are usually lamentable results. But I rose for the purpose of expressing my hearty sympathy with the suggestions made by the noble and learned Lord. I think that the Commissioner of Police, who has considerable powers in this matter, should be stirred up to action in regard to motor traffic, and, if he has not sufficient power, he should be armed with powers to place trusted members of the police force on the watch at certain points in London and to prosecute drivers guilty of reckless acts.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, the noble Lord who has just sat down threw some doubt on the statement that hansom-cabs and four-wheelers go more than ten miles an hour. The other day I was going along the Mall at, according to a very accurate speedometer, twelve miles an hour, when a hansom cab ran away from me. I desire to repudiate the suggestion that the more skilful a driver the more risks he takes. In my experience, the more skilful the driver, the more he appreciates the dangers of the road and the more considerate he is to the public.

BEE PEST (IRELAND) BILL.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*Lord Denman.*)

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, on the Motion to go into Committee I desire to say one word on the subject of this Bill. I believe it was read a second time under circumstances which rendered discussion difficult or impossible, and I do not think the House has heard very much as to the reasons which have induced His Majesty's Government to take the Bill up. It undoubtedly contains some extremely drastic and inquisitorial provisions. I was very much struck by an observation which fell from Lord Willoughby de Broke, who, in the course of his speech earlier to-day, said many sagacious things, to the effect that it is no use passing a law unless you can see your way to make people obey it. The law embodied in this Bill is certainly one which it will not be very easy to enforce. Bee-keeping has increased enormously in Ireland. You hardly see a single cottage in the poorer parts of the country where there are not beehives, and the owners of these hives will be subject to the legislation contained in this Bill. Now what does the Bill do? It compels every owner of bees whose bees show symptoms of this disease to notify the fact, and if he fails to notify it he is liable to a severe penalty. Then inspectors are to be appointed who are to have power to enter at all reasonable times any premises where bees are kept, and any-one obstructing an inspector is liable to penalties. In the next clause the department or the local authority may order the destruction, not only of the bees supposed to be infected, but of all articles and appliances used in connection with bee-keeping which are infected with the disease or suspected of being infected; and there, again, a penalty is imposed for failure to comply with the clause. Finally, there is power taken to proclaim a whole area in which this bee disease is found to exist, and within that area the department may cause the whole of the bees, as well as the articles and appliances used in connection with bee-keeping, to be destroyed. These are very strenuous powers, and I find at the end of the Bill that they can be delegated by the county council to a local authority. What I wish to know is whether His Majesty's Government have satisfied themselves by taking the advice of practical people that this is a kind of legislation which there is any prospect of successfully enforcing. Has there been any inquiry? Have the county councils been consulted? If not, I should like to know why there is so much hurry to force the Bill through Parliament, when, of course, there would be ample time for considering it at our leisure after the summer adjournment.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I should like to say a few words with regard to the remarks of the noble Marquess. Other places besides Ireland have suffered from this bee pest. I am told by a noble Lord near me that every bee in the Isle of Wight last season was killed by this disease, known as foul brood. The Bill is required in order to encourage and promote the cottage industry of bee-keeping in Ireland. I cannot agree with the noble Marquess that this Bill is too drastic in its effect. The noble Marquess quoted the expression of opinion of Lord Willoughby de Broke, that it was no good having a law unless it could be enforced; but I must point out that there are provided in this Bill penalities for not declaring the existence of this pest in particular hives. Where there are penalties surely the law can be enforced. I can assure your Lordships that the Bill is really wanted in Ireland.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, I hope I shall be able to show the noble Marquess that, although the provisions of this Bill appear at first sight to be of rather a drastic character, yet they are not really so. The Bill, as the noble Earl opposite has just said, is urgently needed to stamp out, and to stamp out as soon as possible, this disease. The noble Marquess asked if the local authorities had been consulted. The answer to that is that we are promoting this Bill at the request of the local authorities in Ireland. I believe that nearly all the local authorities and the Council of Agriculture as well as the bee-keepers of Ireland have asked the Irish Department of Agriculture to introduce a measure of this kind. Our desire is to meet, as far as possible, the wishes of these local authorities and of the people interested in the success of bee-keeping. The disease with which the Bill deals has spread rapidly and caused very great loss. Experts are agreed that the only way to cope with the pest is by destroying the infected bees and also the appliances. That is what this Bill seeks to do; and compensation is to be paid to the owner of any bees or appliances destroyed to the extent of half their value. This compensation will be paid out of the funds of the Agricultural Committee of each county. These funds consist of a small rate, generally of 1d. in the £, and a larger sum in the shape of a contribution from the Department of Agriculture. The Department will bear a large proportion of the cost of administering the Act, for not only will they supply a considerable part of the funds but they will also provide the cost of inspectors and other people necessary to carry out its provisions. The Department of Agriculture recognise the urgency of this matter. I do not know whether the noble Marquess will consider that I have answered satisfactorily the points he raised. The noble Earl opposite, Lord Donoughmore, has some Amendments on the Paper which would considerably enlarge the scope of the Bill, and with the great majority of which I am unable to agree. I hope that, although the Bill has been brought up at a late period in the session, noble Lords opposite will not resist the passing of it into law before the adjournment.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am much obliged to the noble Lord for his explanation. If I had been in possession of the information he has given to the House I should not have troubled him.

On Question, Motion agreed to. *Lord Denman.*

House in Committee accordingly.

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE, who had two pages of Amendments on the Paper, said he had consulted the noble Lord in charge of the Bill, and in view of the late period of the session he would not propose any Amendment to which the Government did not assent.

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE had an Amendment on the Paper to insert, after Clause 4, the following new clause—

> "Any person who knowingly removes from his premises, or sells or disposes of to any other person, or imports into any district any bees, or any article or appliance used in connection with bee-keeping, shall be guilty of any offence under this Act, and shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding, for the first offence, five pounds, and for the second or any subsequent offence ten pounds."

He desired to enter an emphatic protest against the action of their Lordships' printers. He had handed the Amendment in in proper English, and it was circulated to their Lordships. The printers, however, had chosen, off their own bat, to reprint it and recirculate it, leaving out the most important word. The Amendment should read—

> "Any 'infected' bees or any 'infected' article or appliance."

As his Amendment stood on the Paper, the removal of a bee hive from one place to another would be an offence. It was curious that when their Lordships worked hardest the printers seemed to get slackest. It was a very strong thing for the printers to revise their Lordships' Amendments, and he thought the House ought to consider whether some inquiry should not take place into the slipshod methods of the printers. He moved his Amendment as he desired it to be put.

Amendment moved—

> "After Clause 4, to insert the following new clause: 'Any person who knowingly removes from his premises, or sells or disposes of to any other person, or imports into any district any infected bees or any infected article or appliance used in connection with bee-keeping, shall be guilty of an offence under this Act, and shall

be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding, for the first offence, five pounds, and for the second or any subsequent offence ten pounds.' "—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

LORD DENMAN moved to amend this proposed new clause by leaving out the words "any infected bees or any" and inserting the words "any bees infected with bee pest or foul brood, or any"; and by inserting after the word "bee-keeping" the words "and infected with that disease." He explained that the scope of the Bill would be enlarged by Lord Donoughmore's Amendment as it stood, and he wished to restrict it to bees infected with this particular disease.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To leave out line 3, and to insert the words 'any bees infected with bee pest or foul brood, or any'; and in line 4, after the word 'bee-keeping' to insert the words 'and infected with that disease.' "—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6 agreed to.

Clause 7:

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved to amend Clause 7, so as to enable the Department to make regulations with respect to the method of isolation, cleaning, and disinfection of bees in addition to their destruction.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 12, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'isolation, cleaning, disinfection, or,' and after the word 'bees' to insert the words 'bee products or.' "—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

LORD DENMAN said he would accept the Amendment if the noble Earl would delete the word "isolation." He had taken legal advice on the point, and had been told that there would be some difficulty in the matter of isolating a bee.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE accepted the suggested alteration.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendment to be received To-morrow, and Bill to be printed as amended (No. 195).

FINANCE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

***VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN**: My Lords, early in the tenure of office of His Majesty's present advisers the minds of a good many stern economists among their followers who had been taught to believe in the gross extravagance of the Administrations of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour must have been much cheered by the statement made by the Prime Minister that he considered that the Estimates for the Supply services, as they then stood, at £111,000,000, were quite excessive, and that he held it to be the first and paramount duty of the present Government to return to a more thrifty and economical administration. The effect of that announcement was seen last year by the reduction of these Estimates by something less than 1 per cent. This year I am sorry to say that the £111,000,000 has been exceeded by nearly £1,000,000. I do not complain of that. I allude to it solely for the purpose of expressing the hope that, now it that was been shown by the experience of the present Government that the charges of extravagance which they so freely launched in the days of their predecessors were wrong, these charges will not be repeated in the future.

What is the present position? We have Estimates for the Supply services of nearly £112,000,000, but that is by no means all. We have before us in the years that are immediately to come anticipations of large additions to those Estimates, not including any question of old-age pensions, but for the ordinary services of the country. Bills have been passed or are passing, such as the Irish

Universities Bill or the Small Holdings Act, which must necessarily add to the expenditure. When the question of elementary education is settled, and I suppose all of us hope that a reasonable settlement of that question may be arrived at before long, a further large charge will undoubtedly be imposed on the Exchequer. Then there are other more important items of increased expenditure to which we may look forward, first in Army services. Unless the rumours which have been abroad within the last few weeks as to intended reductions in the Army are true, as I cannot imagine for a moment they are, and if the Territorial Army scheme is a success, very considerable additions must be made to the Army Estimates in the coming years on that account, especially in order to establish the Territorial Artillery. Then those who are acquainted with the needs of the services tell us that both in the Army and Navy, stores have been depleted in the last two years which will have to be replaced in future years. Lastly, the new construction vote for the Navy for three years running has been reduced to a point which has been unknown for many years previously, with the certain result that if the promises of the Government with regard to the maintenance of our Navy in an effective state are realised the new construction vote must be increased in the years before us, probably by several millions.

In addition to those charges there are two important permanent naval works—the docks and harbour at Rosyth and the Portsmouth lock—for which a sum of no more than £100,000 is taken in the Estimates of the present year, but for the completion of which at least £4,500,000 will be needed. We have been told that the works at Rosyth are to take ten years. If the policy of spending money at Rosyth is sound, and I believe it to be necessary, there can be no question that these works ought to be brought to a conclusion at the earliest possible date. I believe at the present moment there is not a single naval dockyard on the whole east coast of this country capable of receiving a ship of the "Dreadnought" class. If by postponing the execution of this great work owing to their desire to keep down naval Estimates, that work should be found to be not ready in the event of a possible naval war in the North Sea, a responsibility will rest on the shoulders of the Government which I should be sorry to bear. Taking all these matters together, and remembering that the Government have set their faces against loans, I believe a sum of several millions must be added to the ordinary annual peace Estimates during the next few years.

That is not all. We have now before us the Old-Age Pensions Bill, which will impose a burden commencing at £7,500,000 or so, and extending to an amount which no man can foresee, upon the finances of the country. What has been the policy which the Government have pursued with a view to preparing for this great increase? We have been told by the Prime Minister that he budgeted not merely for one year, but that his Budgets form part of the whole of a great financial policy. Last year he gave up £3,500,000 of indirect taxation in the shape of coal duty and reduction of the tea duty. This year he follows that action up by giving up £3,500,000 of the sugar duty—£7,000,000 of indirect taxation given up in two years with these great liabilities before us.

I have never contended, and am not about to contend now, that either the coal duty or the sugar duty is free from objection. I defy any man to discover a tax against which no objections can be made. Least of all can that be said for the income-tax, the high rate of which is certain to have a direct effect upon the employment of the people and upon the condition of trade. But what I have contended is that, granting that there are objections to the coal tax and the sugar tax, just as there must be objections to every kind of tax, it would be absolutely impossible for any Chancellor of the Exchequer to raise the amount which those taxes have produced with less disturbance to the general trade and industry of the country, and with less injurious effects upon the masses of the people. I have no doubt that the repeal of the coal duty benefited the employers and workmen concerned in the production of coal. It did not benefit them to the extent that was anticipated, because I think the rise in the price of coal that took place last year was due not so much to the repeal of the coal duty as to the great expansion of trade on the Continent, which largely increased the demand for our coal, and consequently together with the repeal of the duty, had this effect upon the general consumers of coal in this country that, it materially added to the price which they had to pay for a necessary article of consumption. But the coal duty has gone.

The reduction of the sugar duty, so far as sugar is used as an article of manufacture, has certainly given relief to manufacturers. It may have given some relief, like the reduction of 1d. on tea, to the direct consumers. I do not believe that the reduction in either case gave much if any relief to the very poor classes among us who purchase both their tea and sugar in very small quantities indeed. The reduction of ¼d. a pound on sugar can be of no benefit to the poor person who buys no more than half a pound of sugar at a time. But what I contend with regard to both these duties is that neither of them pressed severely upon the masses of the people. That is clearly proved by the fact that the consumption both of tea and sugar, in spite of the duties upon them, has been considerably increasing, and the sugar duty in 1907 produced a larger sum than has ever been known before, while sugar was at what the Prime Minister described as a satisfactory price.

The Prime Minister described the sugar duty as vicious in principle, burdensome as to its incidence, and unequal as to its operation as between different classes. If it is vicious in principle His Majesty's Government would have carried out their principles by repealing it altogether instead of leaving half of it in existence. I contend that it is not vicious in principle. It is in accordance with the strictest canons of free trade. Nobody has ever denied that. No doubt it is a tax on food and a tax on raw material also, but sugar is mainly used as a raw material of manufacture by two classes in this country—the manufacturers of confectionery and the manufacturers of aerated waters. I pass by the brewers because they have no business, in the opinion of many persons, to use sugar at all. The two trades that I have named are the trades which complain of the sugar duty. Yet it is a remarkable fact that their trade expanded while the sugar duty was at the full amount. Therefore I should contend that it is not burdensome in its incidence.

But the Prime Minister said that it is unequal in its operation as between different classes. No doubt both with regard to tea and sugar the great masses of the people pay more to those duties than the comparatively richer classes. But that is the very object of taxation of that kind, unless it is taken for granted that the taxation of this country is to be confined to those who pay direct taxation and the ever-decreasing number of the working classes who consume alcohol and tobacco. That is a principle which I believe cannot be maintained as sound finance. It was all very well to talk of a free breakfast table when the expenditure of this country was small as compared with the enormous expenditure which we see nowadays, and when the income-tax was at 5d. in the £. A free breakfast table is a very different thing when we have income-tax in peace time at the rate of 1s. in the £, when our expenditure is already £111,000,000 for the Supply services, and is certain to be increased, and when we are about to impose, in the name of social reform, a largely increased burden on the taxpayers of this country. In these circumstances I contend that it is not sound finance to exempt altogether from taxation those members of the working classes—and they are many—who consume neither alcohol not tobacco, but that they ought to pay something to the great expenditure of the country, and especially to that kind of expenditure which is described as social reform.

It was by repealing taxation of this kind that His Majesty's Government thought fit to prepare for the increased expenditure which may be anticipated in the future. They have not suggested that they are about to increase taxation in any shape. What they have stated is that they will devote part of the sum which is now used for the redemption of Debt towards the cost of old-age pensions.

I was not surprised at that suggestion from the Prime Minister, because a few weeks ago I observed that he taunted the Government of Lord Salisbury, in which I was Chancellor of the Exchequer, for annually raiding the Sinking Fund between 1896 and 1899, instead of devoting it to the formation of an old-age pension fund.

If your Lordships will pardon me, that charge having been made, I should like to show that it is a grossly unfounded charge, and that it is even audacious on the part of Mr. Asquith. I will not dwell on the fact that during the years named the subject of old-age pensions had not been sufficiently examined to be ripe for being dealt with in any way; but I challenge the statement as an entire misrepresentation of what I did. Between 1895 and 1897 the Exchequer received a realised surplus in those three years of £10,250,000. That would, according to law, have been automatically devoted through the old Sinking Fund to the reduction of Debt. The Debt at that time was unpurchasable at its nominal value; if you wanted to buy Consols you would have had to pay £110 for £100 nominal value on an average during those three years. It appeared to me—and I remember it appeared also to Lord Wolverhampton—that that would have been very great waste of public money. And, therefore, instead of devoting that £10,000,000 to the reduction of Debt during those years, what I did was to devote £9,000,000 of it to public works, which otherwise would have had to be provided for, under the precedent set by Lord Rosebery's Government in 1895, by borrowing for short terms of years. That proposal was approved by the House of Commons at the time. I think it was approved unanimously, and I am glad to see that view confirmed by the noble Lord opposite.

What were those works? They were the formation of docks and other important naval works at Devonport, Keyham, Gibraltar, and elsewhere, the building of barracks, urgently required at that time for the comfort and health of our soldiers and sailors, the provision of ranges and manœuvring grounds for the training of our Army—all matters that were urgent, because in days previous to the years to which I am referring they had been delayed until it was absolutely necessary, owing to the great increase in the size of ships and the increase in our Navy and Army, that a large expenditure should at once be incurred in that way. It had to be done. It could only have been done, either by loan or by the devoting of that realised surplus to that purpose, and that is what I did. And that is described as raiding the Sinking Fund! That is not all. Of the £9,000,000, £2,500,000 was devoted to the erection of great public buildings—South Kensington Museum, the Admiralty, and those great offices in Whitehall which I think are a credit to the country. And I am very glad to observe that in the Bill now before your Lordships Mr. Asquith has followed my example. In the ninth clause of this Bill it is proposed to raid the Sinking Fund to the extent of £600,000 for continuing that very range of buildings on which much of my £2,500,000 was expended. After this action on the part of Mr. Asquith I hope I shall hear no more of my sins of raiding the Sinking Fund for the very purpose for which he proposes to raid it now.

I turn to another point. The Prime Minister is specially proud—and I admit that it is a subject of pride to the country—of the amount of Debt which he has paid off during the last three years. He claims to have paid off—and I dare say it is quite correct—£47,000,000 of Debt in three years. He claims also to have restored the credit of the country. I wish the credit of the country had been restored. What are the facts? I suppose that the price of Consols is a pretty good measure of the credit of the country. Consols were never so low during the Administrations of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour as they were last year. The present price of Consols is actually lower than the lowest price which they touched in 1905—the last year before His Majesty's present Government came into office, the last year of those extravagant Administrations.

Of course, it would naturally stand to reason that a large reduction of Debt should increase the credit of the country. Why has it not done so? At the present moment, if His Majesty's Government wish to issue a comparatively small amount of 2¾ per cent. Irish land stock, they cannot get any more than 89½ for 100 of it, on their own showing. Why is not the credit of the country better after this reduction of Debt? There are reasons for which His Majesty's Government are in no way responsible which have undoubtedly affected the question, but there is one reason for which they are responsible, which has affected the credit of the country materially. I am afraid one of the reasons why the price of Consols has not increased, but has rather fallen, since their administration began, is the support they have given to the attacks which so many of their supporters have made on property in every shape and form. Further, at the very moment that the Prime Minister prides himself on paying off £47,000,000 of Debt in three years, he is about to impose a new burden on the country, commencing with £7,500,000 to £8,000,000, ending nobody knows where—a charge equal, if noble Lords will consider it, in amount to what represents £250,000,000 of capital. These are reasons, for which His Majesty's Government are absolutely responsible, which have kept down the credit of the country and prevented Consols from rising in spite of the redemption of Debt.

I now come to the way in which this redemption of Debt has been effected, and I think some little attention should be given to that, because, although I entirely congratulate His Majesty's Government on having made it, yet we ought, to consider how it has been done. Now, out of these £47,000,000, £13,500,000 have been found by the realised surplus of the three years. What is that realised surplus due to? It is due to the fact that the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day has under-estimated the yield of his taxation and overestimated his expenditure. When I was Chancellor of the Exchequer I always carefully guarded myself against taking any credit whatever for a realised surplus. To my mind it is rather discreditable than otherwise, because it shows that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's calculations on one, if not both sides have been wrong. Well, £13,500,000 have been found by the realised surplus. Then the process has been made more easy by the price at which the Debt has been redeemed. It has been possible during these three years to redeem Consols at a discount varying from 20 per cent. to 12 per cent.

Lastly, the bulk of the money which is devoted to this purpose has come through the New Sinking Fund out of the Fixed Debt charge of the country. That unquestionably is a matter for which the Prime Minister as Chancellor of the Exchequer may take credit. He has kept that Fixed Debt charge at the amount of £28,000,000. He even raised it last year to £29,500,000, and that has no doubt tended largely to this reduction of Debt. Now it is suggested, that that amount should be reduced next year. The Prime Minister said that the New Sinking Fund would next April amount to as much as £9,785,000, and out of that sum a certain portion might be set free in order to go as far as it could, towards providing for old-age pensions. I, for one, should have no quarrel in principle with such a proposition, and I observed the other day that Lord Welby, speaking on the Old-Age Pensions Bill, took a similar view. But when, in 1899, I pointed out, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, to the House of Commons of that day, that owing to the approaching reduction of the interest on the Debt, and falling in of terminable annuities, the New Sinking Fund would very shortly amount to a sum much larger than that to which it had ever amounted before, and, therefore, that it was advisable to do precisely what the Prime Minister suggests now—namely, to reduce the fixed Debt charge—why, I was denounced up hill and down dale by the leading Members of the Opposition of that day, including, I am quite sure, Lord Wolverhampton, whom I now see opposite.

I think I was right, and I think if Mr. Lloyd-George, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, should decide to take a similar course next year that he will be right also. But I have two things to say. In the first place, the deadweight Debt, as it is called, will next April be £70,000,000 more than it was at the time to which I was alluding—in 1899; and, secondly, if the fixed Debt charge is reduced, I think that anything that is gained by that reduction ought in accordance with all precedents to be devoted to the relief of taxation. What has enabled the Chancellor of the Exchequer to devote so large an amount out of the Fixed Debt charge to reduction of Debt during the last three years? It is just this, that he has maintained the income tax at a shilling in the £. If the income-tax had stood at 8d. in the £ during those three years, the rate at which it stood before the South African War, the Exchequer would have received £30,000,000 less in income-tax in the three years than it actually did. Therefore, what has happened is this, that the £47,000,000 of Debt has been mainly redeemed out of the extra 4d. on the income-tax and out of the realised surplus of the three years.

But, my Lords, there is no prospect that if the Fixed Debt charge be reduced next year, the sum by which it is reduced will be devoted to the reduction of the income-tax. We know very well that it is to be devoted to old-age pensions. I venture to say that that is not sound finance, considering the source from which it comes. Considering the great reductions that have taken place in the last two years in indirect taxation—no less than £7,000,000—it is not finance that in my belief would have been sanctioned by any of the predecessors of the present Government. What does it mean? You are imposing in the name of social reform an enormous new burden on the country for the benefit of the masses of the people. You are proposing to pay for it, so far as we know at present, solely at the expense of that small class on whom direct taxation falls. That is the proposal, so far as we know it. Perhaps I am anticipating rather the Budget of next year, but I hope I am not unduly detaining your Lordships in doing so, because it does seem to me that these questions deserve the attention and consideration of the country, even before that Budget is proposed.

Let me give two reasons why the income-tax should not be retained at 1s. in the £. The first reason is that it is a very heavy tax indeed upon a certain class of the community. In my belief, with an income-tax of 1s. in the £, persons who receive unearned incomes of between £700 and £1,500 a year are about the most heavily taxed persons in the community at the present moment. Secondly, a point which I have over and over again endeavoured to impress upon the country is this, that to retain the income-tax at 1s. in the £ in time of peace is wrongfully to deplete what should be your resource in time of war. When the South African war broke out, the income-tax was 8d. in the £. The income-tax is now 1s. in the £. If war should unfortunately break out tomorrow, the country would be the poorer for war expenditure than it was in 1899 by no less than £10,000,000 a year, because 4d. in the £ of income-tax has already been appropriated to peace expenditure. I will not labour that point, but I will say this, that, looking to the hints that have been thrown out that some further contribution is to be derived from payers of direct taxation towards the cost of old-age pensions, it does appear to me to be a matter which now more than ever before, deserves to be considered by the country at large. What is the position? Here, in the name of social reform, you are actually imposing a burden, the extent of which in the future nobody could foresee, upon the taxpayers of the country. So far as we know at present it is practically to be paid for solely by the payers of direct taxation, while indirect taxation has been reduced by £7,000,000 in two years. Why did the Prime Minister reduce the sugar duty this year? He said it was because he did not need it for the expenditure of the year. That was not the view he took of the circumstances in his Budget of 1907. In his Budget of 1907 the Prime Minister deliberately levied £1,500,000 more than he required for the expenditure of the year on the ground of the burden about to be imposed on the country by the institution of old-age pensions. He devoted that sum very properly last year to the repayment of the Debt and this year it goes towards old-age pensions. If the Prime Minister had followed this year the wise and sound financial policy he adopted last year in making provision for the future burden which he knew was imminent he would have continued the sugar tax and would have devoted £3,500,000 this year towards additional repayment of the Debt and have had £3,500,000 in hand next year as a most important contribution towards the cost of old-age pensions. Had this been done it would have been not only in accordance with financial prudence but with justice in the allocation of taxation, because I cannot conceive a tax that could be more appropriately used to bear a part of the burden of old-age pensions than the sugar duty. But no; financial prudence and justice have been thrown aside; they have given way to the party political exigencies of the moment and to the clamour of the supporters of the Government in the House of Commons for a part repeal, at any rate, of the sugar duty, and this is done precisely at the moment when we are imposing this great burden on the country without knowing how it will eventually be met.

I have heard this described as a popular Budget. I suppose it is a popular Budget, because, no doubt, it has met with little opposition in the House of Commons and in the country. I can only say that in my opinion it is a Budget fraught with evil omen for the future. It seems to me utterly devoid of any financial foresight; it seems to ignore any equitable distribution of our burdens among the different classes of the population, and to disregard what is even more important, the absolute necessity of maintaining unimpaired in time of peace our principal resource for what may be vital needs in time of war.

LORD ST. DAVIDS: My Lords, the noble Viscount, Viscount St. Aldwyn, had said the present Government accused the late Government of extravagance but had not been very much better themselves. He has said that the present Government in their first year reduced the Budget by £1,000,000, and in the present year have slightly increased it, but it ought to be borne in mind that the present Government have adopted the principle that public works, such as barracks and docks, should be done, when they are done, out of the revenue of the year, whilst the Government of which the noble Viscount was a Member, in addition to the monies raised by taxation which they spent every year, spent further sums, almost every year of their life, in public works which, though they have been said to constitute a capital charge, meant, many of them, the spending of money on wasteful objects. They ought really, I think, to have been paid for out of the revenue of the year. That, I think, is the policy of the present Government, and for which the noble Viscount ought to have given them some credit. Then the noble Viscount has said that the farthing a pound off sugar will be very little relief to the very poor classes, because they buy their sugar half-a-pound at a time. That may possibly be the case, but I have very vividly before my mind that just after the announcement of this reduction in the price of sugar I was taken on a motoring tour across the country, and I was struck immensely by the number of notices which I saw in the village shops to the effect that because of the Budget the price of sugar was reduced. We must remember that although there may be those who buy their sugar half-a-pound at a time, most of the village people throughout the country go into the towns shopping on Saturdays and buy considerably more than half-a-pound of sugar at a time. They very often buy several pounds, and those people in almost every case have got the benefit of the reduction from the very day it was made. The noble Viscount has said that the sugar tax was said by Mr. Asquith to be vicious in principle, and that yet the Government have only taken off half of it. The Government have a good deal to do, and the fact that although in office only two and-a-half years they have taken off half a tax is considerably to their credit, whilst the noble Viscount would not probably have given them any additional praise if they had taken off the whole of it. The noble Viscount went on to say that taking off taxes from coal and tea and sugar was, in his opinion, unsound finance. I am very interested to hear it, but it is very vividly before my mind that there is a great propaganda going on in the country in favour of what is called tariff reform, and what the tariff reformers are saying from one end of the country to the other is that they propose to take off the taxes of tea and sugar the moment they have the power. The noble Viscount himself may not hold that view, but it must be in his knowledge that his own colleagues and members of his political party are advocating every day on public platforms that taxes shall be put on corn and other articles of consumption in order that taxes may be taken off tea and sugar.

The noble Viscount went on to say that the credit of the country had not improved under the present Government. He gauged the credit by the price of Consols, and he told us that in his judgment the price of Consols had failed to rise, partly because of the old-age pensions scheme, and partly because of general attacks on property by supporters of the Government. But I think we ought to recognise that there is no party in this country, not even the extremest socialistic party, that has ever proposed any attack on public credit. We have never had in this country any party wild enough to say that the public debt should be repudiated or the interest on it reduced. Whatever attacks we have had we have never had attacks on public credit. I should like to remind the noble Viscount that there are other causes for the low price of Consols. One of them is, undoubtedly, the fact that we have had very good years of trade and that when trade is good it is a commonplace that money goes from the banks into trade and that there are not big sums to be invested by the banks and by capitalists in Consols as temporary investments. There is also the fact that in the last few years we have had nearly all commodities at a much higher price than the average. That means that a big merchant who, perhaps, all his life has been in the habit of borrowing from his bank, say, £100,000, merely because the prices of commodities in which he deals are higher, will, on the same volume of trade, have to borrow £120,000 or £130,000, instead of £100,000. That is one of the main reasons why Consols have been low. There is another reason, and one for which the party opposite is entirely responsible, and that is the law under which trustees in this country are allowed to invest in Colonial stocks. I do not think we felt the full effect of that on the price of Consols when it was done, because trustees are very lethargic bodies, and when holding Consols or anything else are very slow to move out of those securities and to go into something else. But we now have the Colonies borrowing money and coming to the British public to do it. Canada the other day issued a loan at par paying 3¾ per cent., and the Cape of Good Hope quite recently issued a loan at par paying 4 per cent. When trustees are allowed by law to go into securities that pay 3¾ per cent. or 4 per cent., is it not likely that they will cease putting very much money in Consols which will pay much less? That was, undoubtedly, one of the causes of the low period; a cause we are only just beginning to realise and a cause for which the noble Viscount and his friends are entirely responsible. I should like to see some Government repeal that law altogether. I would not compel those who have made Colonial investments to go out of them, but I do not think trustees should be allowed to make such investments in the future unless, of course, provisions to that effect are made in their trust deeds.

The noble Viscount went on to say that a reduced fixed debt charge whenever made ought, as a matter of principle, always to benefit the taxpayer. That may be so, but, after all, there is not such an enormous difference in the minds of some of us between a taxpayer and a ratepayer. If a reduction in the fixed debt charge of this country is to be used for old-age pensions we must remember that as the old-age pensions scheme becomes operative it must tend to keep down rates by taking these poor old people off the rates. The noble Viscount wound up by saying that he thought it was a serious matter that the income-tax was no longer available as a war tax. He pointed out that it is being kept at 1s. in the £, instead of 8d. where it used to stand, and that that means that £10,000,000 a year out of the income-tax being used for the ordinary purposes of the year, it cannot, therefore, be put on as a special war tax. That, no doubt, is so, but in the last two years by reducing taxes on coal, on tea, and on sugar, the Government have given up at any rate, £7,000,000. If a big war should unhappily come upon us it would be necessary to put on some taxes, and for myself

I cannot help thinking that it should be well understood that taxes would have to be put on that everybody would feel. It would tend to reduce the war fever if everybody knew that a war was going to be a serious burden. I do not see why the Government should not be able to reply that if they have not got available the £10,000,000 that could be raised from income in time of war they have these £7,000,000, at any rate, which they could raise on taxes on tea, sugar and coal.

*EARL CROMER: My Lords, I did not come to the House with any intention of speaking on this Bill, but I should like to say a few words, more especially in connection with the partial repeal of the sugar duty. The noble Lord who has just spoken took credit on behalf of the Government for a reduction of taxation. I should like to hear that question discussed twelve months or two years hence, when we know what further taxation is going to be imposed. For my own part, speaking as a free trader, I want to say that it would be a very great mistake to suppose that all free traders welcome the reduction of the sugar duty. It is not, of course, that we like the sugar duty. We are very glad to see it reduced; but many of us certainly think the moment for reducing it was singularly inopportune, for the very good reason that the country could not afford it. The noble Viscount has dealt at length with some of the fresh charges which are about to come upon the country. There is, in the first place, the altogether uncertain charge for old-age pensions. In connection with that subject I wish for one moment to diverge and to say that I altogether repudiate the charges made—not, indeed, in this House, but outside—that those of your Lordships who thought it your duty to oppose, in some measure, the old-age pensions scheme of the Government are not animated by any sympathy with the poorer classes or do not think old-age pensions of some description desirable. It is not by any means a pleasant thing to take all the odium and misrepresentation which naturally accompany opposition to a law which presumably is popular. It is certainly, as far as I am concerned, only a very strict sense of duty that has induced me to do so.

Old-age pensions are to cost we do not know what. The noble Viscount said £7,500,000. I think the lowest estimate given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer is £6,500,000; whilst in 1910, unless the Government's scheme undergoes some amendment, there will be an additional £3,500,000 sterling. Then there is for education an altogether unknown sum; the question of unemployment will have to be dealt with; there is a perfectly unknown sum to be expended for increasing the Navy, the amount of which does not altogether depend upon us, but upon what is done by other nations; and then there are the numerous charges arising at every moment. This afternoon we have heard a suggestion made that Imperial taxation should bear the cost of remaking all the roads of the country; and I think I have rarely heard any debate in this House in which there has not been made a proposal which, if accepted, would not add to the burden of taxation.

What have we on the other side—the assets? First, the very problematical reform of Poor Law administration which, let us hope, will produce a saving, but of which we know nothing at present. In the second place there is the Sinking Fund. I quite agree that £10,000,000 a year is an excessive sum and that the amount devoted to the extinction of debt might very well be diminished. The noble Lord opposite did not say by how much he thought it would be safe to diminish it, but I suppose no Chancellor of the Exchequer would dream of reducing it by more than one-half, and, for my part, I think that sum would be excessive. That gives us only £5,000,000; and certainly, when we look at all these fresh charges which are coming upon us, which at the lowest estimate, I should say, will amount in a couple of years to £15,000,000, or more probably to £20,000,000, we are not very much advanced by getting £5,000,000 out of the Sinking Fund. I have been engaged in this sort of financial work all my life, and I have learned that it is very nearly impossible for any one who has to deal with the finances of a country to be popular if he wishes to do his duty. I cannot help thinking that there is a rather strained desire at the Treasury now, not to look at the facts or arithmetic but rather to look at what would be most popular in the country at the moment. I really regret that on every occasion I have to speak on this subject, I pose rather in the attitude of a male Cassandra, but all I can say is, whatever the noble Lords opposite may think, the financial future of the country inspires me with the very gravest misgivings.

*LORD FABER: My Lords, the discussion on the Finance Bill in this House is more or less academic, but at the same time it seems to be an interesting question. There are three subjects as regards the Budget that stand out from among the rest, namely, the Sinking Fund, the pensions scheme, and the reduction of the sugar-tax. As regards the Sinking Fund, there can be no doubt that a Sinking Fund of £15,000,000 is a very fine and good one indeed. In my view it adds great strength to the Budget generally; it adds also prestige to Consols and has been of enormous benefit in adding to the stability of the stock markets. After all, the Chancellor of the Exchequer regards the Sinking Fund as doing for the nation what any prudent man would do in business—helping to put by certain money as reserves. As regards old-age pensions I do not think anyone wanted for the moment to prevent old men who have served the State well, so far as they could, getting pensions. The whole argument really was whether the pension should be contributory or not. I was astonished when we were told that contributory pensions were impossible, and I think that assertion was founded on the dictum of Mr. Chamberlain. Now how can that be so when we only have to look at what is going on in Germany to find that contributory pensions there are working very well and have answered? Is it that in the prosperous state of this country we have become too lazy to try and work out for ourselves the possibilities of this case, or is it that in the avalanche of public business the human machine has given way and is not able to do the necessary work to keep up with legislation, and that as a result we have been too much inclined to say that a thing is not possible, because we have not time to attend to it properly? This Old-Age Pensions Bill, with all its far-reaching effects and complicated clauses, which ought to have been the work of nearly a whole session, has been put off, almost to the end of the session, and then three-quarters of it has been guillotined without discussion in the other House.

Then there is the policy of the reduction of the sugar tax. Of course, that may be considered wholly and solely in the light of the next Budget. We do not expect, we cannot expect the Chancellor of the Exchequer to tell us what his Budget will be, what taxes he proposes to put on, but I think we have a right to ask this—that when a Chancellor of the Exchequer budgets for the coming year he should be able to feel the pulse of the market at the time. He should be able to know whether it is likely that his Budget figures will come out too high or too low. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer took off the sugar duty last April, he knew quite well that there had been a great depression in America, that trade was very bad there, and that trade in Germany also had been bad, whilst he also knew that trade was falling off in this country. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer budgeted on too prosperous lines. As a matter of fact we are face to face with a deficit of no small amount. I do not think we need be surprised if next year from £7,000,000 to £8,000,000, has to be provided for old-age pensions. Then let us take £3,000,000 for the Navy. If the figures continue to go as badly as now as regards next year's Budget, there will be a deficit of several millions. Therefore I think we have a right to demand that when any Chancellor of the Exchequer takes off a big tax like the sugar duty, he should prudently consider whether his Budget figures will come up to the mark. In this case unless the three-quarters of the year that is left goes very much better than the first quarter, there will be a deficit of several millions. How we are to find anything from £15,000,000 to £20,000,000 I know not. If we make a raid on the Sinking Fund, we can only get from £5,000,000 to £6,000,000, and in any case I venture to think that either an attack on the Sinking Fund, or the raising of the income-tax would be very much more harmful than to have left the sugar-tax as it was.

As regards the Sinking Fund we must admit it has been touched by the party to which we belong. Lord Goschen, in 1887 or 1889, dealt with it, and I believe the noble Viscount, Viscount St. Aldwyn, in 1899, but of course, on the latter occasion we were at the beginning of a big war and it was obviously useless to raise very large loans on the one hand and keep up a big Sinking Fund on the other. But directly the war was over we put the Sinking Fund at as high a point as it has ever touched If we attack the Sinking Fund now, it will have the effect of putting Consols still lower. A further point for consideration is that if the Government attack the Sinking Fund, they will knock down gilt-edged stocks, and if the Government has to raise money for the Irish loan and Exchequer Bills, they will be face to face with having to pay very much more for their money owing to the effect of the Sinking Fund reduction on gilt-edged stock. I agree that Consols are low because more money has been used in trade, but that was some few months ago. I agree also that the unconsidered utterances of the Chancellor of the Exchequer outside the House, and the considered utterances of the President of the Board of Trade in the House, have had a very disturbing effect upon men's minds, and I think part of the fall in the Funds must be directly attributed to that. Finance is on far too narrow a basis; that is the truth of the matter, and the basis of taxation will probably have to be altered. When we had the interesting discussion on the Second Reading of the Old-Age Pensions Bill in this House, the noble Lord, Lord Cromer, touched on very interesting subjects, and there were two matters of which I took considerable note. The noble Lord said he thought that if this nation took up the question of tariff reform it might cause friction with important nations on the Continent; that friction in business would result, and that that would be bad for us. If the noble Lord is right in thinking that tariff reform would hurt this country, why does he suppose that our competitors in business on the Continent would take umbrage at our doing something which, as business men, would hurt us? On the other hand, I should think the nations of the Continent would be glad if we were to take a course that is harmful. The noble Earl made another remark that interested me. He said that so far as he could gather, tariff reformers were those who wanted to tax people—who thought that by taxing people they would make the country prosperous.

EARL CROMER: What I said was that that argument was occasionally put forward by tariff reformers. Many tariff reformers no doubt repudiated it.

*LORD FABER: I have never heard tariff reformers say that. What they do say is quite a different thing. They say not that to tax people will make the country prosperous, but that to tax other people will make the country prosperous. That seems to me to be rather a different state of things. There is one other question which is rather interesting but of a more technical character. How did the Government spend the £15,000,000 in reduction of Debt this year, and did they spend that £15,000,000 in the best way? The noble Viscount, Viscount St. Aldwyn, said that they spent about £600,000 on the buildings close to us. Besides that, they spent £4,000,000 on the purchase of Exchequer bonds and Treasury Bills. For those Exchequer bonds and Treasury Bills they gave par. The Exchequer bonds that the Government bought are short-dated bonds due on the average in 1911, and therefore the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave as much in buying them at par as he would ever have to do. The Treasury Bill is also a short-dated loan, repayable at par, and therefore the Government obviously gave as much as they could ever be called upon to give for the Treasury Bill. And then they gave £6,000,000 for a certain amount of War Loan, for which they gave very nearly par—£99 12s. 0d. per cent. But here again the War Loan is short-dated. It is repayable at par in 1910, and therefore the Government again gave as much as they could ever have been called upon to give for the War Loan. Thus, of £14,500,000 they used £10,000,000 in buying short-dated stuff for which they gave the highest possible prices. The other £4,500,000 they invested, quite rightly, in Consols, which they started to buy at the lowest price on record—81½. That was a very good buy. The highest price to which Consols went up was 87½, and the average of their purchase was 85. My contention is that there was a very large scope for a rise in Consols, that the Government had £15,000,000 to deal with, and that it would have been very much better and wiser finance to have put more in Consols, and less in the stuff for which they gave the very highest possible prices. They would have saved money by a transaction of that sort. It would have been wise also to remember that, after all, Consols are the bell-wether of the market. If you support them, the effect on all stock is very marked, whereas to buy short-dated stocks has no effect whatever. The Sinking Fund is of very great importance. It supported the Consols market at a very critical time last year, and so far as I can gather it would have been rather better to have applied more of the Sinking Fund to the purchase of Consols.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): I am sorry to rise at so late an hour, but I need not detain your Lordships at any very great length. I may, perhaps, be allowed to remark in passing, when we are told of the congestion of business towards the close of the session, I have observed that during the last fortnight of it, which is normally and naturally the busiest, quite half of our time has been taken up by debating very interesting Bills in the names of private Members, all of which, as far as I know, might perfectly well have been dealt with at some other time of the year. I propose to say a few words on this debate. It has always been the custom in this House for the Peer who occupied the position of Leader to speak on this subject. Had it not been for that I should have been very glad to leave the matter to my noble friend Lord Wolverhampton, who speaks with far more practical experience than I do. It is always customary also on these occasions not to make anything in the nature of a Budget speech, and those noble Lords who have taken part in the debate have not entered in any degree into the intricacies of the Finance Bill, such as they are, but have rather dealt with large principles. I am relieved, therefore, from minor points in the Finance Bill. Had I been obliged to mention them I should have been glad to draw some attention to the interesting change which has been made in handing over what used to be called the assessed taxes to the collection of the county councils. That, I believe, will be a useful and practical change, and the manner in which it is to be carried out will, as we hope, throw no extra financial burden on those bodies, and will be altogether to their advantage.

On the general question, the main indictment, I think, of the noble Viscount opposite, who, of course, speaks with such great authority, is that we have carried too far the change in the ratio raised by indirect taxation in this country as compared with direct taxation. It is perfectly true that we have done so. That ratio five or six years ago was, I think, in the proportion of upwards of 52, and it is now as low as 46 9. Well, we make no apology for that. We believe that the proportion of the revenue of the country, which is, even now, raised by indirect taxation, is, at any rate, quite as high as it ought to be. It is argued by noble Lords opposite—it was argued again to-night by the noble Viscount opposite—that, by keeping the income-tax at its present rate, you are really making the country poorer in the sense that you are diminishing the opportunities of employment. If that is to be taken as an absolute canon it would involve the proposition, which I am not at all disposed to admit, that all the income derived by the largest payers of income-tax is productively employed. Unfortunately we know that that is by no means the case, and, therefore, so far as that proposition is true at all it has to be taken with very considerable qualifications.

The noble Viscount spoke all through his speech of an income-tax at 1s. But the income-tax at 1s. is paid by only some 20 per cent. of those who pay income-tax. It is, I have no doubt, or at least I hope, paid by all Members of your Lordships' House on that scale, but as a matter of fact, it is only paid by 200,000 persons, of the whole body of income-tax payers. I think it is a familiar fact that about 9½d. is the average rate of income-tax which is paid in this country. The noble Viscount says that the case is very hard on those whose incomes range from £700 to £1,500 a year. There used to be a story of a very rich man who said he supposed that everybody got £700 a year, but we know that there are a large number who pay income-tax on less than that. But, so far as the observation of the noble Viscount goes, it points, possibly, if you will have it so, to a further scale of abatement, but it does not point itself to a reduction of the 1s. income-tax on large incomes. And it is only fair to point out that we have made an important difference as between earned and unearned income, which, we believe, will prove a very great relief to the poorer class of income-tax payers in this country.

On the general question of the revenue and the credit of the country, it must be borne in mind that the national wealth, happily, goes on increasing. What the actual national wealth is, I believe nobody knows. Most of the estimates that are made of the national revenue are, as I believe, pure guess-work. But there are figures for the United Kingdom of the gross income from all classes of profits which are brought under the view of the Inland Revenue and which show a very remarkable and progressive increase. Those figures have gone on rising from £704,700,000 in 1896–7 to £925,184,000 in the year 1905–6. And the other *criteria* of the national wealth cannot be held to be unsatisfactory. The taxation per head of the country is now estimated at £2 17s., which, of course, is some shillings less than it was three or four years ago. Taking the whole position of taxation as shown by statistics, I think it must be admitted that the capacity of the country to bear that taxation is distinctly greater than it was. On the point of the reduction of Debt, I am not competent to deal with the technical point raised as to whether it was wiser for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to reduce the Debt by paying off a considerable proportion of Exchequer bonds and bills, instead of devoting the whole sum available to paying off Consols. But I imagine it was the desire of my right hon. friend to deal to some extent with the floating debt; at any rate I fancy it is a point upon which financial authorities might well differ. The noble Viscount somewhat depreciated the work of the present Administration in the reduction of Debt. Still, the fact remains—of course I know it is subject to many examples and qualifications—that during the ten years in which the late Governments were in office they—without any mention of the war loans, which were little short of £160,000,000—paid off the National Debt at the rate of £2,200,000 a year, while since we have been in office we have paid off at the rate of £13,300,000 a year. That is subject to a number of qualifications, no doubt. The noble Viscount mentioned the £9,000,000 which he devoted to current expenditure in the form of necessary works. That was, no doubt, a proper allocation to make, but we think that, when large sums like that come to be spent all at once, they are not always likely to be very wisely or economically spent. We have to bear in mind also the line we have taken up of paying our way as we go in the matter of naval and military works. One reason which has undoubtedly actuated us in so doing is that we believe that it leads to very real and substantial economy. On the other hand we are very much impressed by the remarkably rapid obsolescence of many of these so-called permanent works. It is a deplorable thing to have to go on paying off a loan for a so-called work which is admitted by everyone to be absolutely useless, a position in which we find ourselves in regard to some of the works authorised and undertaken by our predecessors.

As to the question of the credit of the country, I do not think it is quite reasonable to take the price of Consols as the single criterion of the state of the national credit. Taken alone, I do not think it can be said to be a criterion. You are bound at the same time to look at the prices of kindred stocks in other parts of the world and to the state of credit of other nations. My noble friend behind me (Lord St. Davids) drew attention to what I believe is by far the most active cause in the continued depreciation of Consols—I mean the opening of Colonial stocks to trustees. I do not agree with him, I need hardly say, in the position I hold, that we should withdraw from the position, but I very much doubt whether at the time that was done, in a rather light-hearted way, it was realised what very serious effects it would have on the money market. Nowadays the proportion of trust funds invested in Consols is extraordinarily small. In regard to marriage settlements, it is almost invariably the rule to invest in other stocks. That, of course, is due to the great variety of other stocks which can be relied upon to produce a somewhat larger interest. Then we are told that we have driven Consols down still further by our old-age pensions scheme. On 6th May Consols stood at 85½; to-day they are just 87. It would be unreasonable, I think, either on one side or the other, to ascribe fluctuations of that kind to any fear of our great financial measures.

Then as to the various reductions of taxes. We have been criticised for having taken off the coal duty. Coal is one of the subjects which the noble Viscount would have continued to tax. I do not enter into the controversy as to whether the Party of the noble Viscount opposite had pledged themselves to take off the coal duty at the first opportunity, although there have been statements to that effect which have not been contradicted. But I think it cannot be doubted—and I am quite sure that my noble friend Lord Faber, who knows very well the trade of the north-east ports, will agree that the coal tax was a very serious hindrance to that trade. It is quite true it did not affect the Welsh high-class coal in the same way, because those coal-owners have somewhat of what is called a "seller's monopoly," and therefore I can quite believe that in that case, at any rate, a part of the tax was paid by the foreigner. But it was certainly not paid by the foreigner so far as the Yorkshire and Midland coal was concerned, and its repeal was recognised there as a great relief, not merely to the coal trade, but to the kindred trades. Then as regards tea and sugar, especially the latter. It is true we have given up £3,400,000 by the reduction of the sugar tax. My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer believes that by the method he has employed in rather more than halving the tax he has succeeded in reaching the consumer as a rule. Those who buy infinitesimal quantities of sugar can hardly be reached by any means, but so far as the general consumer is concerned, my right hon. friend believes that he has reached him.

Then there is the question of the effect on trade. The noble Viscount said the confectionery and mineral water trades might have benefited. But those are two enormous trades; they employ a vast amount of labour, and surely it was worth while, if we could, to relieve them. I suppose that what the noble Viscount would have done is that, instead of taking off the sugar tax, he would have taken something off the income-tax, so far as it affects those who pay 1s., on the ground that that would have added to his possible war chest. I confess I was impressed by the argument of my noble friend Lord St. Davids when he said that when you come to the question of raising an indefinite number of millions, it is apparently as easy to reimpose your indirect taxation as it is to reimpose your direct taxation.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: I did not find it so at all in the South African war.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Not to produce the same amount. I agree that you cannot be sure of imposing the same amount, but assuming that the noble Viscount had only taken off the equivalent in income-tax, I confess I do not see that the one would be more difficult than the other. I am, of course, assuming that a large sum has to be raised. I am not, of course, on the point of the advantage of the one course or the other, but it does not seem to be reasonable to assume that in one case the money is always there at command, and that in the other it is absolutely and irretrievably gone.

I do not wish to enter at this hour into the old-age pensions controversy so far as it is a controversy. Still less do I desire to allude to the two points connected with tariff reform to which the noble Lord referred in allusion to what was said the other night by Lord Cromer. On this question of old-age pensions anything that is said must necessarily be absolutely uninteresting. It is impossible for any member of the Government to attempt to anticipate the Budget of next year. I was very glad to hear the noble Viscount say that he did not consider that course contrary to sound canons of finance. But I think it was a mistake to suppose that that is the only source from which, if necessary, some further increase of the national income could be derived. When noble Lords opposite, quite apart from that, talk of the continually increasing burden of old-age pensions, it is important to know what they mean. So far as the burden increases by the natural growth of the population, we hope it will be more than met by its automatic growth of revenue. But if noble Lords opposite mean the lowering of the age or the increasing of the amount, that is another matter., and a matter in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day will have to face the public, and will have to explain what his means permit of his doing. I do not propose to go into the question of the cost of the defensive services, because, although, of course, it is a subject which in a general view of national finance could not possibly be passed over, yet it is one which does not arise in immediate connection with this Bill. But with regard to what the noble Viscount said about the Construction Vote having fallen, the Vote must, of course, depend upon the needs of the year. There could be no more absolutely foolish, or uneconomical policy than to build more warships than you want at the moment. The modern warship fades almost like a flower after you have plucked it. From the moment it is sent on its trial trip it begins to verge upon becoming obsolete, and, therefore, to build more ships of a particular type than you require at the moment is one of the worst possible economies, because in relation to the programme of other nations it places you at this disadvantage—that although your paper strength may be equal or superior to that of another Power in the proportion you consider sufficient, yet their ships may be just a little newer and a little better than yours. Therefore, the Construction Vote ought to be most carefully watched with the object of always being ahead, not only in numbers, but also in novelty of type. I do not think I have anything to add further. I confess some of the statements which have been made outside this House as to the damage that we have done to national credit have been very unfair and most grossly exaggerated. We believe that we shall be able to go on paying our way so far as the defensive services are concerned, and we do believe that we shall be able, without any dramatic, or, still more, any melodramatic increase of taxation, to carry through this great scheme of benefit for the aged, of which we are very proud indeed to be the authors.

On Question, Bill read 2^a; Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order); further Amendments made. Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow, and to be printed as amended. [No 196.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES BILL.

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow.

LEGISLATION BY REFERENCE.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, a few days ago I made a Motion with regard to the practice which is known as legislation by reference, and the Lord Chancellor was good enough to say he agreed with the Motion in a general way, and that he would submit the matter to the Cabinet so that they could consider what is the proper way to deal with this practice. I wish to put the Question standing in my name on the Paper:—" To ask the Lord Chancellor with reference to the Motion: 'That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire "whether means cannot be devised, either in the way of a detailed Memorandum or otherwise, for conveying to the House in plain language the effect of proposed legislation when reference is made in Government Bills to Acts and sections of Acts of Parliament without explanation," whether His Majesty's Government have taken the matter into consideration.' "

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I was under the impression that I had already stated our decision. We propose to appoint a Joint Committee of the two Houses to report on the drafting of Bills, and whether any improvement should be adopted in relation thereto.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I will ask leave to say one or two words on this. This Bill was referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses, and we then agreed to certain Amendments in order that the Bill should lay down exactly what we think the law should be. These Amendments have been already accepted by your Lordships, but when the Bill was before the Committee a noble Lord, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, suggested with reference to certain points that arise that we should also have a schedule of the Amendments that we propose, Amendments merely relating to the small matter of tidying up or making more convenient the operation of the law. I could not say that there is absolutely no change in the law, but there is no change in any important particular, and the Committee unanimously agreed to recommend certain Amendments strictly of the character I have referred to. These are the Amendments which I propose to introduce at this stage in this House, as it was thought by the Committee that this was the most convenient way of dealing with the matter. If this matter goes to the House of Commons, as I hope it will do, they will be faced with the choice either of having the Bill consolidated with all its imperfections or of having it tidied up so to speak. I move that we take these Amendments as a whole.

Moved, "That the Amendments be taken as a whole."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Moved, "That the Amendments be agreed to."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow, and to be printed, as amended.

IRISH LAND ADMINISTRATION.

LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, I wish to ask His Majesty's Government the Question standing in my name. It is of a very simple nature, and I need not trouble your Lordships with any explanation. My Question is: How much has been received (up to the present or any recent date), in respect of the sinking fund from tenants' annuities paid under the Irish Land Act, 1903, and how much thereof has been applied or invested in making further advances under the Act.

LORD DENMAN: The Answer to the first part of the Question as to the accumulated amount received in respect of the sinking fund from tenants' annuities paid under the Irish Land Act, 1903, from 10th June, 1903, to 30th June, 1908, is £190,955, and of this £182,100 has been applied in making further advances under the Act. I think that gives the noble Lord the information which he desires.

THE IMPRISONED SUFFRAGISTS.

*EARL RUSSELL: I wish to put the first Question standing in my name on your Lordships' Paper, viz.: Whether the women agitating for the vote who were arrested on 30th June were prosecuted before Mr. Francis under Section 2 of the Prevention of Crimes Amendment Act, 1885, whether the maximum penalty on conviction under that Act is a fine of £5 or imprisonment for two months in default; whether, in fact, a certain number of those prosecuted were not convicted under such Act, but were ordered to find sureties to be of good behaviour, and were in default imprisoned for three months, what legal authority exists for requiring sureties of good behaviour of these defendants, and for dealing with them in the manner indicated.

I regret that this Question should appear on the Paper on a day when there is so much work to do, but I may remind your Lordships that I postponed it last week in deference to the request of His Majesty's Government. There is a rather peculiar circumstance with regard to the recent sentences in connection with the women who were arrested on the 30th of June. The prosecution took place under Section 2 of the Prevention of Crimes Amendment Act, 1885, which has the effect of making a new crime of cases of resisting or wilfully obstructing any police officer in the execution of his duty. It provides that under that section a person convicted shall not be liable to a greater penalty than £5 or in default of payment imprisonment for not more than two months. The effect of that is that when a person is convicted under that section, if it is considered to be the worst possible case that could arise under that section, then the maximum penalty that can be inflicted is a fine of £5, and if the person who has the option of paying that does not do so the maximum sentence that can be imposed is two months imprisonment. Instead of passing that sentence, however, the magistrate proceeded to offer to bind over these offenders to be of good behaviour. It is difficult to see how that arises. There is the common law power which, I think, would not apply, and therefore this must have come under Section 1 of the Probation of Offenders Act, passed last year. If that is the Act under which the magistrate acted you have the curious result that under a section of an Act which says that where the nature of an offence is trivial, and it is not considered expedient to inflict other than a nominal punishment, the magistrate gives three months imprisonment to people who would otherwise have only been fined £5 or in default would have been imprisoned for two months. It may be legal to do that, I dare say it is legal, but I think your Lordships will be of opinion that it is rather straining the provisions of an Act of Parliament which professes to hold out leniency. It may be said that these persons might have entered into the surety to be of good behaviour, but I do not think that that is a fair thing to say, for, though mistaken these ladies may be, they hold a certain view and they hold it as definitely as people connected with the Salvation Army hold their views, and they naturally refuse to be bound over not to do again what they think they have a right to do and ought to do. That they refuse is shown by the fact that all these ladies are, I imagine, still serving their sentences of three months imprisonment in the second division and the second division does not differ appreciably from the third division for it involves the wearing of prison clothes, the eating of prison diet, and solitary confinement each day for twenty-two and a half hours. We can hardly consider it reasonable that these ladies should be given an addition to their punishment under an Act which professes to ameliorate the punishment which can be given to them. They might have been charged with being disorderly, but they were not, and Parliament has limited the penalty under this particular section to £5. I should like to ask if it is under the Probation of Offenders Act that they have been imprisoned.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: The Question of the noble Lord divides itself into two parts. On the question of fact he is entirely accurate. It is only in the last three lines of the Question that there comes a legal question, and with regard to that I am somewhat unwilling to enter the lists against the noble Lord. I do not think the Probation of Offenders Act had anything to do with the decision of the magistrates, and therefore the argument of the noble Earl, so far as it was founded on that Act, falls to the ground. The noble Lord asked what legal authority there is under Section 2 of the Prevention of Crimes Amendment Act, 1885. These cases come under Section 12 of the Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871, under which any person who is convicted of an assault on any constable in the execution of his duty is guilty of an offence for which he shall be liable to a fine of £20, or in default to a term of imprisonment with or without hard labour. I apprehend that it was under this section the magistrates acted, and I am bound to say that I think the steps they took met with the approbation of the people of the country.

EARL RUSSELL: I am not sure how much I comprehend that answer. Now I want to ask the second Question in my name, viz.: Whether the women imprisoned in connection with the recent disturbances on 30th June, are not political offenders within the rule laid down in *Re* Castioni, and why their treatment in prison is more severe than that usually awarded to political offenders; and further, whether His Majesty's Government seriously contends that there is any legal obstacle to the exercise of the Royal prerogative of mercy in these cases. I do not want to trouble your Lordships at any length, but I must remind you of the well-known case of Castioni, who shot and killed a person in a political rising and the question arose whether he was guilty of a political crime. I am well aware that the question of its being a political crime could only arise on the question of extradition, and that if he had shot and killed a man and been captured in his own canton he would have been dealt with in the ordinary course. The worst offenders among the ladies who have been arrested have been guilty of nothing worse than making speeches, and whatever their trifling acts may have been they were admittedly in furtherance of a political object. They are treated as second division prisoners, and this differs only from an ordinary sentence of hard labour in the fact that there is possibly not so much labour to do, better prison diet is provided, and possibly also they are better off in the privileges with regard to receiving visits; but they have to wear prison clothes, they are not allowed books or writing materials, and they have to spend twenty-two and a half hours out of twenty-four in their cells. This question has been pretty often raised in the other House, and I have watched the answers of the Home Secretary, but I have not been able to detect whether Mr. Gladstone says that the Royal prerogative of mercy does not exist in this case. On some occasions I gather that Mr. Gladstone said that these were not cases where he had the power to exercise the Royal prerogative of mercy. I should like to ask whether the Home Secretary cannot, and in some cases has not, exercised the Royal prerogative, and in some instances has interfered in cases in regard to contempt of Court. May I remind the House of the very different attitude adopted towards these ladies from the attitude which was adopted in regard to the squatters who have settled on the Island of Vatersay and for whom great sympathy was expressed, although they were treated as first-class misdemeanants.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: In this case also the Question of the noble Lord devises itself into two parts. As to how far these ladies come within the rule laid down in *Re* Castioni the noble Lord, versed in the best arts of an advocate, forgot to say that this relates only to cases under Section 3 of the Act of 1870, which relates to penalties in respect of offences committed abroad.

EARL RUSSELL: I said so.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: The women referred to in the Question have been dealt with for offences under the ordinary law, for failing to keep the peace, and they have been dealt with in the same manner as others who have similarly offended. In regard to the Royal prerogative, His Majesty's Government does not contend that there is an absolute legal obstacle to the exercise of the Royal prerogative of mercy, but where Parliament has expressly given to the magistrates discretion in deciding in which class prisoners should be placed, it would, in the opinion of the Government, be unconstitutional to override their decision. Even if it were possible to exercise the prerogative in one case it could not be done in order to place a whole class of prisoners in a privileged position. There is an obvious difference between dealing with one person in ill-health and in exercising the Royal prerogative in the case of a class. I believe in this case, as in the other which the noble Lord has raised, the magistrates have interpreted the wishes of the people, and that they are entirely satisfied with the decision given by the magistrates.

NAVAL MARRIAGES BILL.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. The Bill will remove a difficulty which exists in regard to sailors serving on His Majesty's ships. Very often they are away on commission for three or four years, and when they come back they want sometimes to get married and do not want to wait for three or four weeks. The object of this Bill is to enable the banns to be set up on board ship at the same time that the young lady is having them published in this country.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

SECONDARY EDUCATION (WALES).

*LORD GLANTAWE: I beg to ask His Majesty's Government whether they will furnish this House with a Return showing the number of subscribers, and the amount of money subscribed voluntarily by the Welsh people towards secondary education as the result of the passing of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889.

The object of my Question is to show to your Lordships' House to what extent the Welsh nation have appreciated the powers of self-government in secondary education which have been entrusted to them by various Governments.

In 1889 the Government of the day passed the Welsh Intermediate Education Act. This was followed in 1896 by a scheme based on that Act which provided for the establishment of a Central Welsh Board for Intermediate Education. The Conservative Government of that period—in fact the Conservatives were responsible for all these steps—were so much satisfied with the work of the Central Welsh Board that by the Board of Education Act, 1899, the Central Welsh Board is made a statutory body for the examination and inspection of the intermediate schools in Wales.

I feel certain that the Return which I have asked His Majesty's Government to furnish your Lordships' House will, if granted, show that Wales has responded by voluntary contributions to the national recognition granted to her by the passing of the Welsh Intermediate Act, 1889, to an extent that cannot be equalled by any of the other three countries. The keen and general interest taken by the Welsh people in education can be proved by the following facts—

(1) The local taxation account money was devoted entirely by Welsh bodies to education. This was not done by any of the other three countries until they were obliged to do so by the Education Act, 1902.

(2) The amount of money raised per head for educational purposes in Wales is more than England and Ireland together or Ireland and Scotland together.

(3) The education rate per £ in Wales is more than that of England and Ireland together, or Scotland and Ireland together.

(4) The number of pupils per 1,000 population in Wales is nearly double that of England, Scotland or Ireland.

(5) The percentage of pupils who remain in the secondary schools of Wales for the third and fourth year courses is much greater than in the secondary schools of any other of the three countries.

(6) Secondary education has advanced during the last few years to such an extent in Wales that experts in education are of opinion that it will not be necessary after next year to provide

for education lower than that of University grade in the constituent colleges of the Welsh University.

(7) More than 80 per cent. of the pupils attending Welsh secondary schools received their primary education in public elementary schools.

(8) The students who are selected to undergo normal training in the Welsh University colleges have received very much better training than those selected by English colleges, and this in spite of the statement in the last report of the Board of Education which says that the percentage of failures in the preliminary certificate examination in Wales is double that in England. In fairness to Wales the Report should contain a qualifying statement to the effect that Welsh students take the matriculation examination and the higher examinations of the Central Welsh Board instead of the preliminary certificate examination, and degree courses instead of the final certificate examination.

Perhaps I should add that with all this Wales has received very little encouragement from the Exchequer compared with what has been given to Scotland and Ireland.

(1) We have not received hardly one-tenth of the University building grants that have or are to be given either to Scotland or Ireland.

(2) Compared with either Scotland or Ireland the grants to the Welsh University colleges should be double or three times what they are at present.

(3) Museums, libraries, portrait galleries, etc., have been built and maintained by the Government in Scotland and Ireland. So far no such blessings have been conferred on the Principality.

Though I am sorry to have taken up so much time in submitting this statement to your Lordships' House, yet I felt compelled to do so in order to justify the action of the Welsh nation in opposing most strenuously the attempt that is being made by the Board of Education to cripple the powers, and undermine the influence of the Central Welsh Board. This they have no right to do. It is not constitutional, for the Central Welsh Board has been given as much control over secondary education in Wales as was given by the same Act of Parliament to the Board of Education over elementary and secondary education in England.

The Welsh people are looking forward to the day—in fact the Welsh Members in Parliament are now considering a scheme—when it may please His Majesty's Government to establish a national council which shall have control over primary, secondary, and University education in the Principality, and in the meantime it is our sincere hope that the Government of the day, by administrative action, will do all in its power to place Welsh affairs in the best possible position to attain that object. No other nation in the world has sacrificed more for education, and therefore no other nation deserves greater freedom to establish a national system of education.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I rise to a point of order. I would ask the Lord Chancellor whether the Question before the House is not that a certain Return be granted. I do not know what document the noble Lord is reading, but we cannot make it out.

*LORD GLANTAWE: I beg your Lordships' pardon for taking up so much of your time, but this is a very important matter. It is so important that contrary to my usual custom I have written out my speech, and have supplemented my Question by the remarks I have just made.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing the number of subscribers, and the amount of money subscribed voluntarily by the Welsh people towards Secondary Education as the result of the passing of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889.—(*The Lord Glantawe.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP: I quite agree with the noble Lord, and the Question he has asked refers to a very large sum of money. It is an important question, and is regarded as especially important by the people of Wales. I am sorry the Government cannot grant the noble Lord the Return he asks for, but the very generosity of the people of Wales is the reason which makes it so difficult to ascertain the amount of money they have given for this object. The Charity Commissioners have asked that a certain minimum sum, generally including a site, shall be given, and when the Charity Commissioners have been satisfied that the minimum sum has been granted, they have done their part. In most cases, however, the people of Wales have given a great deal more than the minimum sum asked for, but the figures at the disposal of the Charity Commissioners and of the Government only give the minimum sum asked for. We consider it would be quite unfair to the people of Wales for us to give a Return of the minimum sum asked for; there are no figures in the possession of the Government or of the Board of Education except these inadequate sums, which do not represent the generosity of the people of Wales, and I hope the noble Lord will, therefore, withdraw his motion for a Return. I would venture to suggest that if the noble Lord wishes to obtain the figures he should apply for information to the various school governing bodies, which have been concerned in this matter.

LORD GLANTAWE: I withdraw my Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

STRENGTH OF REGULAR AND TERRITORIAL ARMIES.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, my noble friend Viscount Midleton is unable to be here this evening, but I observe that the representative of the War Office is also absent. From that I gather that he would be willing that the address which Viscount Midleton asks for shall be presented. On behalf of the noble Viscount I beg to move.

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for a Return showing the strength of the Regular Army, Special Reserve, and Territorial Army on 1st October, 1908:—Strength of the Regular Army on the Home Establishment on 1st October, 1905, and 1st October, 1908: Cavalry; Artillery (Horse and Field Garrison); Foot Guards; Infantry of the Line; other arms; total. Number of recruits attested for Regular Army, 1st October, 1907, to 1st October, 1908: Militia and Special Reserve: Strength of Militia, 1st October, 1905: Infantry; Artillery. Strength of Special Reserve, 1st October, 1908: Infantry; Artillery. Number of recruits, Militia: (*a*) Attested for Militia; (*b*) Transferred to Regular Army: 1st October, 1903, to 1st October, 1904; 1st October, 1904, to 1st October, 1905; 1st October, 1905, to 1st October, 1906; 1st October, 1906, to 1st October, 1907. Number of recruits for Special Reserves:—(*a*) Attested for Militia or Special Reserve; (*b*) Transferred to Regular Army: 1st October, 1907, to 1st October, 1908. Number of Militiamen under twenty, 1st October, 1905. Number of Special Reservists under twenty, 1st October, 1908. Volunteers:—Number of Volunteers, 1st October, 1905: (*a*) Infantry; (*b*) Artillery. Number of Territorial Army, 1st October, 1908: (*a*) Infantry; (*b*) Artillery. Volunteer recruits, 1st October, 1904, to 1st October, 1905. Recruits for Territorial Army or Volunteers, 1st October, 1907, to 1st October, 1908.—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne for Viscount Midleton.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP: The Under-Secretary for War has directed me to say that he would be very glad to agree to the presentation of the address.

Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order).

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said he had to move several Amendments which the Government had promised to bring up on the Report stage. The first Amendment he had to submit to their Lordships was one which added to the definition of evidence which must be given in reference to the age of the applicant for a pension. The Amendment did not alter the clause, but added the words "by census returns or other documents or in such other manner as may seem well to the pension authorities." The whole clause would then read: "The statutory conditions for the receipt of an old-age pension by any person are: (1) The person must have attained the age of seventy as verified when practicable by a certificate of birth or baptism or in the absence of such documents by census returns or other documents or in such other manner as may seem sufficient to the pension authorities."

*Viscount St. ALDWYN said he did not think it was quite clear as the words stood as amended by the noble Lord that such evidence would have, if possible, to be obtained. They ought to have more binding words in the clause, and he would move that the words should be inserted "where no such certificates or documents are obtainable."

Viscount WOLVERHAMPTON said he thought the words were unnecessary. They had already the words "where no such documents or certificates are obtainable."

*Viscount St. ALDWYN said the whole thing would be made clear by such words as he had suggested.

Viscount WOLVERHAMPTON said if the noble Lord wished to have the words in he would accept them.

Amendment moved to the proposed Amendment—

"To add the words 'where no such certificates or documents are obtainable.'"—(*Viscount St. Aldwyn.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 21, after the word 'and' to insert the words 'if the term of imprisonment to which he is sentenced exceeds one month he shall be disqualified.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN said he believed the noble Viscount had put down certain words, but he understood from Lord Saltoun that he had agreed with the Government in an Amendment which was different in words but really the same in substance. It would run as follows: "In page 3, line 21, after the word 'and' to insert the words 'If his term of imprisonment is not less than one month he shall be disqualified.' The result of that was that he could not receive a pension while he was imprisoned. When he left prison he would be disqualified for a further period of ten years if his term of imprisonment had been for one month.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: The Paper handed in to me runs as follows: "In Clause 3, page 3, line 21, after the word 'and' to insert the words 'if the term of imprisonment to which he is sentenced exceeds one month he shall be disqualified.'"

Viscount WOLVERHAMPTON said that was the agreement come to.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*Viscount St. ALDWYN said that he had raised the point to which the next Amendment referred in Committee on the Bill, and he understood that Lord Wolverhampton would propose some Amendment to meet, in some measure, the point he placed before him. He now begged to move the Amendment he had placed on the Paper, because he imagined from what fell from the noble Viscount in Committee, it would commend itself to the Government. It was to insert after the word "him" in Clause 4, the words "as to produce the largest income that can be reasonably obtained from it."

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 4, after the word 'him, to insert the words 'as to produce the largest income that can be reasonably obtained from it."'—(*Viscount St. Aldwyn.*)

Lord FITZMAURICE said that this question was discussed at some length on the previous day, but the Amendment of the noble Viscount was, he thought, very much reduced in importance, if he might say so, by the suggestion he had now made. They had to point out that any modification of this clause presumably would come within the scope of the rule as to the privileges of the House of Commons, and that even if they agreed to accept it in any way they could only accept it subject to a warning on that subject; but having repeated that, he saw no objection to the words which the noble Viscount had proposed.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON moved an Amendment, which he thought would meet the approval of the noble Lord opposite.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 20, to leave out from the word 'them' to the end of line 26, and to insert the words 'if any person is aggrieved by the refusal or neglect of the local pension committee to consider a claim for a pension or to determine on any question referred to them, that person may apply in the prescribed manner to the central pension authority, and that authority may, if they consider that the local pension committee have refused or neglected to consider and determine the claim or question within a reasonable time, themselves consider and determine the claim or question in the same manner as on an appeal from the decision of the local pension committee.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

LORD ATKINSON indicated that he was satisfied with the Amendment of the noble Viscount.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD ATKINSON said he wished to move a clause in connection with what occurred on the previous night. He moved then that any member of the committee should have the power of appeal, and he did not withdraw the Amendment, but, on the contrary, he pressed it, and he understood it was agreed to. He now understood, however, that there was some mistake, and the easiest way of correcting that mistake was to move a new clause substantially the same as the Amendment he moved on the previous day. He dared say the fault was his. It enabled any member of the committee to appeal from the decision of the committee to the central authority. He thought that perhaps an objection might be made to that, that if a member did not choose to attend the committee he should not be allowed to appeal after the committee had arrived at a certain decision of which he might disapprove, and therefore he proposed to move a new clause in a more restricted form, as follows: "Section 7, Clause (*d*), the expression 'party aggrieved' shall include a member of the said committee who has taken part in the consideration of the report, and has dissented from the decision." The noble Viscount would see that that limited it very much and only conferred the privilege of appeal on a person who had come to the committee and endeavoured to do his duty in that respect.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said he understood from his advisers that there was a mistake on the previous night in the Amendment and that the Amendment now moved was substantially agreed to. Therefore, the Government would now assent to the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 7, to add a further sub-clause (*d*) The expression "party aggrieved" shall include a member of the said committee who has taken part in the consideration of the report and has dissented from the decision.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD FITZMAURICE moved, in Clause 8, to leave out the words "means and." It was merely a drafting Amendment in consequence of the Amendment carried on the previous day with reference to the Metropolitan boroughs.

Amendment moved—

"In page 8, line 37, to omit the words 'means and.'"—(*Lord Fitzmaurice.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 38, after the word 'London,' to insert the words 'and the expression "council of a borough" includes the council of a metropolitan borough, and in respect to the City of London the mayor, aldermen, and commoners of the City of London in common council assembled.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON moved to insert a new subsection in Clause 8, which he said, was considered to be a desirable addition.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 18, to insert the words, 'Any reference in this Act to the pension authority shall be construed as a reference to the pension officer, the local pension committee and the central pension authority, or to any one of them, as the case requires."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said that Clause 9 as it originally passed the House contained these words: "If for the purpose of obtaining or continuing an old-age pension under this Act, either for himself or for any other person, or for the purpose of obtaining or continuing an old-age pension under this Act for himself or for any other person at a higher rate than that appropriated to the case, any person knowingly makes any false statement or false representation, or if it appears." Whom it was to appear to was not stated, and it evidently would create a great deal of doubt, and what he proposed was to strike out the words "it appears that," so that it would read: "Any person knowingly makes any false statement or false representation, or if any person has directly or indirectly deprived himself of any income or property in order to qualify himself for the receipt of an old-age pension, or for the receipt of an old-age pension at a higher rate than that to which he would otherwise be entitled under this Act, he shall be liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, with hard labour." It was only a drafting Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, lines 24 and 25, to leave out the words 'it appears that.'"—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said they proposed to make the Third Reading of the Old-Age Pensions Bill on the next day.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN asked if they could not take it now.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON said he would be very glad to do so, but he was given to understand that it would be against the rules of the House. He would like, if their Lordships would allow him, to explain that this had been a very rapid progress, but the reason, he was sure their Lordships would appreciate, was the time of the session, and the absolute necessity if possible in order that Parliament might be adjourned on Saturday, that these Amendments, after the Bill had been read a third time to-morrow morning, which he hoped could be done, should go to the House of Commons at once. Otherwise they would run the risk of being kept there over Sunday. Would he be in order if he moved that the Bill should have precedence to-morrow over other business?

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said they must give notice to suspend the Standing Orders, and it could then have precedence to-morrow, but he did not think they could move now that the Bill should have precedence without giving notice, as it was a matter which involved the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow, and to be printed as amended. (No. 197.)

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS DUTIES) BILL.

SEED POTATOES AND SEED OATS SUPPLY (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

LUNACY BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: This Bill is produced with the utmost brevity my Lords, because all the clauses have already received the sanction of this House in former Bills. The real purpose of the Bill is to extend the administrative powers under the Lunacy Act, 1890, with regard to the estates of lunatics and other matters. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

NAVAL LANDS (VOLUNTEERS) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: This Bill is of a very simple character. It is designed to apply to Naval Volunteers, who were created in 1903, the same benefits as accrue to the land Volunteers or the Territorial Army, as I think they are now called, with regard to the hiring of land and the acquisition of land by these bodies. It is verv useful for the erection of buildings and drill halls, and the Naval Volunteers can then borrow money at a lower rate of interest than they would otherwise be able to do. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Bill Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

WHALE FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Bill read 3ª (according to order).—(*Lord Denman.*)

LORD DENMAN: I beg to move to leave out subsection (1), in Clause 5, page 4. Off the coasts of Ireland, the whale has a different rank or class to what it has off Scotland. Off the coast of Ireland it is a Royal fish, but off Scotland it is only an ordinary fish.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, to leave out subsection (1) of Clause 5."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

COSTS IN CRIMINAL CASES BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

POLLING DISTRICTS AND REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order).

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 9, after the word 'of,' to insert the word 'Parliamentary.'"—(*Lord Denman.*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 12, to leave out the words 'for Ireland.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM BILL

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

GRAND JURY (IRELAND) ACT, 1836, AMENDMENT BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

REGISTRATION BILL. [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered (on Motion), and agreed to.

House adjourned at half-past
Ten o'clock, till To-morrow,
a quarter past Four o'clock,

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 29th July, 1908.

The House met at a Quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Criccieth Water and Improvement Bill; Padiham Urban District Council Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Central Ireland Electric Power Bill; Gosport Gas Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Lords Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to.

Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—Lords Amendments to Commons Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

River Wandle Protection Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Thames River Steamboat Service Act (1904) Amendment Bill [Lords].—Ordered That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered To-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill; Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill; Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill, without Amendment.

Coroners (Ireland) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Dover Graving Docks Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to:—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; Great Northern, Piccadilly; and Brompton Railway Bill [Lords], Keighley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill [Lords]; Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [Lords]; Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Amendment to:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer the Municipal Franchise upon Mercantile Corporations and Companies." [Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to regulate the turning out upon Commons of Entire Animals." [Commons Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to enable Rules to be made regulating the procedure with respect to Provisional Orders made by the Board of

Trade and the Local Government Board under certain Acts of Parliament, and for other matters incidental thereto." [Provisional Orders Procedure Bill [Lords].

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirriemuir, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING, TOWN PLANNING, ETC. BILL.

Petition from Lambeth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Bristol; Crediton; Ebbw Vale; Hammersmith; and Mile End Road (two); to lie upon the Table.

Petitions against: From Marshfield; and Steeple Ashton and other places; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Two Petitions from Thorne, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRAMWAY ORDERS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under the Tramways Act, 1870, during the Session of 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAMWAYS AND LIGHT RAILWAYS (STREET AND ROAD).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th April; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 268.]

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF DURHAM).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Durham altering certain Polling Districts in the Chester-le-Street Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Interim Report under the Small Holdings and Allotments Acts to the 30th June, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1898.

Copy presented, of Return showing the Total Payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account for the financial year 1907–8 [by Command] to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE).

Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance No. 28 (Edinburgh, No. 10) (Regulations for Higher Degress in Arts and Science) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 269.]

ADMIRALTY CASUALTIES, ETC.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th May; *Mr. Vincent Kennedy*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 270.]

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Lancaster).—Further Return relative thereto (ordered 8th August, 1898; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 271.]

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Lancaster) and Inquiry into Charities (County Borough of Preston) and Inquiry into Charities (County Borough of Barrow-in-Furness). — Further Returns and Return relative thereto [ordered 8th August, 1898, 26th July, 1905, and 25th March, 1903; *Mr. Grant Lawson* and *Mr. Griffith Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 272.]

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Wilts).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 9th August, 1901; *Mr. Griffith Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 273.]

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Berks).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 28th March, 1905; *Mr. Griffith Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 274.]

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Copy ordered, "of Treasury Minute, dated the 27th day of July, 1908, stating the circumstances under which certain Civil Servants have been retained in the service after they have attained the age of Sixty-five, and of the Return therein referred to."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).

Address for "Return from every County Court in England and Wales of the total number of Plaints, etc., entered in each County Court from the 1st day of January to the 31st day of December, 1907, both days inclusive, distinguishing those not exceeding £20, those above £20 and not exceeding £50, those above £50 and not exceeding £100, and those by agreement over £100.

"And of the Sittings of the County Courts in England and Wales holden before the Judges of such Courts in the year 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 258, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

EDUCATIONAL EXPENDITURE (COLONIES).

Address for "Return showing, for each of the last five years for which the figures are complete and available, the Expenditure of the Governments of the Dominion of Canada and its Provinces respectively, of the Commonwealth of Australia and of its constituent States repectively, of the Cape Colony and of Natal, and of New Zealand, on Education, elementary, technical, secondary, and university, showing separately any expenditure of public money on scholarships and on post-graduate or research work, specially in connection with science and agriculture, as well as with other subjects and industries; in the case of consolidation of schools, the money spent out of public funds, and, where possible, out of private funds, to be indicated, whether in the construction, equipment, or maintenance of central schools, or in the conveyance of children, or in other ways, and the numbers of children in average attendance, boys and girls respectively, in such schools to be stated."—(*Mr. Verney.*)

EAST INDIA (PROSECUTIONS FOR SPEECHES, ETC.).

Address for "Return of Prosecutions for Seditious Speeches and Writings which have been instituted in India since the 1st day of January, 1907, showing the names and descriptions of the persons charged, the courts which tried them, the precise character of the charge, and the decision in each case."—(*Sir Henry Cotton.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Treatment of the Crew of the "Strathyre."

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the attempted escape from the British steamer "Strathyre" at the port of New York of twenty-five Chinese sailors and firemen; whether he is aware that two of these Chinamen were drowned as a consequence of their attempt to escape; whether he will cause a public inquiry to be held to ascertain if the Chinamen in question had been subjected to ill-usage; whether he has any official reports showing that twenty-three of these Chinamen are being deported to Liverpool on the steamship "Lusitania"; and, if so, whether he will insist on the owners of the steamer "Strathyre" paying the expenses of deporting these twenty-three Chinamen to their homes in China.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill*). My attention has been called to the case referred to by my hon. friend, and I am aware that two of the Chinese seamen were drowned in consequence of an attempt to escape from the steamship. I understand that an inquiry into the case has been instituted by the New York authorities, and as soon as I am acquainted with its result I will consider whether any further action is called for. Three of the Chinamen have been detained in connection with the New York inquiry, but the remaining twenty have been sent to Liverpool on the steamship "Lusitania." Without further information as to the conditions under which the seamen have been sent to this country, I am unable to say whether the owners can be required to repatriate the men to China. They will, however, be called upon to pay any expenses to which they may be liable.

County Westmeath Revaluation Cost.

SIR WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will give directions to have a separate account kept of the work done and expenses incurred by the Commissioner of Valuation in connection with the annual revision of valuation of the county Westmeath, and that particulars of the same may be furnished to the county council.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I am informed that the course proposed by the hon. Baronet is impracticable.

Delay in appointment of Sub-postmaster at Dunleer.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster-General if he can say what is the cause of the delay in appointing a sub-postmaster to the vacancy which exists at Dunleer, County Louth, Ireland; whether it is intended to appoint a constable who is at present a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and who is a candidate for the position; whether there are any other candidates for the vacancy; and, if so, will he fill the position without further delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The sub-postmaster of Dunleer, Drogheda, has given notice of his intended resignation, but he is not due to relinquish his appointment until 23rd September next, three months notice being necessary. A new sub-postmaster will be selected as soon as the necessary inquiries regarding the qualifications of the various candidates have been completed.

Examination for Overseers at Cork Post Office.

MR. A. ROCHE (Cork): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state on whose authority have sorting clerks and telegraphists in the Cork sorting office been recently examined for the position of overseer, what are the subjects of examination, and who are the examiners; and will he on this occasion consider the claims to this position of sorting clerks and telegraphists who have been performing overseer's duty for a number of years to the entire satisfaction of the department.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The hon. Member has been misinformed. There has been no examination for the position of overseer at Cork. Some of the senior sorting clerks and telegraphists however, have been afforded an opportunity of showing their ability for certain writing work which forms an important part of the duties of overseer at Cork. In accordance with the rule of the service, the claims and qualifications of all the senior eligible officers will be duly considered before any promotion is made to the position of overseer, and the officer will be selected who is, in my opinion, best qualified for the efficient performance of the duties.

Telegraphic Delay at Cork.

MR. A. ROCHE: To ask the Postmaster-General if he will issue a Return showing the delay on the telegraphic work dealt with in the Cork post office during the period 29th June to 11th July, and if he will say if such delay was abnormal, and what were the causes; can he also give the number of hours overtime performed daily in the telegraph office during this period; is he aware that members of the Cork telegraph staff are compelled to work three and four hours overtime per diem; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of increasing the staff of the Cork telegraph office.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) During the period in question some unusual delay occurred, resulting mainly from wire failures and from the handing in of press matter of which notice had not been given. The average daily amount of overtime performed in the instrument room during the period stated was seventy-three hours. No officer was compelled to work overtime.

A revision of the Cork indoor force is now being prepared, which I hope will do much to diminish the overtime.

Mess Payment System in the Navy.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he has had under consideration the hardship inflicted on men who have entrusted their savings for the payment of mess debts to a mess caterer who subsequently deserts with the money; and whether, in conjunction with the pay department of the ships, or in the case of destroyers with the pay department of the parent ship, some more responsible system can be adopted.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) This point has been met, for all practical purposes, by the new victualling system which came into force on 1st October last. Under this system the canteen tenant must submit a statement to the commanding officer, within forty-eight hours of the payment of the messing allowances, showing what debts are still due to him from messes, thus greatly reducing the possibility of misappropriation. Further, in all ships bearing an accountant officer, the paymaster himself settles the mess debt with the canteen out of the money due to the mess. It is not considered practicable or desirable for the Admiralty to go further than this.

Spark Catchers on Factory Chimneys.

Mr. BELLAIRS: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the case of factory chimneys in the vicinity of danger buildings where explosives are manufactured, regulations are made ordering the chimneys to be fitted with spark catchers within certain limits of distance; and, if so, what is the date of the regulation and what is the authorised limit.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) There is no general regulation to this effect, but the fitting of a spark catcher is an ordinary precaution which is very often adopted in explosives factories; and in factories licensed under the Explosives Act the fitting of an efficient spark catcher is, where deemed necessary, specifically required. A spark catcher is practically never required for the chimney shaft of another factory in the vicinity of an explosives factory, because each danger building of an explosives factory (if licensed under the Act) has to observe a specified distance from every factory outside the licensed area.

Education Grants.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether grants are still being made to local education authorities to assist in the provision of public elementary schools in cases where the existing school accommodation is wholly of a denominational character.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Yes, Sir, but only in settlement of cases already provisionally approved by the Board.

Naval and Military Courts of Inquiry.

Mr. BELLAIRS: To ask the Prime Minister whether the Government will grant a Return giving a list of all inquiries which have been held into naval and military affairs since the year 1800, the Reports of which have been published as Parliamentary Papers.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I see no objection to granting this Return.

Breeding of Kerry Cattle.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether, seeing the importance of the breed of Kerry cattle and the necessity of keeping the breed pure, he will take any steps to establish a breeding centre in some part in the County Kerry.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department of Agriculture have recognised the importance of the breed of Kerry cattle by establishing a dairy herd book, in which the owners of animals that conform to type and are of good milking quality can have them entered, so that their progeny may be eligible for service premiums. All the breeders of Kerry cattle may participate in this scheme, and the benefits likely to accrue therefrom are, in the opinion of the Department, much greater than would follow from the establishment of a breeding centre as suggested in the Question.

Promotion in the King's Liverpool Regiment.

MR. CROSFIELD (Warrington): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that in October, 1901, two extra battalions of the King's Liverpool Regiment were disbanded; that the officers who then became supernumerary have only just been absorbed, owing to which cause promotion has been exceedingly slow, especially in the junior ranks; and whether in view of these facts, he will take measures to prevent officers being brought into the King's Liverpool Regiment from other regiments.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The circumstances of the case were fully considered, and there did not appear to be any reason why this regiment should not take its quota of the supernumeraries like the other regiments. The hon. Member may not be aware that the regiment got the entire benefit of the promotion entailed by the augmentation of 1900, which had only been partially carried out when it was abandoned in the following year. No officers were brought in from other regiments as in the case of other augmented regiments. So far, therefore, from the officers suffering by the partial augmentation and subsequent reduction the reverse has been the case.

Territorial Association and Rifle Shooting.

CAPTAIN MORRISON-BELL (Devonshire, Ashburton): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware of the desire which exists in practically every part of the country for gaining experience in rifle shooting through miniature rifle clubs; and whether he would be prepared, through the Territorial Associations, or otherwise, to co-ordinate and organise this movement, so that this desire may be utilised in some practical way towards helping in the national defence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am aware of the general interest that is taken in miniature rifle clubs, but it is impossible at present to ask the associations to take the matter up while they have so much other work on hand. A War Office committee will, however, consider the question later on in the autumn in conjunction with the associations.

Appointments and Rank of Officers on the Special Reserve.

MR. GODFREY BARING (Isle of Wight): To ask the Secretary of State for War in what rank officers of the Special Reserve will be attached to Regular battalions; for what time such appointments will last; who will be responsible for the selection of the officer to be appointed; and whether the officer commanding the Regular battalion will be consulted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) When officers of the Special Reserve are attached to Regular battalions they will be employed in the rank they hold in the Special Reserve. The probable duration would be stated at the time when such employment was being offered; it is impossible to state it now. Officers of the Special Reserve who desire employment with Regular units register their names with the officer commanding the district, on the recommendation of the officer commanding the Special Reserve unit. The selection of the Special Reserve officer would rest with the War Office. The officer commanding the Regular battalion will not necessarily be consulted.

Direct British Steamship Line to East Africa.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government can yet see their way toward promoting or establishing a direct British steamship line to East Africa.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) The question is engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government. While endeavouring to find a satisfactory solution of it they are not at present in a position to make any public statement.

Religious Instruction in Prussian, Bavarian, and Belgian Schools.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign

Affairs what provision is made for religious instruction in the elementary schools in Prussia, Bavaria, and Belgium.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I cannot at such short notice furnish the desired information, but the correspondence will be examined and, if necessary, reports on the subject will be obtained.

Letter Deliveries at Derreenavurrig and Bullough.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that there is only one delivery of letters in the week to residents in the districts of Derreenavurrig and Bullough near Sneem, County Kerry; and whether, in view of the inconvenience thereby caused, he can arrange for improved postal facilities.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this subject, and on its receipt I will send the hon. Member a reply.

Hastings and St. Leonards Post Offices.

Mr. DU CROS (Hastings): To ask the Postmaster-General when the indoor staff at the Hastings and St. Leonards offices will be revised so as to initiate the rotation of duties promised in February, 1907; and on what date the new system will commence.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The revision of the indoor force at Hastings and St. Leonards will shortly be carried out. The revision will provide for the employment of each officer in rotation on the various duties in which he would be required to become efficient.

"Nut Butter."

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if it has been decided whether the compound generally known as nut butter, when prepared entirely from nuts, of a brown colour, and free from any trace of animal fat, comes within the definition of margarine in Section 13 of the Butter and Margarine Act, 1907; and whether the Board will consider the advisability of introducing an amending Bill to remove doubts and to enable this vegetable compound to be sold as nuttine or under some similar name which does not convey the misleading suggestion that it is made up of animal fat.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) Any decision as to the interpretation of the section to which my hon. friend refers rests with the Courts and not with the Board. We do not consider that any Amendment of the Act in the direction suggested is called for.

Exchequer and Audit Department Officials.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that acting examiners in the Exchequer and Audit Department receive £122 10s. per annum during their eighth year of service, and that on completing their eighth year they are promoted and given a superior certificate, but with a reduced salary of £115 per annum, he will quote any general rule or authority under which promoted officials suffer loss on promotion and for a considerable number of years thereafter.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The officers referred to are Second Division clerks, who on completing eight years service are eligible for promotion to the class of examiners in the Exchequer and Audit Department. As Second Division clerks they have the right, under Clauses 5 and 6 of the Order in Council of 21st December, 1907, to elect to be placed upon the new scale of salaries prescribed by that Order. But it has been decided in this case, as well as in similar cases in other offices, that there is no reason for varying in their favour the conditions of promotion to the class of examiners which were contemplated on the recent reorganisation of the Department. Any such clerk, therefore, who, having elected under the above-mentioned Order in Council to be placed upon the new scale becomes qualified and is recommended for promotion, is required to enter the scale of the examiner class at the point at which he would have arrived had he continued to serve as a Second Division clerk on the old scale up to the date of promotion.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state how many local auditors and assistant auditors abroad have now signified their intention of returning to the headquarters of the Exchequer and Audit Department, and the age, length of service at home, and length of service abroad of each.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) Eleven auditors and assistant auditors have accepted the new scheme of amalgamation The information as to age and service is as follows—

Number.	Age.	Service in Colonial Audit Department.	
		At Home.	Abroad.
1	30	8 months	6 years 5 months
2	25	11½ ,,	2 ,, 10 ,,
3	27	2 years 2 months	2 ,, 10 ,,
4	27	10½ months	2 ,, 5 ,,
5	29	2 years 4 months	3 ,, 3 ,,
6	29	1 ,, 2 ,,	4 ,, 3 ,,
7	29	1 ,, 3 ,,	8 years
8	27	10 months	2 years 3 months
9	29	1 year 7 months	4 ,, 10 ,,
10	28	1 ,, 2 ,,	4 ,, 10 ,,
11	33	—	3 years*

* Served previously from 1892 under various Colonial Governments.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that returning Colonial auditors and assistant auditors will have their names interspersed with those of the former members of the main establishment of the Exchequer and Audit Department, but with considerably higher salaries, and that service abroad is held out as a special qualification for promotion, he will explain how the interests of the former members of the main establishment of the Exchequer and Audit Department are safeguarded in this procedure.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) This is a matter which, under Section 9 of the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act, is within the discretion of the Comptroller and Auditor-General.

Agricultural Credit Banks.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether in view of the powers contained in Section 39 of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act on the subject of co-operative and credit bank societies, and of the determination of the Government not to give its sanction to any scheme of agricultural credit banks involving unlimited liability, the Board will direct full inquiries to be made and a

Report issued upon the systems of agricultural credit practised in Germany, Austria, France, and Italy, so as to ascertain whether and to what extent agricultural credit societies in those countries are under limited liability; or, if not, whether unlimited liability has entailed those detrimental consequences which the Government appear to attribute to it, and generally to obtain particulars as to the working of such societies.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board have published in their *Journal* from time to time articles dealing with agricultural credit banks in foreign countries. Information as to Germany was given in March, 1906, and as to France in June, 1905. The conditions which obtain in Austria and Italy will be described when opportunity offers.

Applications for Small Holdings in Yorkshire (North Riding).

MR. HAMAR GREENWOOD (York): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether any, and, if so, how many, applications have been made for small holdings to the County Council of the North Riding of Yorkshire; what is the acreage, if any, already granted for small holdings; and whether the Board is aware that this county council has suggested to any possible applicants that they should apply to local landlords for small holdings and not rely on the county council.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) We are informed that 288 applications have been received for 5,494 acres, but no small holdings have as yet been actually provided. The Board are not aware that the council have suggested that applicants should be made to landlords, but we will at once make inquiry on the point.

Headford Kenmare Train Services.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received further represenations from Kenmare protesting against the alteration in the railway time-table, whereby the interests of the people of the district are subordinated to those of a few tourists; and whether, seeing that the Headford and Kenmare Railway is largely maintained by rates levied on ratepayers in the neighbouring baronies, he will see that the railway company is not permitted to ignore the reasonable wishes of the people of the district.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The representations to which the hon. Member refers were duly received by the Board of Trade and communicated to the railway company with a request that they might receive careful consideration. The company's reply is as follows—

Great Southern and Western
Railway Company (Ireland),
Kingsbridge, Dublin.
25*th July*, 1908.

Sir.—In reply to your letters of the 21st and 23rd instant, I beg to inform you that my Board have again gone into the question of the train service on the Kenmare Branch, and they find that they must adhere to the decision conveyed to you in my letter of the 8th instant. The question was very carefully gone into by this company before the change in time-table was carried out, and every effort was made to supply such a service as would meet the reasonable requirements of both the through and local traffic. I have only to add that the present service is really a better one than the traffic warrants, and that this branch line is worked at a considerable loss to the company.—(*Signed*) I am, etc.,

FRANCIS B. ORMSBY.
Secretary.

Establishment of a Model Farm at Castlequin.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland), whether he is now in a position to state what steps the Department proposes to take in order to carry out the establishment of a model farm at Castlequin, Cahirciveen, in accordance with the suggestions submitted for his consideration; and, if not, whether he is prepared to consider any alternative scheme for the promotion of scientific agricultural knowledge and the improvement of the breed of Kerry cattle by utilising the land now available at Castlequin.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department do not propose to establish a model farm at Castlequin. Alternative schemes for the dissemination of scientific and practical agricultural knowledge and the improvement of the breed of Kerry cattle are being adopted. For the dissemination of such knowledge the Department have placed the services of eight trained men at the disposal of the farmers in the backward districts of Kerry, while, for encouraging the breeders of Kerry cattle, the Department have put into operation a scheme which will confer on the owners of these animals the benefits which breeders of other cattle now enjoy.

Appointments of Scottish Lords-Lieutenant.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can state the rules governing the appointment of Lords-Lieutenant of counties in Scotland; whether there is any property qualification; with whom the appointment rests; for what term is the appointment made; what are the duties of the position; and what are the powers of those holding such posts with regard to the appointment of Justices of the Peace.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I am not aware of the existence of any body of rules governing the appointment of Lords-Lieutenant. These officers are appointed by the King on the recommendation of the First Lord of the Treasury, and the appointment is for life. My hon. friend will find an account of the duties exercised by them and their powers in respect of the appointment of Justices of the Peace in Sir W. Anson's "Law and Custom of the Constitution."

MR. WATT: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether in view of the practice that Lords-Lieutenant of counties are appointed on the understanding that they are politically in sympathy with the Government of the day, he can state how many of the Lords-Lieutenant of counties in Scotland have been appointed by the present Government and how many of them are in political sympathy with the present Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) Four Lords-Lieutenant have been appointed for Scottish counties since December, 1905. I cannot say how many of them are in political sympathy with the Government of the day.

Scottish Crofting Legislation.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland having regard to the fact that the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill has now been definitely abandoned, will he state whether in view of the pressing need of land legislation, he intends to introduce, at an early date, a fresh Bill to amend the Crofters Acts.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I can only refer my hon. friend to the Answer given by me yesterday on behalf of the Prime Minister to the similar Question addressed to him by my hon. friend. I must remind my hon. friend of the fact that the arrest of the progress of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill this session was due not to its abandonment by the Government, but to its rejection upon Second Reading by the House of Lords.

Rate Arrears in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland in view of the fact that on the 31st March last the arrears of rates in the Island of Lewis amounted to upwards of £9,000, and that there is no prospect of this sum being liquidated in the near future, will he state how it is proposed to continue the administration of the affairs of the island.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) As I have already informed my hon. friend the parish councils have been advised that it is their duty to take the ordinary steps to recover arrears of rates overdue. I appreciate the difficulties of the existing situation, which are engaging my close attention.

Rebuilding of Houses in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland in view of the need for the rebuilding of houses on sanitary sites in the Island of Lewis, will he state how he proposes to arrange for this to be done, seeing that the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, which made provision for the improvement and rebuilding of dwellings in congested districts, has now been definitely abandoned.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) This matter, as my hon. friend knows, is under close observation and consideration, but at present I have no announcement to make.

Corporation of London and Cleaning of Spitalfields Market.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether, in view of the fact that by an Act dated 31st July, 1902, the Corporation of London obtained powers to acquire the leasehold of Spitalfields Market, and, upon such purchase being completed (which was to be 18 months after notice was given, which notice was served on 27th January, 1903), the Corporation of London undertook to clean and scavenge the streets in and abutting on the market, such cleaning being still undertaken by the Stepney Borough Council at a cost of over £1,000 a year, owing to the purchase of the leaseholder's interest not having been affected, he will take steps to expedite the proceedings now being undertaken in his name by the Corporation of London, so that the Stepney Borough Council may be spared the expense consequent upon the Corporation of London's failure to fulfil the obligations imposed upon it by the Act of 1902.

(*Answered by Sir William Robson.*) This action was commenced in the name of the Attorney-General at the relation of the Corporation of London against the leaseholder of Spitalfields to have determined certain questions which affect the price to be paid for the market. The Corporation of London has the carriage of the proceedings, and I understand it is doing all in its power to expedite them. It cannot be said that it has failed to fulfil its obligations under the Act of 1902, as such obligatons (in respect of cleaning streets) have not yet arisen.

Duke of York's School Chelsea—Suggested Open Space.

MR. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether in case of the sale of the site of the Duke of York's School, Chelsea, means will be taken to reserve at least some portion thereof as an open space and to retain as many of the large trees as may be possible in the thoroughfares that will be laid out; and whether any plan or scheme has yet been prepared.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) No plan or scheme has yet been prepared, and I am not able to make any further statement.

Suggested Naval Base at Invergordon.

MR. WEIR: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether in view of the recent manœuvres, the question of establishing a naval base at Invergordon, on the shores of Cromarty Firth, Ross-shire, will again be considered.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The reply to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Bisley Camp—Traders' and Hawkers' Licences.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for he Home Department whether summons have been issued against the occupants of tents in the bazaar lines at Bisley Camp on the ground that they had not taken out hawkers licences; and, if so, whether he will stop further proceedings against such persons.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The matter referred to is still under inquiry by the Inland Revenue authorities, who are bound by the provisions of 51 and 52 Vict., c. 33, s. 2.

Spirit Duties.

MR. WATT: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, what were the duties paid on spirits (not wine or beer) per head of the population of England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, for the year 1907–8.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The net duties on spirits collected for the year 1907–8 in England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, were as follows—

	£
England - -	9,959,743
Scotland - -	7,486,642
Ireland - -	4,392,432

Calculated upon this basis, the payment per head of the population would be for—

	£	s.	d.
England	0	5	8
Scotland	1	11	4
Ireland	1	0	1

But no safe conclusion can be drawn from these figures, as the place of payment of duty by no means necessarily corresponds to the place where the spirits are consumed.

Hop Substitutes.

Mr. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether in the Bill he desires to introduce this session to prohibit the use of hop substitutes in the brewing of beer in the United Kingdom, he will also prohibit the use of malt substitutes in the brewing of beer; and, failing such prohibition, will he make it obligatory upon the sellers of beer in this country to declare the substances, if any, other than malt and hop extract in the brewing of such beer to each buyer.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I do not think that the use of malt substitutes is on the same footing as that of hop substitutes, and, unless an equally good case were made out for prohibiting the use of malt substitutes, I should not feel disposed to support my hon. friend's proposal. But the point can be further considered when the proposed Bill is being prepared.

Grant for Re-building School at Curraheen.

Mr. BOLAND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whther he is aware that application for a grant to build a new school at Curraheen, Glenbeigh, County Kerry was made by the manager in November, 1902, accompanied by the statement that the floor between the boys' and the girls' school was in a dangerous condition, and that even though propped it might collapse at any time; and whether, in view of the fact that the whole school buildings have been condemned by the surveyor of the Board of Works, and that, owing to the poverty of the locality, it is impossible for the manager to raise £400 from the district as required by the Board of Education, being a contribution of one-third, he will arrange for an equitable distribution of the expense of constructing a new school in the place of one which is a constant source of danger to children and teachers.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education have sanctioned a grant of £872, being two-thirds of the estimated cost of a new school house for boys and girls at Curraheen, in place of the existing schools which have been condemned. The manager has recently represented that he is unable to raise the required local contribution of £436, and has applied for a grant of the entire cost. The Commissioners are not in a position to consider appplications of this kind, pending a decision upon the general question of special grants towards school buildings in necessitous districts which is at present under consideration.

Improvement of Boat Slips at Roads and Glen.

Mr. BOLAND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board now propose to carry out the necessary works of improvement at Roads and Glen boat-slips, seeing that under the present conditions it is not possible for the fishermen to carry on the fishing industry.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Congested Districts Board intend to carry out the work at Roads during the present summer. The Board have already expended £451 at Glen Boat Cove, but after the work was finished the fishermen asked to have a boat yard constructed. They have been informed that the Board have no funds for expenditure on fresh projects of the kind this year.

Evictions on the McGillicuddy Eager Estate.

Mr. BOLAND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been called to the eviction of six tenants on the McGillicuddy Eager estate, near Glenear, County Kerry; and whether, seeing that negotiations for purchase were on foot, the Commissioners will now intervene with a view to a settlement.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners cannot trace the receipts of any applications from evicted tenants on this estate, but if the hon. Member will furnish them with the names of the persons to whom he refers they will make inquiries.

Delay in the Sale of the King-Harman Estate.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has any information as to the cause of the delay in carrying out the sale of the King-Harman estate (No. 3), County Roscommon, which has been hanging fire for the past five years; and whether he can hold out any hope that the sale will be completed at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The question of purchasing this estate is at present engaging the attention of the Estates Commissioners, who hope to make an offer for the estate at an early date.

Purchase of the Estate of Mr. D. C. O'Connell.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any, and, if so, what, steps to bring about a settlement as to terms of purchase on the estate of Mr. D. C. O'Connell at Coomahover, near Mastergeehy, County Kerry, in accordance with the memorial submitted to them by the tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that on the 17th instant they received a memorial from seven tenants on the estate in question, stating their desire to purchase their holdings through the Commissioners. The Commissioners have no power to compel the landlord to sell the property, but they are writing to him in order to ascertain his intentions in the matter.

Tramp Nuisance in Blackrock.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the County Louth police has been called to the complaints of the inhabitants of Blackrock, near Dundalk, of the tramp nuisance, which causes much annoyance to seaside visitors; and whether any steps have been taken to check it in the present season.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that no complaint has been made to the police by the inhabitants of Blackrock, near Dundalk, in regard to annoyance by tramps. The local police, however, have been instructed to pay attention to the matter.

Evicted Tenants Act in County Cavan.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieuteannt of Ireland if he will state whether any steps have yet been taken to put the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907, into operation in County Cavan, and what are they; and has every evicted or alleged evicted tenant been inspected in County Cavan, and, if so, how often.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners propose to acquire in County Cavan, under the Evicted Tenants Act, 129 acres on the estate of Mrs. C. E. Hynds, and 379 acres on the estate of Mr. John Fay, and in the former case the prescribed notice has been gazetted. All applications received from evicted tenants prior to 1st May, 1907, have been inquired into.

Sale of the Estate of Mary B. Falkner.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the estate of Mary B. Falkner, situated at Springhill, Queens' County, and placed in the Land Judges Court in October, 1903, has been sold to the Estates Commissioners, and, if so, upon what date; has the purchase money been paid the several owners; can he say what was the amount coming to each owner; and whether he can state the name of the several mortgagees and annuitants and the amount paid to each.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Registrar of the Land Judges Court informs me that the estate in question was sold to the Estates Commissioners on 24th January, 1907, since when substantially the entire purchase money, amounting to £10,238, has been distributed by the Land Judge among the parties entitled thereto, so far as they were known. There was a large number of owners entitled to complicated fractional shares, and in order to supply the detailed information asked for it would be necessary to withdraw the officers of the Court from their proper business at a time of great pressure. The final schedule of incumbrances is however open to inspection, and will afford the information which the hon. Member desires.

Reinstatement of Mr. William Aherne.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are now in a position to state approximately when they expect to effect the reinstatement of Mr. William Aherne in his former holding on the Annesley estate, Ballinamona, Glanworth, County Cork, seeing that agreements for the purchase of this estate as a whole have been signed eighteen months ago, and that the holding in question is untenanted.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners propose to provide William Aherne with a holding if possible, and have referred the case to an inspector with that object. They are unable to make any further statement in the matter at present.

Superannuation of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of male and female national school teachers with thirty years service or more who resigned on pension during the past five years, specifying the number in first, second, and third class, and what was the amount of pension payable to the teachers in each class.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The return asked for would take a considerable time to prepare, as the service of all the teachers (about 700) who have been pensioned during the last five years would have to be examined, a course which would entail much labour. Perhaps it would serve the hon. Member's purpose if the total number of teachers retiring in each class, with the total amount of pension in each class, were given, without entering into the question of service, as almost all teachers retiring on pension have given upwards of thirty years service. I shall be glad to give him this information if he will address a Question to me on the subject after the recess.

Increased Grants for Irish Workhouse Teachers.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the distribution of the grant to national teachers in Ireland, he will make provision for increases to the workhouse teachers in Irish unions, as such teachers are under the national board rules and their salaries are paid by Government grants, and as in many cases there never has been any improvement in their positions in the way of salaries.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The reply is in the negative. No charge in respect of the salaries of teachers of Poor Law union schools has ever been borne on the Vote for public education. Such teachers are in the service of the boards of guardians, and are paid out of the local rates.

Reinstatement of Patrick M'Clushy.

MR. LARDNER: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why the Estates Commissioners have informed the solicitor for Patrick M'Clushy, who claimed to be reinstated in a farm in Mulladermott, County Monaghan, on the estate of Colonel Leslie, that they have decided not to take any action in the matter, and that they do not intend to provide Patrick M'Clushy with a farm; and if they will reopen the case and reconsider it.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that their decision was based on a full consideration of the circumstances of the case, and they regret that they are unable to depart from it.

Claims of John D. M'Auliffe.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have considered the claim of John D. M'Auliffe, evicted tenant on the estate of Mr. Devyanes Smith at Blarney, for reinstatement; and, if so, what action it is proposed to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have fully considered the application of John D. M'Auliffe, and have decided to take no action upon it.

Claims of Mrs. Mary Callaghan.

MR. SHEEHAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an application has been received by the Estates Commissioners from Mrs. Mary Callaghan, of Derryvaling, Ballingeary, whose father, Denis Cronin, was evicted from a farm on the White estate at Gortloughra, Kealkil, Bantry, and has she been placed on the approved list as a person entitled to reinstatement.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Mrs. Mary Callaghan, and they have noted her name as being suitable to be provided with a holding in the event of any untenanted land being acquired in the neighbourhood.

Killarney Land Commission Appeal.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say when the decisions in the appeals to be heard before the Chief Land Commission at their last sitting in Killarney will be given.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that the last sitting of the Appeal Court in Killarney was held on 30th June, and the cases are still in the hands of the assessors, whose Reports have not yet come in. It is not at present possible to say when the decisions will be given.

Distribution of Holdings on the Blacker Douglas Estate.

MR. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the holdings in the Blacker Douglas estate, in North Kerry, will be vested in the tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are not at present in a position to answer this Question. They are awaiting their inspector's Report in the matter.

Date of Completion of the New Duke of York's School.

MR. HORNIMAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has yet any information as to the date of the completion of the new buildings at Dover, and as to the date on which the boys will be transferred there from the Duke of York's School, Chelsea.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The new buildings at Dover are expected to be completed by the end of this year, and it is intended that the transfer of the boys from Chelsea will take place about the following Easter.

Bullets Used by the British Teams at the Olympic Games Shooting Match.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the rifle team of the Hythe School of Musketry, who represented Great Britain in the 300-metre international match at the Olympic Games, received instructions not to use pointed bullets; if so, on what grounds; and whether this team was successful in the competition.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) No instructions were given by the War Office as to the bullet to be used. The Department was not prepared to manufacture pointed bullets specially for this competition. No official information as to the result of the competition has been received, but it is understood from the daily papers that this team was not successful.

Drafting of Bills.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE: To ask the Prime Minister, with reference to Consolidation Bills as presented in this House, whether originating here or in another place, and with a view to facilitating the examination of them, what steps, if any, will be taken to establish as a general practice that each such Bill shall have a table of corresponding sections showing where the sections of the earlier Acts are reproduced; that each section of such Bill shall have a marginal reference to the earlier section to which it corresponds; and that new matter and substantial alterations shall be distinguished by italics or underlining.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The practice suggested in the Question as to the preparation of a table showing the mode in which, in a Consolidation Bill, the Acts consolidated are dealt with, and as to marginal references to the corresponding sections in the earlier Statutes, has been for some time followed in all Consolidation Bills prepared by the Government draftsman. The table is sometimes not circulated to the House with the Bill, but can always be circulated if required. The suggestion as to distinguishing, by italics or underlining, new matter and substantial alterations, even if new matter and substantial alterations were introduced in Consolidation Bills, would, from a practical point of view, be difficult to carry out satisfactorily. These and other points affecting the drafting of Bills will form the subject of inquiry by a Joint Committee which the Government have promised to set up.

Scottish Crofting Legislation.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Prime Minister, having regard to the fact that the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill is not to be proceeded with, will he state whether the Government propose to make any further effort during the present Parliament to amend the Crofters Act, and so give effect to the repeated pledges of the late Prime Minister and members of the present Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am not at present able to add anything to what I have already said on behalf of the Government luring this session upon this subject.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

German Destroyers.

Mr. ARTHUR STANLEY (Lancashire, Ormskirk): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, having regard to the fact that German destroyers of the current year's programme have already been laid down, he will consider the advisability of spending more than £4,000 a-piece before 31st March next on the 16 destroyers to be laid down by this country.

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): The question of naval expenditure on shipbuilding for the current financial year was fully considered by the Board of Admiralty when the Vote for ship construction was brought before Parliament in the present month: the Vote was approved by this House so recently as the 13th instant.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Does the right hon. Gentleman admit that the German destroyers have been laid down?

Mr. McKENNA: The expression, current year's programme, has no real applicability to the German method of building. I must not be understood as admitting the accuracy of statements in Questions put to me.

Mr. BELLAIRS (King's Lynn): Will the right hon. Gentleman say if the fact was taken into consideration that the contracts for the German destroyers which were laid down in April provide for their completion in twenty months, and whether our destroyers take from twenty-three to thirty months in building?

Mr. McKENNA: Yes, this was taken into consideration.

Mr. ARTHUR STANLEY: I beg to ask the First Lord whether he will consider the necessity of increasing the number of destroyers especially designed for work in the North Sea, having regard to the fact that Germany has 60 of 26 knots so designed.

Mr. McKENNA: The number of destroyers is being increased annually, in accordance with requirements.

Mr. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing) had notice of the following Question: "To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what were the amounts of tonnage provided for by the British and German Governments respectively by their programmes for the years 1906–7, 1907–8, and 1908–9 respectively."

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Before the right hon. Gentleman replies, may I ask whether he does not think that in the interests of peace and friendly relations with other Powers it would be well not to answer Questions of this kind, which draw invidious comparisons?

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Question has not been asked.

Germany v. British Shipbuilding Programmes.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that the total tonnage of armoured vessels provided by the three programmes of the present Liberal Administration is approximately 150,000, and that during that time the battleship "Montagu" of 14,000 was lost, and in view of the fact that during the same period the armoured tonnage provided by Germany was aproximately 183,000, making a total deficiency in the British programmes of 47,000 tons below bare equality, it is the intention of the Government to take immediate steps to redress the inequality.

Mr. McKENNA: In reply to my hon. friend the Member for Orkney, I join with him in deprecating most strongly Questions in which these invidious comparisons are drawn. The figures for the British programmes and for the tonnage of the "Montagu" are correct. As far as is known there are no statistics available to confirm the alleged German armoured tonnage. The proposed comparison, however, does not lead to the conclusion stated by the hon. Member, as although the German tonnage may have been included in the programme, the whole of the tonnage will not be provided at the expiration of the period when the whole of the British tonnage will have been completed.

Mr. ASHLEY: As the right hon. Gentleman does not know what the German shipbuilding programme is, how can he confidently assert that it will not be finished as soon as our own?

Mr. McKENNA: If the hon. Member will refer to the German Naval Bill, he will see what the programme is and in what time it is expected to be finished.

Mr. BELLAIRS: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that he will add any British ships to the Navy before the German ships are completed? Does not the statements in the Question lead to the conclusion that the comparison does hold good?

Mr. McKENNA: No, I do not agree that it does.

Mr. BELLAIRS: Does the right hon. Gentleman expect to add any vessels to the British total?

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty on what date the orders were given for the three German battleships of the 1908–9 programme; and whether he can state if the fourth armoured vessel of this year's programme has yet been ordered by Germany.

Mr. McKENNA: We have no official information that the orders have yet been given, though it is understood from the Press that the three battleships were allotted to various builders in June. No information has yet been published with regard to the fourth armoured vessel.

Mr. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty when he anticipates that the design of the armoured cruiser of this year's programme will have been settled, and when the Board propose to lay down this vessel and the other armoured ship of the 1908–9 programme.

Mr. McKENNA: The type of vessel has already been settled as an improved "Invincible." The complete design will be settled not later than October. According to present arrangements, it is proposed to lay down this ship at Devonport in February, 1909, and complete her in two years, and to lay down the other armoured ship at Portsmouth in January, 1909, and complete her in two years.

MR. BELLAIRS: As the German battleships order was given eight months in advance of the order for the British ships, how does the right hon. Gentleman expect that the latter will be completed before the German ships?

MR. McKENNA: We have no official information that these orders have been given, and my hon. friend has no right to conclude they have been given.

Deptford Victualling Yard.

MR BOWERMAN (Deptford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he is aware that all hired workmen employed at the Deptford victualling yard and other naval establishments are discharged upon reaching the age of sixty years, although previous to three years ago the age for compulsory discharge was sixty-five years; whether he is also aware that recently the Board of Customs has reverted to the sixty-five year age limit; and whether, looking at the difficulty experienced by such men in obtaining other employment upon leaving the service, and to the fact that they will not become entitled to claim an old-age pension until they reach the age of seventy, he will consider the desirability of reverting to the sixty-five-year limit.

MR. McKENNA: The present regulations permit of men being retained until sixty-five years of age when their services are required, and they are fit to perform the duties. It is not proposed to modify this practice.

War Office Expenditure on Aeronautical Work.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what have been the amounts of public money allotted to aeronautical work during each of the last five years and this year; and, in view of the paramount importance of the command of the air, what steps are being taken for the further development of this branch of the service.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The expenditure upon aeronautical work has been — 1903–4, £14,600; 1904–5, £19,150; 1905–6, £23,600; 1906–7- £20,750; 1907–8, £16,500. The estimated expenditure for 1908–9 is £13,750. Such steps as are considered necessary are being taken in connection with the further development of this work.

Hired Horses for the Military.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware of the delay in paying for the loan of the horses which accompanied the Army Medical Corps to Ramsay, Isle of Man; and whether he can state if owners in Manchester of the horses which returned on 19th June have yet been paid.

MR. HALDANE: I am not aware of this case. The hon. Member is presumably alluding to the Lancashire Territorial Force Medical Units. The horses are hired by the County Associations and the payment is made by them. They can obtain advances of money from the Chief Accountant of the Command.

North Riding Territorial Association.

MR. CLYNES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the remarks made by the chairman at the recent meeting of the North Riding Territorial Association, that working men going into camp must necessarily make a great sacrifice; and whether he can make any statement on the declaration of Colonel Williams and others at the meeting that it was the duty of the Government to supply the means.

MR. HALDANE: My attention has not been drawn to the particular speeches in question. I am, however, well aware of the splendid self-denial shown by the various classes of men serving in the Territorial Force. I think that the Government have done what is right in making the provision they have made.

Notts and Derby Regiment.

MR. STARKEY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the reason for the proposed transfer of the headquarters of the 4th Notts and Derby Regiment from Newark, in Nottinghamshire, to Grantham, in Lincolnshire.

Mr. HALDANE: It is a question of sufficiency of accommodation, but no decision has been arrived at to transfer the headquarters of the 4th Notts and Derby Regiment from Newark to Grantham.

Mr. STARKEY: Is there any intention of closing the barracks at Newark?

Mr. HALDANE: No decision has yet been come to.

Mr. Tilak's Trial.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if Mr. Tilak, at his recent trial in Bombay, was convicted by seven Englsh jurymen and acquitted by two native jurymen; and, if so, in view of the fact that the jury were disagreed and of the feeling caused by the sentence of six years imprisonment in the Bombay Presidency, whether the Secretary of State will cause the sentence to be remitted.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): With regard to my hon. friend's Question, I have nothing to add to the full statement that I made yesterday in reply to the hon. Member for Brentford.

Rioting in Bombay.

Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can make any statement to the House regarding the frequent and serious riots in Bombay, with special reference to the causes thereof and to the method adopted to restore quiet.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I made a statement on this subject in reply to the hon. Member for Bolton yesterday. Since then the Secretary of State has received a report from the Governor of Bombay to the effect that the situation had improved and some mills were at work; he has issued a proclamation promising that any grievance properly presented will receive consideration and calling upon all citizens to help in restoring order.

Sir H. COTTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman get information as to the causes of these riots and the methods adopted to restore quiet? Were the causes political or purely economic?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I answered a similar Question to that yesterday.

Sir H. COTTON: On how many occasions did the military fire on the mob, and how many people were killed?

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must give notice of that Question.

Indian Public Works Staff.

Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether new rules have recently been issued altering the pay and allowances of officers of the India Public Works Department; whether those have been approved by the Home Government; and, if so, whether he will publish the old and new schemes for the information of the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Revised rules of pay for the engineers in the Public Works Department have been issued in India with the sanction of the Secretary of State. The new rules have been published by the Government of India in the Gazette of India on 25th April, 1908, a copy of which is in the Library. If the hon. Member wishes it I can have a copy of the old rules also placed in the Library.

Imperial Conference Secretariat.

Mr. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps are being taken by the secretariat to the Imperial Conference with a view to keeping the Governments concerned informed between now and the next meeting of the Conference in regard to matters which have been or may be subjects for discussion, and with a view to fulfilling the desire on the part of the self-governing Colonies to be brought into closer contact with each other and with this country; and whether the secretariat is so organised and equipped as to be able to discharge these functions satisfactorily.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby): I cannot at present add anything to the Answer which I gave to the right hon.

Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, on this subject on the 20th inst.

MR. TENNANT: Is it intended to be a permanent and real body?

COLONEL SEELY replied in the affirmative.

Natal Indemnity Act.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Natal Indemnity Act, 1906, passed both Houses of the Colonial Legislature in July, 1906; that the Governor was authorised to give the Royal Assent to that Act, which was not specially reserved for the Royal consideration, on 13th August, 1906, and that the Governor postponed giving that assent till 1st October, 1906; and, seeing that in the meantime the Colonial Parliament had been dissolved, and that in these circumstances doubts have arisen concerning the validity of Act, whether any steps have been taken, or are in contemplation, in order to set such doubts at rest.

COLONEL SEELY: The point raised by the hon. Member's Question was argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on 5th July of last year, and the doubt, if any, which may have previously existed was finally set at rest by the decision of that tribunal.

Inland Revenue Fines.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the fines levied by the Inland Revenue authorities in the Walsall district during the year 1907–8 and the ten previous years respectively; and will he state whether Inland Revenue officers responsible for the cases where fines are imposed get any commission on the fines so inflicted, and, if so, what is the amount.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The amount of fines imposed for Excise offences in Walsall Excise district during the ten years ended 31st December, 1907, is as follows:—

Year.	£	s.	d.
1898	6	2	6
1899	34	16	0
1900	11	5	0
1901	20	18	0
1902	16	6	0
1903	15	11	0
1904	24	3	0
1905	22	2	0
1906	51	0	0
1907	38	7	6

In cases where fines are imposed as a result of an Order for legal proceedings by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, a reward is paid to the officer concerned, but the amount of such reward depends upon the circumstances of each case.

MR. H. C. LEA: Does the right hon. Gentleman approve of the system of paying commissions to Inland Revenue officers in order to secure convictions?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am not prepared to answer the Question until I have considered the point.

MR. H. C. LEA: Will the right hon. Gentleman, in view of the abuses which arise, inquire into this matter?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: If my hon. friend can give me any information showing that mischief has been caused, I will certainly inquire.

Rates in the Western Hebrides.

SIR J. DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if his attention has been drawn to the rates in several parishes in the Western Hebrides, resulting in the complete breakdown of local government, and if he can state what steps the Government propose to take to meet these exceptional circumstances.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, Sir; my attention has been called to the circumstances to which my hon. friend refers, and I am in communication with my right hon. friend the Secretary for Scotland on the subject. I am unable to give my hon. friend any further information at present.

Lyon King-at-Arms.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can now make a statement as to the standing of Lyon King-at-Arms in matters of Imperial heraldry.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): The Secretary of State has no statement to make, except to say that questions of what he understands the hon. Member to mean by Imperial Heraldry are outside the jurisdiction of the King at-Arms. Arms are granted to a Colony by His Majesty under a Royal Warrant, countersigned by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. All that is done by the Officers of the Earl Marshal's Department is to put into heraldic form the design the colony wishes to adopt, and to see that the King's concession is duly recorded in the Department.

MR. R. DUNCAN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that on the accession of King James the VI. and I., Imperial heraldy became of moment and required a corresponding status for the heralds of England and Scotland?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I am afraid I had forgotten that.

Brecon Open-air Meetings.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the letter of Mr. A. S. Williams, chief constable for Brecon, in which he refuses to afford protection to a public open-air meeting because he does not approve of meetings in the thoroughfare; and whether he will inform the local authorities that this failure on the part of the police to preserve order against organised rowdyism is a proof of inefficiency in the force which, if persisted in, will lead to the police grant being withheld.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Secretary of State has made inquiry in this matter and finds no reason to suppose that the police have failed to repress violence or disorder at Brecon. It is no part of the duty of the police to secure a quiet hearing to a speaker or to prevent verbal interruptions. The Secretary of State sees no reason, on the facts known to him, for addressing any warning to the responsible local authority.

* MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that at one time there were ugly rushes endangering life, and that the police did not interfere?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: That is not our information.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): And cannot the hon. Gentleman make inquiries in other quarters?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: We have had a statement of facts from the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Why not take the same steps to preserve order at Brecon as are taken at Hyde Park?

* MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Similar steps should be taken if the cases are similar.

Workmen's Compensation—Kettering Judgment.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the recent judgment of the County Court Judge at Kettering in the case of Bowler v. Foskett, under the Workmen's Compensation Act, in which it is held that Section 13 of the Act does not cover accidents to workmen employed on casual labour or peicework; whether he will take the opinion of the Law Officers as to whether the principle on which this judgment is based is likely to be upheld; and whether in that event, he will, in the interests alike of workmen, employees, and insurance companies, introduce a short declaratory Bill to make clear the intention of Parliament to include casual and piece labour under the provisions of the Act.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Secretary of State has read the newspaper report of the case. The decision does not go so far as the hon. Member suggests. The main question of law before the Court was whether the applicant was employed as a workman, or whether he was a person who had undertaken to carry out an independent contract; and the Court decided the question in the latter sense. It is true that the Judge referred to the facts that the man was paid by the piece and that he was not regularly employed. But the Secretary of State does not consider that there is any need for fresh legislation, since there can be no doubt that piece-workers and casual labourers are entitled to compensation under the Act in all proper cases.

Literature in Prisons.

MR. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether, in view of the fact that public attention has recently been directed towards the regulations in prisons as to the supply of books and other matters, he will make investigations by Departmental Committee, or otherwise, with a view to improving these regulations.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Secretary of State replied to this Question a day or two ago, in a printed Answer which was circulated with the Votes, that the matter was under his consideration.

Motor Cab Regulations.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that several motor cabs on the day of the Marathon race arrived at Windsor with six, and in one case eight, passengers; whether the police have made any report or taken any action in the matter; and, if not, whether this inactivity on the part of the police arose because the police were of opinion that in neither of these cases was there a case of serious overcrowding; and whether he has considered that the official refusal to carry out the terms upon which a cab licence is granted acts unfairly to other licensed drivers and deprives them of an opportunity of securing a fare.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Secretary of State's attention has not been drawn to the incidents mentioned and he does not know whether the Windsor police took any action. The Metropolitan police had not heard of them. The occasion was of course very exceptional; but the presence in a cab of six or eight passengers would certainly be regarded by the Metropolitan police as serious overcrowding. Every endeavour is made by the police to enforce the cab regulations impartially and with due regard both to the interests of cab drivers and to the public convenience.

Robbery and Violence in Yorkshire.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of Lord Coleridge, as Commissioner of Assize, to the grand jury at the Normanton assizes, in which he referred to the fact that several cases of robbery with violence were to come before them, and laid stress on the inflicting of the sentences of corporal punishment, mostly passed in cases of this nature to check such crimes; and whether, having regard to the observations of the learned judge and to the fact that the great majority of judges never impose the punishment of the lash, which is a matter of judicial discretion, he will undertake, in each case in which a sentence of flogging is imposed, to consider the facts with a view, if possible, to the remission of the sentence.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Secretary of State doubts whether the hon. Member has placed the right interpretation on the observations which Lord Coleridge is reported to have made in charging the Grand Jury, at Swansea, on the 17th of this month; but, however that may be, he may remind the hon. Member that, by the Criminal Appeal Act, 1907, their tribunal has been established to which prisoners sentenced to corporal punishment can apply for leave to appeal against their sentences or their convictions; and that no sentence of corporal punishment can be carried out until after the expiration of the period within which such an application can be made. I must decline to give the undertaking asked for by the hon. Member.

MR. H. C. LEA: Have there been any successful appeals against sentences for flogging?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL asked for notice.

Meat Trade Inquiry.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade when the Committee upon meat prices will sit; and whether their sittings will be public.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): I understand that the first meeting of the Departmental Committee upon combinations in the meat trade has been fixed for Friday next, 31st July. As at present advised I see no reason for any departure from the usual practice that the meetings of Departmental Committees are not open to the public.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries was consulted as to the appointment of the Committee to inquire into the price of meat, and agreed to the proposed composition of the Committee.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether in view of the importance to British agriculture of the question of meat supply, and the inadequate representation of the agricultural interest upon the proposed Committee to inquire into the meat prices, he will postpone the inquiry until the Autumn Session in order to enable the question to be adequately discussed in the House of Commons.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have already informed the hon. Member that the Committee has appointed Friday next, the 31st July for its first meeting. As the reference to the Committee is limited to an inquiry as to the existence and influence of combination of companies or firms in the meat trade of this country I have no reason to suppose that any specific representation of the agricultural interest is necessary, or that a postponement of the enquiry is desirable.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): Am I to understand that the scope of the Committee will be strictly confined, and that they will not inquire into the desirability or otherwise of removing the restrictions on the importance of Canadian cattle?

MR. CHURCHILL: It will not touch the agricultural side of the question. The Committee are to inquire into the economic and financial results of the operations of the beef trust.

British East Africa—Native Labour Rules.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade in view of the fact that certain Native labour rules, approved by him on his own responsibility when visiting the British East African Protectorate, were condemned at a large meeting of colonists on 24th March; whether he was authorised by the Secretary of State before leaving England to sanction regulations or do other acts affecting the general policy or expenditure of the Protectorate without reference Home.

MR. CHURCHILL: The promulgation of rules for the treatment of Native labourers is fully within the competence of the Governor of East Africa. During my visit to that Protectorate I had the opportunity of discussing with the Governor and his officers the conditions under which Native labour should be recruited and regulated, and His Excellency saw fit to embody the result of these conversations, and of minutes which I had written upon them in a series of rules designed to secure native labourers recruited for private employers by Government agency protection against neglect or ill usage, and generally to enforce a greater respect for their rights and a more intimate study of their needs. I afterwards expressed my entire agreement with the Governor in the course he had adopted. This procedure was regular in every respect. The phrase employed by the hon. Gentleman "condemned at a large meeting of colonists" is inaccurate and misleading. Less than 150 persons were present at the meeting. There are upwards of 4,000,000 natives in the administered districts of the East African Protectorate.

MR. ASHLEY was understood to ask if the meeting of colonists was not a very large one.

MR. CHURCHILL: It may have been large for Nairobi, but certainly it was not large when compared with the number of settlers concerned.

Edenbridge Labourer's Eviction.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has yet made inquiries into the case of the labourer, David Nicholls, occupying a cottage near Edenbridge, in Kent, who, after applying for land under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, is about to be evicted from his cottage; whether he is aware that David Nicholls was admitted by the farmer who is about to evict him to be a decent and respectable man, who has paid his rent regularly, and that no satisfactory reason has been assigned for the action that is now being taken against him; and whether, if the facts are as stated, the Government will consider the advisability of inserting a clause in the Housing Bill giving the Local Government Board special powers to deal with urgent cases of this kind.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I have no authority to interfere in a case of this kind, and I do not gather the nature of the powers which my hon. friend thinks the Local Government Board should be authorised to exercise in such circumstances. I doubt, however, whether the matter could be dealt with by means of a clause in the Housing Bill.

Millport Telegraph Service.

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the inconvenience caused to the people of Millport by the frequent interruption of the telegraph service, due to the bad condition of the cable between that place and the mainland; and whether he will give instructions to have the cable repaired or replaced at an early date.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I understand that the cable in question has not previously been interrupted for some years, and perhaps the hon. Member will kindly give me particulars of the alleged "frequent interruption." In consequence of the recent interruption it was decided about a week ago to supply a new shore end to this cable.

Postal Employee's Attacks on the Hobhouse Committee.

SIR C. HILL (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been drawn to a public speech made by Mr. Dowling, a postman at Maryborough, containing an attack on the Chairman and other Members of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Post Office Servants; and what action he intends to take, or has taken, in regard to it.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: My attention was called to a public speech made at Maryborough by a postman named Dowling, who, I may mention, had received an increase of 3s. a week in his maximum pay as the result of the recent reclassification. The speech contained imputations on the good faith of the Chairman, as well as a gross personal attack on him and on other Members of the recent Select Committee on Post Office Servants, because of their action as Members of the Committee. When asked for an explanation, Dowling made no adequate withdrawal or apology, and I decided that his two good conduct stripes should be forfeited and that he should be severely reprimanded. I feel sure that the House will concur in the view that it was necessary to take serious notice of Dowling's conduct.

Rushden Postmen's Wages.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the maximum of postmen's wages has been reduced at Rushden, Northants, by 1s. a week, while in the adjoining town of Wellingborough the maximum of postmen's wages has been raised by 1s.; whether he is aware that the cost of living and the character of the work in both towns are approximately the same, Rushden having just over 15,000 inhabitants, and Wellingborough just over 20,000; whether this inequality of the maximum of wages is due to the somewhat out-of-date arrangement by which so large a town as Rushden is still classed as a rural sorting office; and whether he will make local inquiry into the circumstances, and consider whether the maximum at Rushden can be raised to the level of Wellingborough.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The volume of work at Wellingborough is represented by 134 units. It therefore falls into Class III. for outdoor force, on the system of classification recommended by the Committee, and modified by me for the benefit of the outdoor force. The lower limit for that class is approximately 100 units of work, as stated in the Parliamentary Paper (Post Office: Changes in Wages, etc.) issued on the 11th instant. The cost of living is represented by the index number 96, and is therefore slightly below the average. Rushden sub-office, where the volume of work is considerably below 100, being only 32 units, goes naturally on the same system into Class IV. The cost of living is probably about the same at Wellingborough.

Work for School Children.

*Mr. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the terms of reference to his Inter-Departmental Committee include the hearing of evidence in support of extended facilities for taking children away from school to engage in such remunerative work as can be safely entrusted to young children, or to help in domestic work; whether it is intended to exclude such evidence; and whether he can see his way to frame impartial terms and set up an impartial committee.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): The answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. So far as I am aware the Committee and the terms of reference are impartial. In any case I should be sorry to hazard a guess as to the direction in which my hon. friend thinks they are biassed.

*Mr. MONTAGU: But is there not a considerable belief that the children are compelled to attend school in the country districts to the prejudice of their physical welfare?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I daresay that is so, but this is hardly relevant.

Mr. MONTAGU: But would not it be relevant to an inquiry into facilities for half-timers?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I have no doubt the whole question will be fully inquired into.

Douglas Hall, Hoxton.

Mr. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the London County Council have asked for the recognition of Douglas Hall, Hoxton, as a provided school for the purpose of accommodating children from St. John's Church of England School during the reconstruction of the school; and whether, seeing that it is proposed to transfer the children, staff, and managers *en bloc* from St. John's School to Douglas Hall, and subsequently to transfer them to St. John's School, and thus, in fact, to defray the whole expenses of a non-provided school out of the rates, the Board will decline to sanction the proposal.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that Douglas Hall, Hoxton, to which the London County Council propose to transfer the children from St. John's School, is the hall of a political club; and whether, under the circumstances, the Board will decline to sanction the arrangement.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: In reply to these Questions, the building referred to was, I understand, in use before the approval of the Board was asked. I am not aware that it is the hall of a political club, but in view of the unsatisfactory character of the premises the Board's sanction has been given only on the understanding that their use is discontinued after the summer holidays. The attention of the London County Council has been drawn to the fact that it is not open to them to provide premises, even of a temporary nature, for a voluntary school and they have been informed that it will, therefore, be necessary that a building should be hired by the managers of the St. John's School or alternatively that recognition as a council school should be applied for.

Mr. S. COLLINS (Lambeth, Kennington) asked whether it was necessary under Section 8 of the Education Act to give notice of the intention to use these premises as a school.

Mr. RUNCIMAN asked for notice of that Question.

Bermondsey County Council School.

MR. COOPER (Bermondsey): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that many parents of children attending the London County Council School, Monnow Road, Bermondsey, have received notices of the intention of the Council to transfer their children to some other school in the neighbourhood, and in some cases to non-provided schools; whether he is aware that some of these children have attended this school for some considerable period; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Part of this school has been converted into a higher elementary school, and it has, therefore, been necessary to provide elsewhere for children who are not qualified for admission to the higher elementary school. I think this must be regarded as a reasonable ground for exclusion within the meaning of Article 53 of the Code.

MR. COOPER: Do I understand from the right hon. Gentleman's Answer that the children, some of whom for several years have been taught the religious syllabus of the London County Council, will now be compelled to accept the sectarian religious teaching of a non-provided school, or their parents must take advantage of the conscience clause and their children be deprived of any religious teaching at school?

MR. RUNCIMAN: The County Council must, of course, carry out the law.

London County Council School at West Square.

MR. COOPER: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that a number of children attending the West Square London County Council School have been compulsorily transferred from this school to other schools in the neighbourhood; that some of these children have been sent to the St. Jude's non-provided school against the wishes of their parents; that the parents of children sent to this school have either to accept sectarian religious teaching being given to their children or take advantage of the conscience clause; and whether, seeing that the St. Jude's school has been overcrowded by this action of the County Council, and before the holidays a class had to be taught in the cloakroom, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Part of this school has been converted into a higher elementary school, and it has accordingly been necessary to provide elsewhere for children who are not qualified for admission to the higher elementary school. I will make inquiries as to the last part of my hon. friend's Question.

Llangollen School.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the legal questions of some importance raised by the managers of the Llangollen Church of England School, were raised by their letter of the 17th of March last; whether a reply to those questions have yet been arrived at, and, if not, what is the reason why so long a period has been found necessary for deciding a point of law.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The legal questions referred to were raised by the managers in a letter dated the 21st February, and have received careful consideration. I have now decided that there is no reason to depart from the decision which was previously arrived at and which has since been acted upon.

LORD R. CECIL: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the case of the Garforth School in the West Riding, which seemed to raise very much the same point?

MR. RUNCIMAN: If the noble Lord wishes to draw any analogy between the two cases, I should like notice of the Question.

Penmachno School.

LORD R. CECIL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of the proximity of the site of the proposed Penmachno School to a sewage tank, any local inquiry was held by the Board as to its suitability; if so, whether the report was in favour of the site; to whom did the site belong and what was the price paid for it; and how and by whom was the price settled.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No local inquiry was held by the Board, as no objections to the site were received by them, but the report from their inspector was not unfavourable. I understand that the sewage tank referred to has been disused for some considerable time, and that the objections on that score will only arise in the event of the tanks again being worked. The site belonged to Dr. W. N. Williams. The price paid was £400, which was settled, I presume, by agreement between the vendor and the Carnarvonshire County Council.

LORD R. CECIL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that only £350 was given for 4 acres of land, of which this school site purchased for £400 was a part?

MR. RUNCIMAN replied in the negative.

Newspapers Files for Members.

MR. LARDNER (Monoghan, N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if he will consider the advisability of providing a room, and arranging for the filing of the daily papers in the House for at least a year back, for the convenience of Members who may wish to refer to them during the course of the Parliamentary Session.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. L. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): The disposal of newspapers is under the charge of the Librarian and Authorities of the House; I regret to say that there is no unoccupied room available for this or any other purpose.

Provincial Homes Investment Company.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he will state if the police authorities in England have full information affecting several companies, such as the Provincial Homes Investment Company, as to their fraudulent constitution and business methods; will he state if they have similar information as to concerns known as doubtful traders; will he say where this information can be obtained by the public; and, in view of Judge Parry's recent remarks in Manchester at his Quarter Sessions, will he direct steps to be taken to warn the public in some way, that they may safeguard themselves against attempts to obtain money under false pretences by companies or individuals known to the authorities to be fraudulent.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said he could not answer as to the particular case mentioned, and upon the general question could not undertake to say what information might be in the possession of the police. He could assure the hon. Member that, if the police obtained the necessary evidence which in his opinion would justify such action, proceedings would be taken by the Public Prosecutor. He could scarcely undertake to issue such a warning as was indicated in the question.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.) asked if it was intended to take any action in respect to advertisements in newspapers having the effect of misleading the public.

SIR W. ROBSON said he was disposed to hope that some action would be taken by the proprietors of newspapers, with whom he had been in communication, to check the insertion of such advertisements.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: If the hon. and learned Gentleman will look at the *Police Gazette* he will see how many companies there are of that description.

Thurso Steamboat Service.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will consider the possibility of establishing a regular weekly steamboat service between Lochinver and Thurso.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): As my hon. friend is aware, the efforts that have been made to develop local traffic north of Lochinver have not been successful and no proposition of the kind referred to is now before me.

Burning of Crofter's House in Sutherlandshire.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has any further information with regard to the alleged burning of crofters' houses in the parish of Creich, Sutherlandshire.

MR. SINCLAIR: I have received a report from the Chief Constable stating that a house in the Parish of Creich, in the occupation of John Murray, was burned by a Sheriff's officer on the 18th instant. It seems to be a matter of some doubt whether Murray was a crofter who had paid rent to Mrs. Hadwin the owner of the estate or not. I am making further inquiries and shall inform my hon. friend.

MR. MORTON: Who is the owner of the property and who authorised the burning of the house?

MR. SINCLAIR: I have said I am still making inquiry as to the facts.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: Were the premises evicted before they were set fire to?

MR. SINCLAIR: I assume so. The Sheriff's officer acted on a decree of the Court.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Was the house set fire to in order to get the tenant out?

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. gentleman has already stated that he is further inquiring into the facts.

Farrihy Evicted Tenant.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that John Haugh, with his wife and eight young children, were evicted from their holding at Farrihy, owing, at the date of their eviction, two-and-a-half years rent; whether he is aware that during the great storm in June last, they took shelter in their old home, and that Haugh offered to pay one year's rent to the landlord, Mr. R. Stacpool, and the balance in instalments, if permitted to remain; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners inform me that on 31st March last, they received from John Haugh an application for reinstatement in a holding from which he was evicted on 11th January last. The Commissioners have no knowledge of the circumstances of the eviction. Having regard to the recent date of the eviction the Commissioners are not able to say when they will be in a position to consider the application. There are numerous prior cases which must first be dealt with.

Cranagill Orangemen.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the road from Cranagill to Annaghmore station, in the county of Armagh, has from time immemorial been used by all persons on their lawful avocations; if he is aware that on the 13th July last the members of the Cranagill Orange Lodge were prevented by the police from passing along this road; if he is aware that six Nationalists from this district were sentenced by Mr. Justice Dodd, at the recent Armagh Assizes, to two months imprisonment for attacking members of the Orange Order; and if he will state on what grounds the members of this lodge were debarred from their accustomed use of this highway.

MR. BIRRELL: In ordinary circumstances the road from Cranagill to Annaghmore is open to all persons. On 13th July the police prevented the Cranagill Orange drumming party from passing over Annaghmore Hill, an exclusively Nationalist locality, and induced them to proceed to Annaghmore railway station by another and safe route which is but a quarter of a mile longer. At the recent Assizes, eight persons were sent to prison for two months for attacking an Orange drumming party near Annaghmore. Party feeling runs high in the locality, and the police authorities consider it necessary for the preservation of the peace that Orange parties with drums should not pass over Annaghmore Hill. The Orange party have seldom attempted to use that road. In April, 1906, a serious riot took place when they attempted to do so, and later in the same year a force of 150 police had to be called in to keep the peace when a similar attempt was made.

Sales by the Estates Commissioners.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the date on which the estates for sale now being dealt with by the Estates Commissioners were lodged; and how many estates have been sold through the Estates Commissioners for the twelve months ending 31st May, 1908.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are at present dealing with estates for the sale of which the agreements were lodged in June, 1905. During the year ending 31st May last proceedings were instituted before the Commissioners for the sale of 1,188 estates by landlords to tenants, and for the sale to the Land Commission of 127 estates by landlords, and of 12 estates in the Land Judge's Court.

Dickson Estate, Doon.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the lands of Lackanagoneeny, Doon, County Limerick, formerly part of the Dickson property, is in the hands of the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, what is the cause of the delay in its allotment and distribution, or is there a prospect of such in the immediate future.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have not yet received possession of the untenanted lands referred to, but their inspector has been directed to prepare a scheme for the division of the lands.

Ballyneety Evicted Tenant.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the late Morgan Hayes, of Carriganaltin, Ballyneety, County Limerick, was evicted within the past twenty years off two farms on the estate of Courtney Croker, one farm at the above address, the other on the Ballinagarde side of the road; is he aware that a stepson of Hayes, named Peacocke, whose father originally owned one farm, is living in America, and a daughter, named Mrs. Hammersly, lives in the parish of Grean, some ten miles distant; and have those persons applied to the Estates Commissioners for those evicted farms, and, now that the Croker estate is being sold off to the tenants, will the daughter and stepson of Hayes be restored, one to each farm.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received from Mr. Peacocke and Mrs. Hammersly applications for evicted holdings on the estate in question, and have referred the case to their inspector in connection with the proposed division of the untenanted lands on the estate. The applications will be fully considered by the Commissioners when they are dealing with the inspector's report.

Clery Minors Estate, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he say whether the Estates Commissioners are in negotiation, or have instituted proceedings, with the Court of Chancery for the purchase of the Clery Minors Estate at Athlacca, County Limerick, with the view of distributing it among the holders of uneconomic holdings, landless people, and evicted tenants; can he say whether the leases of the cattle dealers and exporters from the Court have expired; and, if so, will the Court, in whose hands the estate now is, sell it to the Estates Commissioners for the above purposes.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that in November last an order was made by the Lord Chancellor authorising the receiver of this estate to enter into negotiations with the tenants for the sale to them of their holdings. The matter has since on several occasions been under consideration, but no agreement for sale has yet been arrived at. I do not gather that any question as to selling the estate to the Estates Commissioners has arisen, but the Lord Chancellor will doubtless take the matter into his consideration.

Police Protection in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what was the number of persons receiving constant police protection and special protection by patrols throughout Ireland on the last day of June, 1908.

MR. BIRRELL: On 30th June there were in Ireland seventy-one cases of constant police protection and 238 cases of protection by patrols.

Ballyvourneen Evicted Tenant.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the late James Reardon, of Ballyvourneen, Cahirconlish, County Limerick, was evicted from his farm some fifteen years ago; that a planter named Timothy Reardon subsequently took up the farm; has the wife or son of James Reardon made any application to the Estates Commissioners for reinstatement; and, if so, on what grounds has reinstatement been refused or delayed.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from the widow of the late James Reardon, and have decided to provide her with a holding if they should acquire untenanted land in the neighbourhood.

Outrages in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of outrages in Ireland recorded as agrarian and non-agrarian, respectively, in which firearms were used during the six months ended 30th June, 1908.

MR. BIRRELL: The numbers are—Agrarian, 83; non-agrarian, 37.

Orange Demonstration in Fermanagh.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) :I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 12th July last the Catholic inhabitants of Brookborough and Snow Hill, County Fermanagh, were obliged, on their way to church, to pass under several Orange arches spanning the public roads of these villages; and whether, having regard to the irritation produced by the erection of these party emblems and to the calculated insult conveyed thereby to the Catholics in the districts in which they are erected, steps will be taken, in the interests of peace and goodwill and the maintenance of public order, to prevent similar displays of Orange party emblems on the 12th August, more especially as Catholics and Nationalists forbear from any displays calculated to offend the feelings of their Protestant neighbours in their annual celebrations on the 15th August.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that on 12th July two Orange arches were erected over the public road at Brookborough, but none at Snow Hill. One of the arches at Brookborough was put up in a Catholic district within 200 yards of the Catholic church, and the congregation had to pass under it when going to and from church. The inhabitants resented the erection of this arch and pulled it down, but it was subsequently put up again. The local police are of opinion that the erection of Orange arches in this Catholic district is liable to endanger the peace, and the question whether the erection of such arches can be prevented in the future is at present under the consideration of the authorities.

MR. LARDNER: Had they to obtain the permission of the local authorities to erect these arches?

MR. BIRRELL: I am told they were not consulted.

MR. LARDNER: And yet the Postmaster-General has to obtain permission to carry a wire across the street.

De Blaquiere Estate, Clare.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Thomas Hanley, Tubber, County Clare, holds only 1 acre 1 rood 22 poles of land on the De Blaquiere Estate; and will he explain why this tenant's holding was not increased and made economic.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have referred Thomas Hanley's application to their inspector for inquiry and report, and until they have received the report they are unable to say what their decision in the matter may be.

Irish School Literature.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the sanction of the Commissioners of National Education has been withdrawn from the Advanced National Reader, a book which has been extensively used in Irish national schools for the past three years; whether the first and only public notification of the withdrawal of the sanction of the use of the book was contained in a letter from the secretary of the Board to the Imperial Protestant Federation; can he state whether the decision there announced was made by the Commissioners as a body, or, if not, by whose authority was it issued; and can he specify what part or parts of the book are now pronounced unsuitable for Irish national schools.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that Brown and Nolan's Advanced Reader was never sanctioned for general use in national schools. It was sanctioned for use in some particular schools, but on objection being made to it on religious and political grounds the sanction in these cases was withdrawn in accordance with Rule 124 (a). The Commissioners do not consider it necessary to make any further statement on the subject. The whole question is to be considered by the Board at their next meeting.

Mr. McHUGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Nationaal Board considered this book at their meeting yesterday, on the suggestion of the Protestant Imperial Federation?

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not know what happened at that meeting. I dare say I shall be supplied with information before long.

Mr. McHUGH gave notice that he would raise the question.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Is it not a fact that the National Board met yesterday and investigated the merits of a book, the circulation of which they had stopped many weeks ago, condemning it first and buying it afterwards?

Mr. BIRRELL: I have no knowledge of the business that was before them.

Mr. McHUGH: Does the right hon. Gentleman know that the Imperial Protestant Federation has Lord Ashtown as its figure-head?

Mr. BIRRELL said he did not know.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) Will the right hon. Gentleman make him self acquainted with the book?

Mr. BIRRELL: Oh, I have the book in my room, and I propose taking it away with me on my holidays.

Mr. LARDNER: Is the Federation to decide what is to be read in Catholic schools?

Mr. BIRRELL: Not at all.

Mr. McHUGH: Has the right hon. Gentleman any control over the National Board of Education?

Mr. BIRRELL: Only when they die.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: And in the interests of education the sooner they die the better.

Warrenpoint Excursion Fatality.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the fatality to a lady excursionist at Warrenpoint, County Down, Ireland, on Sunday, 19th July, 1908; whether he is aware of the feeling that exists that had the Great Northern Railway Company taken reasonable precautions this fatality would have been avoided; and whether he will order an inquiry, which will satisfy the public and which may lead to the prevention of such accidents in the future.

Mr. CHURCHILL: This accident has been duly reported to the Board of Trade. No representations have been received indicating that the railway company failed to take reasonable precautions. Both the jury at the coroner's inquest and the police have expressed the opinion that no blame attached to anyone, and I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by a further inquiry.

The Bank of Ireland.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has considered the question as to whether any change should be made in the relations of the Government with the Bank of Ireland, in which the Government accounts are kept, and of which the late Treasury Remembrancer in Dublin Castle became a director while still holding that office, and which is given a preference in dealings by the

Government to other banking institutions in Ireland, regard being had to the decision in the action of Alderman Corrigan against Mr. Edward R. Read, as chairman of the late National Assurance Company of Ireland, which was heard in Dublin in June last before Mr. Justice Andrews and a special jury, and to the fact that the National Assurance Company, four of whose directors are also directors of the Bank of Ireland, was accommodated by overdrafts up to £90,000 by the Bank of Ireland, by which the directors were enabled to conceal its true position and to postpone its winding-up, to the ruin of the shareholders; and whether he has considered the effect likely to be produced on public confidence in commercial probity by revelations of so grave a character making no alteration in the attitude of of the Government to the Bank of Ireland, as a favoured institution for Government accounts or business.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have nothing to add to the Answers which I have already given to similar Questions put down by the hon. Member for the 6th and 8th instant.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Does the right hon. Gentleman admit the fact that four directors of the Bank of Ireland were likewise directors of this fraudulent company, and does he admit the Government give a preference in all money transactions to this bank?

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University): May I remind the right hon. Gentleman——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The right hon. Gentleman is giving information, not asking for it.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: May I ask whether it is a fact——

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker, is it usual for counsel employed in a case to use the information he has received as counsel?

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think it is at all desirable that counsel who has been employed should take any part.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: As a matter of personal explanation, may I say that my interest was on behalf of the plaintiff, in whose interests this Question is put. I simply rose in the interests of fair play to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he was aware that the facts of this case are still *sub judice*?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I think there is an appeal. I am not clear whether it is a question of fact or a question of law, but it makes it undesirable that I should give any answer which would prejudice the case one way or the other.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Does the right hon. Gentleman know that the questions of fact are undisputed and that the appeal is on a question of law?

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the £90,000 was advanced by the Bank of Ireland out of the unclaimed balances?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Financial morals in Ireland.

Irish Land Stock.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the disappointment felt by small investors in connection with allotments made recently of Irish Land Stock, he will when issuing future Government loans adopt some such method as the following, viz., to issue the prospectus to the public twenty-four hours before subscriptions are received; make the application money £15 per centum; promptly close the list of subscriptions for town (the country applications to have twelve hours longer) as soon as the loan is covered a few times; allow only one application from the same address; and give prior allotment to all applicants undertaking to pay up in full on the understanding that the stock allotted to them is not to be transferable or certificates to bearer obtained until the final call has been paid upon the partly-paid stock, the bank to issue letters of allotment in two colours, thus differentiating between fully paid and partly-paid stock.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am obliged to the hon. Member for his suggestions, which shall be borne in mind. Some of them could not, I fear, be adopted without risk of interfering with the success of a loan, and others would impose conditions which could easily be evaded. But I will consider the matter further.

Irish Land Purchase Act.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, before the House rises, he can give any information as to the proposals of the Government for financing the Irish Land Purchase Act.

The PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): I am afraid I cannot make an statement on the subject before the House rises.

The Licensing Bill.

Mr. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, if Clause 1 of the Licensing Bill becomes law, it will be possible under any circumstances to grant a licence for a new hotel in any place while the number of licences in that place is above the strict statutory scale.

Mr. ASQUITH: Under the clause as it stands at present such a licence could in my opinion be granted under the provisions for the modification of the statutory scale, but, as it is a matter of considerable practical importance, I propose to make the matter clear by inserting on the Report stage an express enactment that in proper circumstances and under proper limitations a new licence can be granted to an hotel, notwithstanding the provisions of the clause. The provision would apply not only to hotels, but to railway refreshment rooms, &c.

Mr. ADKINS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the inclusion in Clause 1 of the Licensing Bill of the period of fourteen years as the period for the statutory reduction of on-licences necessarily involves the retention of fourteen years as the period for the time-limit under Clause 3.

Mr. ASQUITH: No, Sir; the period for the statutory reduction under Clause 1, and the period for the time-limit under Clause 3, need not necessarily be identical.

Mr. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): May I ask whether the decision taken under Clause 1 necessarily precludes the possibility of shortening the period under Clause 3?

Mr. ASQUITH: No, Sir, neither shortening nor lengthening.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) asked as to the order of business for Friday.

Mr. ASQUITH stated that the first business for Friday would be the Committee Stage of the Appropriation Bill; after that he proposed to take the Lords' Amendments to the Old-Age Pensions Bill and the Irish Universities Bill. As he was afraid there was not general assent to the Motion with regard to the Wednesday sittings in the autumn they would afterwards take the Motion for the adjournment. The Motion with regard to Wednesdays would not be taken unless there was general assent.

LORD CROMER.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to give notice that on an early day I will move—"That, having regard to the fact that this House recently voted £50,000 to Lord Cromer it is of opinion that he does not stand in need of a Government pension of £900 per annum, and that it should cease on and after 1st January, 1915."

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill: Mr. Long and Earl Percy; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Samuel Roberts and Sir Frederick Banbury.

Report to lie upon the Table.

LOTTERIES AND ADVERTISEMENTS.

Report from the Joint Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 275.]

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (MERCANTILE CORPORATIONS AND COMPANIES) BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 13th October, and to be printed. [Bill 347.]

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 349.]

NEW BILL.

GROCERS' LICENCES (ABOLITION) BILL.

"To amend the Law with respect to the grant or renewal of licences for the sale of beer, wine, and spirits, to be consumed off the premises," presented by Mr. Robinson; supported by Mr. Maclean and Sir Maurice Levy; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 13th October, and to be printed [Bill 348.]

SUPPLY [20TH ALLOTTED DAY] [28TH JULY].

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1908-9.

CLASS II.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £31,450, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, including a Grant in Aid of certain Expenses connected with Emigration."

CLASS I.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £608,168, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. Royal Palaces - -	42,500
2. Osborne - - - - -	7,300
3. Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens - - -	79,900
4. Houses of Parliament Buildings (including a Supplementary Sum of £5,000) - - -	37,000
4A. Salisbury Memorial -	1,100
5. Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain - - -	48,000
6. Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain - -	55,000
10. Surveys of the United Kingdom - - -	116,815
11. Harbours under the Board of Trade - -	32,840
12. Peterhead Harbour -	22,000
14. Public Works and Buildings, Ireland - -	134,259
15. Railways, Ireland - -	31,454
	£608,168"

CLASS II.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,145,045, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. House of Lords Offices -	15,956
2. House of Commons Offices	19,900
3. Treasury and Subordinate Offices - - - -	62,917
4. Home Office - - -	139,967
7. Privy Council Office -	6,217
8. Board of Trade - -	213,169
9. Mercantile Marine Services - - - -	80,347
10. Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade -	5
11. Board of Agriculture and Fisheries - - -	83,124
12. Charity Commission -	15,308
14. Exchequer and Audit Department - -	39,900
15. Friendly Societies Registry - - -	5,819
16. Local Government Board	156,500
17. Lunacy Commission, England - - -	11,384
20. Public Record Office -	14,820
21. Public Works Loan Commission - - -	2,507
22. Registrar-General's Office, England - - -	26,825

	£
24. Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, &c., Office -	13,613
25. Works and Public Buildings Office - - -	53,693
26. Secret Service - -	10,000

Scotland.

27. Secretary for Scotland's Office - - - -	11,600
28. Fishery Board - -	14,998
29. Lunacy Commission -	3,901
30. Registrar-General's Office	3,063
31. Local Government Board	11,592

Ireland.

	£
32. Household of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland -	2,627
33. Chief Secretary for Ireland - - - -	18,101
35. Charitable Donations and Bequests Office - -	1,053
36. Local Government Board	52,616
37. Public Record Office -	3,625
38. Public Works Office -	27,413
39. Registrar General's Office	7,338
40. Valuation and Boundary Survey - - -	15,147
	£1,145,045 "

CLASS III.

4. " That a sum, not exceeding £1,685,768, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Law Charges - - -	54,190
2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses - - - -	22,564
3. Supreme Court of Judicature - - - - -	189,867
4. Land Registry - -	21,750
5. Public Trustee - -	1,500
6. County Courts - -	3
7. Police, England and Wales - - - -	24,858

Scotland.

11. Law Charges and Courts of Law - - -	51,316
12. Register House, Edinburgh - - - - -	26,966
13. Crofters Commission -	2,345
14. Prisons - - - -	60,790

Ireland.

	£
15. Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions -	38,078
16. Supreme Court of Judicature and other Legal Departments - -	60,446
17. Irish Land Commission -	160,978
18. County Court Officers, etc.	70,475
19. Dublin Metropolitan Police - - - -	36,632
20. Royal Irish Constabulary	739,902
21. Prisons - - - -	64,661
22. Reformatory and Industrial Schools - -	55,225
23. Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum - - -	3,222
	£1,685,768 "

CLASS IV.

5. " That a sum, not exceeding £8,217,512, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Board of Education -	6,594,150
2. British Museum - -	115,137
3. National Gallery - -	7,414
4. National Portrait Gallery	2,621
5. Wallace Collection - -	4,173
6. Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	28,295
7. Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales - - - -	146,800
8. Public Education, Scotland - - - -	1,198,557
9. National Galleries, Scotland - - -	2,497

Ireland.

	£
10. Public Education (Supplementary) - - -	114,000
11. Endowed Schools Commissioners - - -	515
12. National Gallery - -	1,153
13. Queen's Colleges - -	2,200
	£8,217,512

CLASS V.

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £366,236, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Diplomatic and Consular Services - - - -	323,103
3. Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable - -	42,133
4. Cyprus (Grant-in-aid) -	1,000
	£366,236

CLASS VI.

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,684,845, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Services including in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Superannuation and Retired Allowances - -	375,022
3. Hospital and Charities, Ireland - - - -	110
4. Savings Banks' and Friendly Societies' Deficiencies - - - -	109,713
5. Old-Age Pensions - -	1,200,000
	£1,684,845 "

CLASS VII.

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £382,104, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in receipt of the Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. : —

	£
1. Temporary Commissions	25,000
2. Miscellaneous Expenses	7,867
3. Repayments to the Local Loans Fund - -	4,404
4. Ireland Development Grant	85,342
5. Repayments to the Civil Contingencies Fund -	41,491
6. Expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905 - - - -	200,000
7. Relief of Distress (Ireland)	13,000
8. Government Hospitality	5,000
	£382,104 "

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £5,562,700, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Navy Services, viz. :—

	£
2. Victualling and Clothing for the Navy - -	2,286,400
4. Martial Law - - -	13,900
6. Scientific Services - -	66,000
7. Royal Naval Reserves -	368,300
9. Naval Armaments - -	2,048,700
11. Miscellaneous Effective Services - - -	409,200
12. Admirality Office - -	370,200
	£5,562,700"

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

10. That a sum, not exceeding £13,505,100, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for Expenditure in respect of the Army Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories), viz. :—

	£
2. Medical Establishment Pay, &c. - - -	451,000
4. Territorial Forces - -	2,005,000
5. Establishments for Military Education - -	142,000
6. Quartering, Transport, and Remounts - -	1,839,000
7. Supplies and Clothing -	3,912,000
8. Ordnance Department Establishments and General Stores - -	498,000
9. Armaments and Engineer Stores - - -	1,490,000
10. Works and Buildings -	2,515,000

		£
11. Miscellaneous Effective Services	- -	73,000
12. War Office and Army Accounts Department	- -	580,000
Ordnance Factories	-	100
		£13,505,100

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1908–9

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £11,821,531, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs, and Telephones."

First two Resolutions read a second time, and postponed.

Third Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he desired to address to the President of the Local Government Board two or three questions, not in any unfriendly spirit, but partly because there was a general desire that some information should be conveyed to the country, and partly because he desired to press on his attention what he believed to be a very desirable question. He first desired to ask in what stage was the consideration of the *status* of the Local Government Board, the Board of Trade, and the Board of Agriculture. From what took place earlier in the session, many of them were in hopes that before now it would have been possible for the Government to announce their decision to raise the *status* of these Departments, and the position of the occupants of these offices, and to bring them into nearer, if not complete, equality with other great Departments of the State. This was a question which aroused a great deal of interest amongst local authorities throughout the country. He was certainly among the last persons in that House to attach any undue importance to *status* and to distinction of title, or to salary, but any common-sense person must realise that if they made a distinction between different Ministers people outside would call for the reasons of that distinction, and would draw from the fact inferences which were not always satisfactory or gratifying to the existing occupants of the offices. There was, he thought, a general consensus of opinion at the time to which he had referred that the Departments ought now to be raised, and he ventured to say then that he hoped the Government would deal with the question, which was not a very difficult one, and that they would deal also with the redistribution of the duties as between the Home Office and the Local Government Board, for instance, and he expressed the earnest hope that the present occupants of the offices concerned would not feel themselves bound, by a sense of false modesty, if he might say so, to refuse themselves a distinction which was given, not to them, but to their offices. In this particular case, he gladly repeated in the House what he had said outside, viz., that, politics apart, he was glad to testify to the courage, ability, and independence with which the present President of the Local Government Board had discharged his duties. As an old President of that Department he would rejoice to see that Department raised, and he would be glad indeed that the first occupant of the office in its improved conditions should be the right hon. Gentleman who now presided over the Local Government Board. He was convinced that anyone who followed the working of that House would find that the Local Government Board was one of the most important offices in the State. It was concerned not only with those great questions which affected the well-being of the poorer classes, the administration of the Poor Law, and other cognate subjects, but also with the public health of the country; and any Department charged, as that was charged, with the supervision of public health, although it was true that the Local Government Board had no very great control over the work done by the subordinate local health bodies, had immense power and influence which could be well exercised in the direction of good government, and he believed it had been so exercised without interruption, whatever might have been the politics of the presiding Minister for the time being. If anyone were to examine the work done by the chief permanent officials or the subordinate permanent officials of the Local Government Board, they would find it at least equal to that of any other department in the State and considerably heavier than that of some Departments. He would be very glad to hear that the inquiry had reached a conclusion and that the Government would be prepared before very long to announce their decision on the question. There was some discussion in the House on the previous day, or between three in the afternoon and breakfast-time, with regard to the Motor Car Act, and he wanted to offer a suggestion to the President of the Local Government Board. It was idle to pretend that they were going by legislation or by regulations, or by speeches, to interfere with the rapid development of motor traffic in this country. Whether they liked it or not, it had come to stay, and it was a very important factor in all business at the present moment. There could be no doubt that motors as at present used, whether the motors of luxury or of business, constituted in many cases not only a great discomfort to the public, but a source of danger, and he believed that a great deal might be done to check that if the Local Government Board, in conjunction with the Home Office, would issue instructions to the police. When the Motor Car Bill was passing through the House, he was responsible for it in its original form, and it included no limitation in regard to speed. That limitation was imposed on the then Government against his wishes, and against the wishes, he thought, of most of his party, but it was the manifest opinion of the House at that time, and to that opinion they bowed, as they were bound to do and, he thought, as they were justified in doing. But he had never changed his opinion, and he had been a close observer in London, in some of the large towns, and in the country, of the effect of that Act on motor traffic. If the House then had been content to rely on Section 1 of that Act they would not have thrown on the police the duty they now had to perform of everlastingly trying to arrive at the pace of motors, instead of asking themselves the simple question of whether the driver of the vehicle was driving to the public danger or not. Under Section 1 there were ample powers, and he did not hesitate to say that the pace at which a car was proceeding had very little to do with the possible results in regard to the public. The pace at which it was going, say on Salisbury Plain, might be sixty miles an hour without the smallest danger to the public, but in a town four miles an hour might be as dangerous as twenty-five or thirty elsewhere. At present the whole attention of the police was concentrated on the speed at which the vehicle was proceeding, their efforts being devoted to proving that the man was going beyond the statutory limit of twenty miles an hour, and that had led to what he regarded as a most undesirable practice, known as the police trap, which was contrary to British methods. They did not lay traps for evil-doers; they took them openly and fairly, and they knew from experience that if they said it was in the interests of justice to lay traps they brought as a consequence similar action on the part of those they were trying to trap, in order to avoid detection. In this country we had a system which was absolutely ridiculous. The roads were covered with men who acted as scouts, whose duty it was to warn the driver of a motor car that there was a police trap in the neighbourhood. Sometimes they succeeded, and sometimes they failed, but the consequence was that they had motor policemen trying to catch the driver and motor scouts warning the driver that the motor policeman was near. Could there be anything more ridiculous and more calculated to destroy the foundation of justice? If the police, instead of being occupied in this stupid practice, this waste of time and of public money, were engaged on their ordinary road patrol, and were advised by the Local Government Board and the Home Office that their duty was to protect the safety of the public, and that they would be supported if they summoned the drivers for driving to the public danger, regardless of the pace at which they were going, he ventured to say the Motor Car Act would be much more effective than it was now. He believed that until the Government Departments took action in the matter the police would not abandon the practice of looking to the pace rather than to the effect of what the man was doing. If the Local Government Board and the Home Office would work together and send a letter to the local authorities, calling the attention of the joint committee and chief constables to the fact that there was throughout the country a strong sense of injustice to the community at large by the dangerous use of motors and that they could check it by the full exercise of the powers in Section 1 of the Act, he believed that a great improvement would ensue. There was another suggestion he had to make to the President of the Local Government Board. Under the Motor Act the local authorities were charged with the duty of posting on their roads at certain places signboards indicating that there was danger on account of some sharp turn or for some other reason, and that the speed of the motor ought to be reduced. It was quite obvious that they could not go outside that clear definition to a large extent; but he ventured to suggest that the right hon. Gentleman might in conjunction with the Home Office issue a circular to the local authorities saying that they would be well advised to put up signposts on the roads at places where there was no danger on account of the state of the road, but where, owing to a cluster of cottages occupied by the peasantry, the dust raised by the motors caused a nuisance. At present the dust raised by motors on many roads was so abominable that life in the cottages became impossible. It might be said that this was a class suggestion. He did not care in the least for that kind of criticism. It was quite true that the dust was as great a nuisance to a big house as to a small house, but it must be remembered that the big house was generally some distance off the road, while the cottages were generally right alongside the road. His suggestion applied to where there were two or three cottages, or a cluster, or a small hamlet. All those who lived in the country knew the infinite love which many cottagers had for their gardens and the great amount of labour they bestowed on them, and what a beautiful feature those gardens were in the country landscape. The gardens which lay alongside the road were too often smothered in dust raised by motors, and their most beautiful flowers came to naught. He had had an experiment made of instructing the motor driver to drive at a reduced speed past cottages of that kind, with the result that the dust raised was practically *nil*. That implied, of course, that the motor should be driven at a reduced speed for 300 or 400 yards; but what on earth did that matter to the driver? They all liked to go fast—he knew that he did when he was in a hurry—with safety; but surely when travelling on the public roads of the country which were intended for vehicles drawn by horses, for equestrians and for foot passengers, and were also the necessary places for so many dwelling places of poor people, they should not be used like railway lines, but with some regard for the safety of the public and the general convenience and comfort of the people living alongside. He believed that the issue of some such circular suggestion as he had made by the two Government Departments would have much effect on the local authorities, that it would lessen the dangerous use of motors, and also that the hostility to motors now existing would disappear. There was another subject to which he wished to direct attention. It was one of the most important which the House of Commons could be called upon to consider in regard to the administration of Acts relating to public health. When he was at the Local Government Board he was intensely interested in the discovery made by Professor Koch with regard to tuberculosis. He thought that that threw a wonderful new light on certain diseases. Though Dr. Koch was so confident that his first discovery justified his greater conclusion, that eminent scientist went on to hold that it must not necessarily be assumed that the tuberculosis which was developed in the lower animals became a danger to man. It was that theory which induced him to appoint the Tuberculosis Commission, and that was the first field of investigation which the Commission were asked to cover. The Commission had now been six years in existence, and he ventured to say that anyone who had followed their work, even in the most elementary manner, must admit that their labours had been of enormous benefit to the country. Already the knowledge possessed by the country with reference to tuberculosis was of immense value and the proper use of that knowledge had led to the prolongation of human life. It had also disposed effectually of Koch's theory that there was no danger of the transmission of tuberculosis from the lower animals to man. There were rumours that the labours of that Commission could no longer be justly continued. He might pay a passing tribute, honest and sincere, to the work done on that Commission by Sir W. H. Power, who had had an honour conferred upon him by His Majesty in recognition of his scientific attainments. It was impossible to exaggerate the value of the work he did or the energy and devotion with which he laboured on this and other subjects. At the time of the appointment of the Commission, he had the same difficulty which every Minister had to face. He had to go to the Treasury to get the necessary money for the expenses of the Commission. The Treasury was not very much different then from what it was now. He had heard hard things said about the Treasury in that regard, but he must confess he had always found them very ready to listen to what he had to say and to do what they could in the way of giving a share of the funds at their disposal. But they were the guardians of the public purse and had to cut down expenditure as much as they could. There were some characters in this country of which they could not be too proud—namely, those good people who, when public money failed, came forward with some generous provision for carrying on a good purpose. In this case the Treasury found the money, but he had to find a suitable place in which the Commission could carry on its investigations. Sir James Blyth, now Lord Blyth, came to his assistance, and the Department were able to provide the necessary farm where the experiments were conducted. This entailed loss to Lord Blyth, but it had been borne out of a generous desire to serve the public. It was impossible to ignore the fact that even with that co-operation the labours of the Commission could not end with inquiry into one subject. It was no doubt true that scientific opinion did not now dispute the conclusions at which the Commission had arrived. Dr. Koch's theory of the non-susceptibility of man to tuberculosis from the lower animals had been entirely disproved. It was now admitted that there was a danger of man being infected by disease from the lower animals. But a good deal more had yet to be done in that regard. He knew little or nothing of the degree of risk to be run, either through milk or meat. He knew little of how that risk was to be dealt with. Everybody acquainted with the conditions of an ordinary farm must know that a great deal more knowledge had yet to be attained by investigations made in the interests of the public at large. He earnestly hoped that the Government would not check these inquiries. Apart from the question of milk and meat, there was another subject which required investigation, namely, how far it was safe to allow tuberculous cows to be retained in dairies for ordinary purposes. A good deal had to be done in that direction, partly because our knowledge on the subject had not been brought to a sufficiently high level, and partly owing to the fact that however much we knew of the application of the laws of health, the more accurate knowledge we could get the easier it would be to secure a proper administration of those laws. A great part of the difficulties that had arisen between the Local Government Board who were the pioneers in sanitary knowledge, and the Board of Agriculture and the local authorities, was that they were not all equally fortified with the results of scientific investigations. He hoped that nothing would be done to stay the progress of these investigations which were of the utmost importance to the lives of the people of this country. He did not say that it was absolutely necessary to continue the Commission as it was now constituted. He knew that Lord Blyth, whose heart was in this work, would make almost any sacrifice to continue the investigations, and if the present system was not altogether satisfactory — he had no authority to speak in Lord Blyth's name, but he believed his Lordship would be ready to meet the Government more than half-way if they had any suggestions to make. He repeated that this was a question above all others; at any rate, none was more important. It was a question vitally affecting the poorer classes of the country. The growth of the tuberculous diseases had been very serious. He did not know whether it was an actual growth, or whether it was owing to the fact that we knew more about them, and that their existence was made more public than formerly, but wherever one went, and asked the doctors what was the prevailing difficulty they had to meet, the answer was that it was tuberculous disease. Its effects were bad; it caused fearful suffering, and it frequently ended in death. The rich could surround themselves with every precaution; they could avail themselves of every possible remedy; but in the case of the poor that was impossible. They could not secure the separation which was essential in that kind of disease. The House would agree with him that only fifteen or sixteen years ago it was believed, not only by uninformed laymen, but by the medical profession, that tuberculous diseases were hereditary and not infectious. But it was now known beyond dispute, and he believed that no eminent scientist would deny it, that these diseases were communicable by individuals, and were not hereditary, except in this sense, that where an individual was affected with tuberculous disease—for instance a mother, the infant child which slept with her and breathed the same atmosphere as she, the unfortunate, suffering parent, might become infected, though it had not the disease hereditarily. If this fact was not known fifteen or sixteen years ago, so far as scientific knowledge went, how much more might they not possibly learn by patient investigation about this, one of the most terrible scourges of the human race? The total cost of the Commission was about £5,000 a year. He was the last to look upon that as a small or contemptible sum; he recognised that it was a considerable sum; but even if the amount were only £500, he held that not one penny of it should be spent save wisely, carefully, and in the public interest. But the £5,000 spent in continuing these investigations was money well spent in the interests of the people at large. A disease of this peculiar character affected not only one or two members of the family, but the whole of it, the mother and half-a-dozen children, who might become helpless members of society, unable to maintain themselves, unable to do their duty as citizens—a curse laid upon them, a curse which Parliament might help to remove. With the aid of science, which, in its turn, would lead to better administration, they might be able to reduce the disease to infinitesimal proportions. It was because he believed this to be no dream, but a practical work, which, if only smiled upon those in authority, might be carried on with immense advantage to the community, that he earnestly urged the Government to press on the work of investigation, at all events for a year or two more, in the hope that they might add to their store of knowledge, and in the belief that they would be doing something real and substantial in the interests of the health of the community at large, especially of its poorer classes.

*Mr. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) said he had listened, as he presumed other Members had done, with great satisfaction to the greater part of the observations of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to motor car traffic. The right hon. Gentleman was thoroughly well acquainted with the conditions of country life, and he was sure that all dwellers in the country owed him a deep debt of gratitude for raising the question in such a courageous way. He would press upon the President of the Local Government Board the view that the time had indeed arrived when he ought to take action in the direction pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman. He quite agreed that motor traffic was very useful, he had no desire to suppress it or interfere with it unduly. But it had been, and was being increasingly abused. The roads of this country were not suitable for express trains. As the representative of a country constituency which suffered very largely from the abuses of this traffic, he urged the President of the Local Government Board to exercise the undoubted powers which he possessed. He hoped the authorities of the Motor Union and kindred associations would note the declaration made on the authority of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, who thoroughly knew the conditions of the case in the country, that something which had always been denied on behalf of the motor interest, namely, that scouts were used to defeat the police, was the fact, and that the function of scouts was to act as conspirators to circumvent the police in the discharge of their duty. The right hon. Gentleman had said, on his great authority, that his experience showed him that this was absolutely true. He hoped that this observation would be taken note of by the motor authorities. He quite agreed that something might be done upon the lines of the regulations which had been pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman. But there was an obligation upon the President of the Local Government Board to do something much more than that. The situation was very simple. Parliament in its wisdom had thought it right to lay down in the Motor Car Act of 1903 that no person should under any circumstances drive a motor upon the public highway at a greater speed than twenty miles an hour. Anybody who knew anything about the conditions of country life knew that there was not one motorist in a hundred who paid any attention to that limit. There was not one motorist in a hundred who had the slightest intention of paying any regard to it; and it was idle in face of the experience we had had to suggest that the police could enforce that statutory obligation, and still more idle to suggest that they could enforce the conditions of Clause I. of the Motor Car Act against driving to the danger of the public if the speed-limit were taken away. Therefore, although he thought that the regulations suggested by the right hon. Gentleman would be very useful as far as they went, he hoped that the regulations would be made within the maximum speed-limit of twenty miles an hour, and that their operation would be to reduce the limit below twenty miles, and not below fifty or sixty miles, which was the present limit.

MR. WALTER LONG said he had perhaps not made himself clear. What he meant was that in addition to the powers given to local authorities, it should be made plain that their first duty was to check driving, at whatever speed, when there was ground for saying that it was dangerous to the public. That should be done without any regard to speed at all.

*MR. HERBERT said the right hon. Gentleman seemed to be more in accord with him than he had thought. He wanted to take this other point, namely, that the Local Government Board ought to fulfil a duty in the matter which it had hitherto entirely failed to carry out. The duty was imposed upon the Department by Parliament of seeing that the speed-limit of twenty miles was, in fact, carried out. How could they do that? The Local Government Board was given express powers under the Locomotives (Highways) Act, 1896, and under the Motor Car Act, to see that it was done. It was given powers to make regulations as to the construction of a car, its registration, and the particulars to be furnished before it was allowed to be on the roads, and therefore it was perfectly easy for the Local Government Board to carry out its duties by means of a regulation that no car which was geared—for it was not the question of power but the question of gearing—to go at a greater pace on the level than twenty miles an hour should be allowed to be registered or receive a licence from the county council. Why had the Local Government Board up to now failed to fulfil this duty? It was a duty clearly imposed upon it by the Act of Parliament. There was a speed-limit clearly laid down, and the duty was laid on the Local Government Board to see that the provisions of the Act of Parliament were carried out. They had never had any explanation from the Department as to why it had entirely failed to exercise its powers in this respect. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman whom they now saw with great satisfaction occupying the post of President of the Local Government Board would not be comforted by the thought that people, when in future they were covered with dust raised by a motor car going at excessive speed, might reflect that it was due to his failure to carry out his duty, or that, when children were run down, as they were very frequently in the villages of his constituency, and when his constituents were knocked over in large numbers in those villages, every one of them would be able to call down curses on his head because of the failure of his Department to perform its duty, and to make it absolutely certain that no car should go more than twenty miles an hour. For these reasons he supported what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and he hoped the President of the Local Government Board would see to it that the regulations were made and carried out.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland), in reference to motor traffic, desired to support the hon. Member for the Wycombe Division in urging that something should be done and done quickly. It was very unfair that the inhabitants of villages should be endangered, and that the inside of houses alongside the roadways should be filled with dust raised by motor traffic. If some of those who owned motor cars were compelled to live in roadside residences, or in the villages by the wayside, they would soon have a demand for early and vigorous legislation for the reduction of the existing motor nuisance on the highways. Again, in regard to the question of speed, during the last year or two there had been some very disgraceful cases of fully-grown adults having been knocked down on the highway and left there to die, the motorist passing on without giving the least assistance or taking the least notice. When men of that character drove motor cars it was time for the law to step in to prevent such occurrences. He had not himself seen anyone knocked down, but he had witnessed the running over of several very fine dogs, valued by their owners, without the drivers paying the least attention. If that was to be the standard of conduct on the highways then he endorsed all that had been said. He wished to call attention to the question of the milk supply and tuberculosis. Milk seemed to be a source of disease in this country. According to his information there could be no question that medical experts regarded the milk supply as a source from which this disease spread. He asked the President of the Local Government Board whether it was not a fact that on 5th March two private Bills with clauses to give powers for the better regulation of the milk supply had been promoted by one of the hon. members for Lancashire, and by the hon. Members for Blackburn and Widnes, and that the right hon. Gentleman had opposed them and promised to bring in a Government Bill to deal with the question. On 5th May he said the Bill was being prepared. Why was it that the measure was still in a state of preparation? There could be no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman himself admitted the importance of the question. Children were being sacrificed to an enormous extent, doubtless owing to the spread of disease through the milk supply; therefore, he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to press the matter forward in order that legislation might be passed at an early date with a view to grappling with the question. Another question, and to his mind the most important of the questions occupying the attention of Members, was the administration of the Unemployed Act. There could be no sight more sad than that of an unemployed worker seeking employment. During the past year he had seen, not once but often, some respectable unemployed worker who had turned out before six o'clock in the morning to go the round of the workshops in search of work, and repeating the process at nine o'clock in the morning to see whether at breakfast time there was any possibility of obtaining a job. He returned home depressed and sad, with the same sorrowful story to tell his wife and children—no work, no money, the cupboard empty. It was indeed a sad spectacle. And, let it be noted, there were thousands of these respectable workers out of employment to-day. There were 500,000 of these men, putting it at the lowest, who, if they had the opportunity, were ready to do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, instead of having to depend upon the Poor Law. It might be urged by the right hon. Gentleman that it was quite sufficient to take the experience of the two previous years, inasmuch as they were only going to have another £200,000 in order to meet the distress arising from unemployment. So far as he was concerned he would be sadly disappointed if that was to be the only provision to deal with distress from unemployment during the coming winter. In reading the newspaper yesterday he saw that the Local Government Board inspector had been visiting Sunderland, and had remarked that the distress due to unemployment there was less at present than it had been some time ago. He could only say that the number of men registered by the local distress committee last month was greater than in the corresponding month last year, and that the general indications showed that the distress was more keen than it was twelve months ago. The man who had saved something had got to the end of his small resources, and had to part with pieces of furniture and other articles in order that he might carry on a little longer. Only a fortnight ago there was the case of an unemployed worker which he put with all seriousness to Members of that House. The unemployed had their sympathy, but some persons were apt to look upon them as men who were not prepared to work even if they had the opportunity. Let them take the particular case which had occurred a fortnight ago. There they had an instance of a worker who had been unemployed for months. He got up at four o'clock in the morning to seek work. There was only a crust of bread in the house, and that he left for the children. He walked several miles, and gathered a sack of coals. He turned towards his home, carrying his load, and dropped by the wayside, where he died from sheer starvation. A spectacle of that kind in a wealthy country like England, with its boasted Christianity, certainly ought not to be possible. The right hon. Gentleman turned round to him and said—"Of course, he could have got Poor Law relief." He could only reply that the workhouses of the district were full to overflowing, and it was not always such an easy matter to get Poor Law relief as some people imagined. A large number of men—and in this he had the greatest possible sympathy with them—had a great repugnance to seeking Poor Law relief, and a still greater repugnance to entering the workhouse. They were the best of the unemployed workers who took up that position. So far as his information went, the outlook for next winter was very sad indeed, and the £200,000 they were to get would not in any way meet the demands of the distress committees in the various towns of the country to provide for the unemployed. He remembered that two years ago the right hon. Gentleman had said that—

> "Hollesley Bay Colony was an experiment, and that he intended it to go on with a view to its fair trial in order to see whether they were justified in leaving it to time to ascertain whether it was successful, meanwhile maintaining an energetic and firm administration. He hoped to be able to go into this question during the next two or three months and see what could be done to distinguish between the criminal and the chronic vagrant and the honest labourer and the genuine unemployed."

But he did not think that these experiments in regard to unemployment had received a fair trial. He did not think that they had been allowed that freedom which they might have had to deal with the unemployed in the manner in which those who sat on the Labour benches would like to see them dealt with. He had in his possession a copy of the correspondence which had taken place between the Hollesley Bay managers and the Local Government Board, and certainly its tone, to his mind, was not of that sympathetic character which one would have expected from the right hon. Gentleman, especially when one carried one's mind back to times gone by. Of course, he knew that the right hon. Gentleman felt just as keenly about the unemployment problem as they did themselves, and understood it just as well. Therefore, the tone and character of the letter were not such as they expected, particularly after the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman two years ago. Here was the letter—

> "I am sure you do not wish that your subsidised industry——"

That was hardly a respectful way in which to speak of it—

> "Should be used to ruin the local gardeners, who have their own battle to fight."

He thought from the tone of that communication that at all events Hollesley Bay was not getting that opportunity to do its best which had been indicated by the right hon. Gentleman two years ago. To his mind the case as regarded Hollesley Bay had never been fairly put before the House. He himself looked upon it as a genuine attempt to set the unemployed worker upon his legs and to make a man of him. In tackling the unemployed problem this would have to be taken into serious consideration. The idea in promoting Hollesley Bay was to acquire land with a view to placing men upon it permanently. What was the position? A man could not stay at Hollesley Bay longer than sixteen weeks, in which period he was to learn fruit-growing, or dairy farming, or whatever the branch might be. At the end of the sixteen weeks he must walk and make room for another. The instruction given him was thrown away. They had applied to the Local Government Board for permission to acquire several acres of land to which to transfer these men—a scheme to which the Government were favourable in view of their Small Holdings Act; but the Local Government Board had stepped in and said "No." For sixteen weeks a man at Hollesley Bay was taught, fed, and brought into an efficient condition to do work. That was time wasted, and the money spent ought not to be placed against Hollesley Bay, so far as a beneficial return was concerned. Let them take a part he knew well, where the scheme had been carried out through the agency of the Local Government Board, and what applied in that case applied to almost every case in the land. They took a man who had been out of work for six or nine months, and who was, from privation, physically unfit to do a hard day's work. Probably he had lived on tea and bread, They put that man to a hard labourer's job with pick or shovel, and because he collapsed and was unable to do the work that an ordinary, well-fed labourer would do, they said the experiments with regard to unemployment were a failure, and this was urged as an excuse for not continuing them. They would have to look at the unemployed problem from an altogether different standpoint. They would have to recognise that in eight cases out of ten the unemployed worker was physically run down, and that he should be nursed for a week or a fortnight before they could expect him to do the work necessary to provide the satisfactory results required by some Members of the House. When the right hon. Gentleman said he would give them 50 per cent. more to make up any deficiency, that was not altogether satisfactory so far as dealing with this problem generally was concerned. He wanted the right hon. Gentleman to give a lead, and to deal with the unemployment problem from the standpoint he had indicated. So far as he had been able to tell from the financial standpoint and from the general result in regard to labour, there was every reason to be pleased at the results at Hollesley Bay; all that was wanted was a little more generous consideration by the Local Government Board, and he felt sure that if they would give it, Hollesley Bay would be before long an example of what might result from a somewhat generous treatment of the unemployed. He knew the statement was made that they were competing against local gardeners, and so forth, but the correspondence indicated that they were quite prepared for the Local Government Board to inspect the books and go fully into the matter, and they defied them to prove that they had competed with local gardeners or anyone else to their detriment. That being so, unless the Local Government Board were prepared to accept the invitation and go down to prove what they asserted, they ought not to continue to make the assertion. In regard to cost, he had figures which went to demonstrate that to maintain in that colony 1,597 persons for over twelve weeks, the cost worked out at something like £1 0s. 7d per head. He knew it had been contended that it was considerably more, but he contended that the charges put forward by the President of the Local Government Board in regard to the upkeep of the place ought not to be included. If it was treated on fair and proper lines that was something like the sum which went to keep a man and his family of five. It cost 14s. a week now in London to keep a pauper, and he was only a pauper at the end of the year. He had given no beneficial result to the nation. If they viewed it from the standpoint that they had to keep a man and his family at the rate of 14s. a week each, and they could get the result he had indicated at Hollesley Bay by the employment of unemployed labour at a cost of a little over £1, it was certainly to the benefit of the nation that they should spend the money in that direction rather than that they should continue to waste it on Poor Law administration. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give fair consideration and a fair trial to Hollesley Bay and allow the promoters of the experiment to demonstrate what might be done with the unemployed, and that he would be able to tell them that in addition to the £200,000 that he set aside for dealing with unemployment during the coming winter, legislation would be promoted which would indicate that they were beginning to view this question of unemployment in the light in which it ought to be viewed, and that there was some prospect of something like a permanent settlement of the question. He could not imagine that Members were prepared to continue spending the money they were spending in useless and temporary experiments. Instead of that he asked that they should endeavour to give the unemployed worker some security in regard to employment and give him some heart in his work. If they did that the results would be different and they would have more satisfaction.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): said he wished to say a few words in regard to tuberculosis in cows. The *quasi*-scientific experiments which were made were altogether useless for the purpose of demonstrating that there was any danger to human beings from the consumption of the milk of tuberculous cows. They had taken the spittle of tuberculous persons and stuffed little animals full of it, and when the little animals had been ill they said they had transmitted tubercle from a human being to an animal, and, therefore, they were able to transmit tubercle from an animal to a human being. But that was no proof at all. It was the greatest possible mistake. If they took a large demonstration such as was to be got every day they found the reverse. They had cases where children and other people consumed as much milk as they wanted, and to a great extent there was comparative freedom from disease of that kind. In the East End of London where milk was very sparsely consumed, and where ½d. a day was considered a large expenditure on milk, there was a great deal of tubercle. There was no proof of connection between tuberculous milk and consumption at all. He had read most carefully all the information he could get on the subject, and he failed to see any connection. In regard to the question of the vaccine matter as supplied by the Local Government Board, they were continually having cases of children being killed by putting vaccine matter into the skin and so into the blood; then the Local Government Board sent down an inspector who made a secret inquiry and a secret report which was not shown to Members, and on the evidence of the secret report they made accusations against the mother as to her treatment of the child, and said it was from the smells of her back yard that the child died, although the doctor who had attended the case from beginning to end had certified that death was due to vaccination. It was really monstrous that the public should be fobbed off with secret reports in cases of this sort. Everyone who had studied the question knew that the stuff they got from these calves was full of dangerous germs. The reports of the Local Government Board medical men said that it was possible to mitigate the poisonous effect of these dangerous germs, but it was not done. They put the stuff into the child and the child got very ill and died, and then they said it was due to want of care after vaccination. It appeared then that vaccination was an operation which required the care of a trained nurse and the constant attention of a medical man every day, because if there happened to be a dirty back yard and anybody came from it into the room where the baby was, the baby was going to be poisoned. If this vaccine matter was to be put into little children, the children must be removed to a sanatorium and a proper hospital nurse put in attendance on them until they had entirely recovered. He had called the attention of the Department the other day to a case of death after vaccination. The doctor who vaccinated the child certified that he died of vaccination and then the inspector made accusations against the mother for not attending to the wound properly. But the report would not be brought forward. The inspector who made the report knew very well why it was to be kept secret. It was because if it was exposed to the light of day the whole ridiculous rubbish that they put into these reports would be exposed. If they were not ashamed of the report, let it be brought forward. He was sure the President of the Local Government Board would have no particular wish to keep the thing secret. It could only be done for the sake of the inspector who made the report. He hoped on these two subjects they would have some enlightenment from the President of the Local Government Board.

MR. SUMMERBELL said he desired to make a correction in fairness to the right hon. Gentleman. He had referred to the expression "subsidised industry" as emanating from his Department. He wished to withdraw it. It emanated from a Member of the House, and he apologised.

MR. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said the Hollesley Bay Colony, to which the hon. Member for Sunderland had just referred, was in the constituency he had the privilege to represent. He did not wish to say a word to discourage the work being done there to help the unemployed. On the contrary he admired the efforts being made there to educate and help those who temporarily resided at the place. It was a place in itself, both in character and in situation, admirably suitable for the purpose for which it was being used. And it had as superintendent a gentleman very specially qualified for the very difficult work. But many complaints came to him from time to time—some had come quite recently—from gardeners in the division of the injury they believed they sustained in their trade through the competition of Hollesley Bay produce at Ipswich and Felixstowe, the chief towns in the district. He believed the President of the Local Government Board had used his influence to have the great bulk of the produce now sent to London to sell. But, undoubtedly, there was still a strong feeling among the local gardeners and small cultivators, a very deserving class of men, that they were prejudiced in their struggle to get bread and pay their way by the sale of such produce as was still sent to local markets from the colony.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Surrey, Wimbledon) said that as a former President of the Local Government Board perhaps he would be permitted to say a few words. In everything that fell from his right hon. friend in regard to the *status* of the office, the question of tuberculosis and the continued efforts that ought to be made to extirpate it, and if that was impossible, to diminish the disease, and also with regard to motor cars, he did not think there was a word with which he did not most absolutely and cordially agree. It had always seemed to him they ought to diminish the great annoyances which were constantly inflicted on the public by reckless drivers of motor cars. With regard to the security of the public, what was wanted was not so much a restriction of the speed-limit as a more strict enforcement of the law against driving to the danger of the public. As his right hon. friend had pointed out, he thought that that could be carried out without wasting so much time and without trying to catch people under the trap system. If that were done he believed that to all intents and purposes the security of the public would be assured. He thought some more careful attention to the amenities of the roads was also necessary. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the intolerable annoyance inflicted on every house near the roadside by the clouds of dust which were raised by the enormous pace of motor cars. If more careful attention was paid to the amenities of the road those intolerable annoyances could be done away with. He could not see that there would be any great difficulty in putting this suggestion into effect by circulars from the Local Government Board, and if that were done they would hear very much less of this nuisance, and there would be an immediate diminution of the hardships inflicted upon those who were compelled to live by the side of the road and who now saw their little gardens ruined and the comfort of their homes suffer by these vehicles. This could easily be done by slackening the speed for a short time when motor cars were passing houses or cottages alongside the public roads. He agreed with what had been said in regard to the changes foreshadowed by Ministers at an earlier part of the session, and he shared the hope that before the debate was concluded they would hear something definite on the subject from the Government. He did not believe anyone who had not occupied the position of head of the Local Government Board could realise the enormous amount of work which fell upon that Department and upon the officials, who, for many years, were very insufficient in number compared with the work they had to do. He would give the House an instance which would carry absolute conviction upon that point. When he was first appointed to the Local Government Board it was no exaggeration for him to state that he found that Department to a large extent in a state of chaos and absolute confusion. Before he had been in that Department a month or six weeks he found instance after instance showing that there were letters which had not been answered for as long as eighteen months or more, and this was due to no fault of the officials but simply to the fact that the Department was insufficiently staffed.

So much was that the case that he had to make immediate representations to the Treasury on the subject. He did not, of course, meet with the response which he desired, but after taking the trouble to make the case perfectly clear, and getting a Departmental Committee to investigate the question in order to bring home conviction to the Treasury, the result was that no less than 118 additional appointments to the staff were made. He did not think that such a thing had happened in any other Department and he only quoted it as showing the importance of the work done by the Local Government Board. He hoped they would hear a definite statement on the subject from the right hon. Gentleman. That was not an occasion for long speeches and he would not detain the House any further. If, however, these should be the last words he would utter this Session he wished to say that it would add to the pleasure of his holidays to state that in regard to the kindly observations which had been made by his right hon. friend concerning the present holder of the office he shared to the full everything he had said.

*SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he wished to refer to two or three topics in the briefest way. The hon. Member for Sunderland had brought before the House and the President of the Local Government Board the administration of the Unemployed Act. He put a question a few days ago inviting his right hon. friend's friendly consideration of various suggestions as to improvement in its administration which he would not now enter upon in detail. What he did press upon the Government was the extreme desirability of reconsidering the regulations and circulars relating to the administration of this Act before the coming winter. They were all painfully aware that the pressure would be extremely great in the industrial districts during the coming winter, and he ventured to suggest and to press in the strongest possible way the desirability of introducing such changes in the regulations as would enable the Local Government Board and the Distress Committees all over the country to deal with deserving cases of men who desired work and could not obtain it. He hoped that there would be greater elasticity permitted in the treatment of such cases under the Unemployed Act, and that a larger number of those who really needed work might have suitable work provided for them during the coming winter than had previously been the case. He urged the adoption of a wider and broader policy with regard to the administration of this Act. He had thought the subject was left in the most unsatisfactory position by the debate on the Unemployed Bill last March. It seemed to him that the most striking feature of that debate was the statement of the very large number of deserving cases which could not be dealt with under the Act, and which were not covered by the existing administration. He specially appealed to the President of the Local Government Board on this point. He was absolutely at one with his right hon. friend in insisting on sound economical lines of working, and sympathised with the firmness with which he kept local authorities to the strictest policy of avoiding waste of public money and insuring strict probity. He asked him, while maintaining that wise policy, to consider whether by issuing fresh circulars to local authorities or by some alteration of the existing regulations he could not cover this point effectively in the interests of the larger number of unemployed which they would have to consider and deal with during the coming year. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin in a most interesting and useful speech had referred to the Report of the Commission on Tuberculosis. The subject of phthisis in our industrial towns was a most urgent question. As his right hon. friend knew he represented one of the most progressive districts in England in regard to this question. All through that industrial area there was the keenest possible demand amongst the working people for the compulsory notification of phthisis in order that the most effective machinery might be available for the elimination and extirpation of this disease. Whatever might be the case elsewhere it was found in the boot and shoe factories that infection was easily spread, and that stringent measures were necessary.

He would urge this consideration upon his right hon. friend. When this was insisted on, not by well-to-do people with large houses, who could easily isolate members of their families who were diseased, but by people in humble circumstances living in houses perhaps of two or three rooms, who were willing to submit themselves and the members of their families to all the disabilities and inconveniences of a strict regulation of their daily habits when disease came to a member of the family, and when they were willing to make these great sacrifices to protect their families and for the good of the community, he thought that it was time for the Local Government Board to bestir themselves and, in the interest of the health of the community, to help them and to show a bold and progressive spirit in dealing with this great evil. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had referred to the work of the Commission on Tuberculosis. He had paid attention to this matter for many years, and he wished to see this Commission hurried in its work. He did not wish that the work should be done inefficiently, but he thought it was time that the results of that great inquiry should be brought to bear on the problem to which he had alluded—one of the greatest problems which was facing the public at the present time. Sir Herbert Maxwell, a distinguished member of the party opposite, formerly a Member of that House, went to the Continent and studied this question, and he presented a Report which came before Parliament and the Board of Agriculture twelve years ago, and upon that Report not one stroke of work had been done. He thought it was a scandal that Parliament had not dealt with the question on the bold and strong lines which had been adopted in Denmark. That line of action was urged upon this country by Sir Herbert Maxwell, and if it had been adopted it might long ago have begun to help to eliminate tuberculosis from the herds of this country, and at the same time to remove the curse of tuberculosis from the human race. Referring to the question of motor traffic, he urged that the Local Government Board and the Home Office should combine in having more uniform instructions and more uniform practice imposed upon the police in the discharge of their duties. He thought the present state of things was absolutely ludicrous. In coming to the House the other day in a "taxi" the driver reduced the speed in St. James Park until the motor seemed almost to be arrested in its progress. He asked the man if there was anything wrong. "Not at all," he replied, "the only thing is that they are extremely strict here in St. James' Park." Motor vehicles were now in practice allowed often to go from fifteen to twenty miles an hour in crowded thoroughfares, while thus forcibly restricted to a very low speed in the parks. The present state of things was neither safe to the public nor creditable to the police of the metropolis. There ought to be something like uniformity for the protection of the public. He did not agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, and other speakers, that they ought to get rid of the speed limit. Nor was there any rational ground for complaining of the police for marking out certain areas, and timing motors as they passed along the roads within those limits. He would like to ask any commonsense man how the police could bring offenders against public safety to book except by means of what were called "police traps." It was an absurd title for that method of detection. It was quite right that they should use stop-watches and marked-out areas, and so obtain evidence with the view to the punishment of the offenders. A speed-limit was absolutely necessary, and, having regard to the fact that the public roads were used by every class of the community—they were the natural resort of children, old people, and other pedestrians, who had just as much right to the roads as motorists—he thought there ought to be a stringent reduction of the speed-limit. Motoring was an exhilarating delight which he enjoyed, but it was a scandal that it should be carried on as at present. He thought his right hon. friend would do well to take his courage in his hands and face the few small groups of rich and interested men who indulged in this delightful pastime in a way which was not consistent with the public safety. He would cut down the speed-limit considerably. He thought a limit of fifteen miles an hour was quite enough, and no motor car constructed so as to be capable of going beyond that speed should be allowed on roads frequented by the public. He did not believe that there was any real remedy for the evil except by that method, and by, if necessary on certain occasions and for certain purposes, marking off portions of roads. Let them, if possible, do what was done in Florida and elsewhere, take large areas or districts where the special speed-limits might be removed in order that motorists might enjoy greater freedom in the pursuit of this pastime. He thought, with regard to the Metropolis and other crowded areas, and also in regard to a great many country lanes which were frequented by children, the dangers connected with motoring were such that it was high time for the Government to take action in cutting down the speed-limit. He ventured to think that the two suggestions which he had made were practical, namely, to have a speed-limit of fifteen miles an hour, and to have motors so constructed as to be incapable of running above that speed.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) said he desired to support the strong appeal made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin to the President of the Local Government Board to take no steps which would at present dissolve the Royal Commission which had been at work for some time on the question of tuberculosis. The hon. Member for East Northamptonshire had complained that the Commission had not yet been able to publish the results of its investigations. He need scarcely remind the hon. Member of the extraordinary difficulty of the investigation in which the Commission had been engaged and how very unwise it would have been on their part to have published any conclusions before they were quite certain that those conclusions were logically true. In this connection he somewhat regretted the speech made by the hon. Member for Sleaford, who, under the influence of his extreme views on the question of vaccination, was unable to realise the value of the investigation and the character of the deductions from those investigations which had been made by the Members of the Commission. The Commission was appointed seven years ago, and they issued their first report in 1904. When that Report was issued, the late Sir Michael Foster was still Chairman of the Commission. He need scarcely say how deeply indebted the members of the Commission were to him for the valuable work he did and for the able Report which he presented. It was no small result when the first Report was issued that the Commissioners were able satisfactorily and entirely to disprove the assertion which the whole of the scientific world had been led to believe that there was no connection between human and bovine tuberculosis. That assertion was made on the authority of Dr. Koch, who possibly had not verified the conclusions to which he came as thoroughly as the members of the Commission had verified theirs. In that respect one of the objects of the reference to the Commission might be said to have been already achieved, and an important point had been gained, because it had rendered necessary what would otherwise not have been necessary, namely, the careful inspection of all animals that were used for food and a careful analysis of our milk supply. In spite of what the hon. Member for Sleaford had stated he thought he might say it was absolutely proved to demonstration that tuberculosis might be communicated through the milk of an infected cow. It had not yet been so fully proved that the consumption of the flesh of an animal suffering from tuberculosis could communicate tuberculosis to human beings who had partaken of it. That was one of the many subjects which were still unsettled and which would receive much careful consideration if this Commission continued its labours. Another reason why the Commission should be continued, or that some other body of scientific experts should be appointed to carry on the work so well begun by this Commission, was that laboratories had been fitted up for the express purpose of making these investigations, and the farm which Lord Blyth had hitherto placed at the disposal of the Commission, they hoped would still continue to be placed at the disposal of the Government at the expiration of the term of years for which the Commission at present existed. Apart from the scientific experiments with which the Commission dealt, there were several questions within the reference to that Commission which were not yet settled, and which were more or less of an administrative character. These related to the arrangements for the inspection of animals and also for the examination of our milk supply and the conditions under which that milk was distributed. Into those questions the Commission had not yet had time to enter, but their recommendations, as the result of their scientific investigations, should have the effect of influencing the action of the Local Government Board. He ventured, therefore, very sincerely to express the hope that at any rate for two or three years this Commission might be allowed to continue to exist. It was said that the cost of the Commission was £5,000 a year, but having regard to the important results which they have already undoubtedly achieved and which the eminent men of which it was composed would be able to achieve in the next few years, and the bearing of those results on the health of all classes in the community, he did not think that £5,000 a year devoted to scientific investigations of this importance was money ill-spent. He therefore ventured to support the appeal of his right hon. friend.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) said that three questions had occupied the time of the House—the regulation of the speed of motor cars, the endeavour to prevent the spread of that terrible disease tuberculosis, and the provision of better facilities for our fellow-citizens who were unable to obtain employment to secure it. He made no apology for stating that in his opinion the last-named question was the most important to the Labour Members. He had no desire to conceal that they were taking advantage of the Vote for the Local Government Board for the purpose of once more placing before the House the condition of a large number of the population, and the necessity there was for the Department doing something more than had been done up to now with regard to unemployment. He had no desire to enter into the discussion with any spirit of rancour or for the purpose of introducing personalities. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of that Department would clearly understand the reason why they were desirous of taking advantage of every opportunity of bringing this question before the House and the country. He was not going to say that some valuable work had not been accomplished by the Local Government Board. A great deal of distress in the various centres of industry was partially alleviated last winter by the donations of the Local Government Board in combination with local contributions; but he was bound to say that while it was alleviated to a considerable extent, the facilities which were held out to local public bodies were hopelessly inadequate to meet the distress. They wanted an extension of those facilities, and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would not misunderstand him when he said that he had received numerous letters of application from various industrial centres to which he replied briefly and very curtly that those places had not been ear-marked in accordance with the scheme of distribution of the money to be granted by the Local Government Board. In his judgment that restriction should be removed quickly and facilities should be given to those people to enjoy what it was possible for the Local Government Board to give them by opening up useful employment. The Committee was engaged the previous night in voting quite a lot of money. He took part in seven or eight divisions, and so far as he could gather they voted away a total of £20,000,000 in five or six minutes. [AN HON. MEMBER: More than that.] More than that, said an hon. Gentleman behind him; and before the House adjourned that night they would vote away more than that for defensive purposes and to prevent the possible invasion of this country by the forces of a foreign Power. To vote £200,000 for the sustenance of the men and women who helped to build up this nation and Empire was, in his judgment, hopelessly out of the question to meet the case. They desired that Parliament should give power to the Local Government Board to spend not only £200,000 but all that the President of the Board could persuade his colleagues to sanction for the purpose of at least alleviating partially the distress in the country. He recollected that prior to his coming into the House, during the term of the late Government, he had occasion in his capacity as a trade union official, to go with some of his colleagues before the then President of the Local Government Board and the late Prime Minister in order to lay before them suggestions of what they considered to be a practical character, for works which might be carried out without further legislation. On that occasion they mentioned the fact, which was then being inquired into by a Commission, of the rapid encroachments of the sea on valuable land, especially on the East coast. These encroachments, they said, could be arrested and the reclaimed land made a valuable asset to the country. That could be done, they said, through the agency of the Local Government Board if the Department were prepared to spend the money. The suggestion met with the sympathy of the late President of the Local Government Board and of the late Prime Minister; but the deputation did not go before them for sympathy but to ask them to put into operation something on the lines they put forward. They also placed before them the possibility of introducing a comparatively large scheme of afforestation. It was pointed out by men who had expert knowledge on the matter, that if a scheme of afforestation were put into operation it would give employment to a large number of people capable and willing to carry out that kind of work, which work in the course of thirty or forty years would become a valuable asset to the country. Further, they pointed out the possibility of a general reduction in the hours of labour, though that did not come under the Local Government Board Vote. There were put before the late Prime Minister and late President of the Local Government Board other suggestions of a practical character that required no legislation but only that the Department should spend money in putting them into operation at the earliest possible date. When the present Government came into power many of them expected great things from them with regard to unemployment. As a young man in a hurry and not knowing all the intricacies of the House, he was one of those who expected much; but candidly they had not received what they had anticipated from one with whom they had been long associated. They had no desire unnecessarily to carp at the operations of the Local Government Board, but he would remind the House that though the problem of unemployment was not so evidently before the public to-day as it was in the months of December and January last, it was still there if hidden by the good weather we were enjoying. He was quite within the points of logic and legitimacy when he said that there were at the present moment 12,000,000 of people at the lowest estimate, below the submerged tenth. That was a condition of affairs that the Department should seriously consider, and accordingly he hoped that during the coming autumn some of the hints thrown out in the discussion would have the necessary effect on those who were in control of the Department. A point had been raised by his hon. friend who opened the discussion with regard to certain misstatements which had been made with reference to operations that had gone on under the guidance of certain unemployed bodies. They had read in the newspapers that when the women's department of the Central Unemployed Body tendered for clothing, the tenders were so high as compared with ordinary private enterprise tenders that it was impossible to carry out the work. And in order to give the House an illustration of what he meant, he would read a quotation from a communication which appeared in the *Morning Post.* In the *Morning Post* of 22nd July there appeared a statement by an expert whom evidently the Local Government Board relied on. The Poplar Board of Guardians was supposed to have invited tenders for certain articles, and the expert declared that the lowest tender for men's flannelette vests was 1s. 9d., and that that of the Women's Department of the Unemployed Body was 2s. 11d., which left a margin of

1s. 2d. between the tenders of the private contractor and the Central Unemployed Body. What were the facts? The forewoman of the Women's Department had written to the Chairman of the Central Unemployed Board, who happened to be Mrs. Tennant, the wife of an hon. Member of this House, and said—

> "With regard to the Poplar guardians' contract commented on by the *Morning Post* on 22nd July, the first paragraph *re* prices as to one item is quite incorrect. The Central Unemployed Board did not tender for men's flannelette vests at all, but for flannel, and at the price of 2s. 1d., and not 2s. 11d."

That showed that the expert had misled the public to the extent of 1s. 2d. That applied also to the money expended on other matters. If the Local Government Board was misled to that extent by its expert knowledge with regard to the cost of the work turned out by private contract and that turned out by the Central Body of Unemployed it meant that many people in the country must regard as useless all the efforts and experiments that were being made in this direction. In the past great efforts were made by the late Robert Owen who tried many experiments on the communal, co-operative principle in the midst of competition, but they were failures because he was surrounded by private competitors who made such sacrifices as to swamp him. Everything done up to the present time was of the most meagre description, and no opportunity had been given to show that big work could be promoted by these bodies. He trusted that greater efforts would be made in the future on genuine democratic lines by the expenditure of more money. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider in the near future the advisability of greater facilities being given for afforestration, the reclamation of the foreshores of the country, and other matters to which he had referred and provide the money for the purpose of carrying out in times of depression those forms of useful work which were necessary to every industrial centre in the country. He did not believe that under our competitive system it was possible to absorb the unemployed at the present moment. All they could suggest and all they could ask for were these paliatives which would tend to reduce the evil to some extent. That was all they could claim, but there were many in the House who believed they would be able by taking a more comprehensive view of the wealth production of the country to bring about a system which should absorb unemployment once and for all. However, while the grass was growing the horse was starving, and they were there to ask the right hon. Gentleman to utilise all the power of the Local Government Board for the purposes of doing everything within the scope of present legislation that could be done for unemployment. Unemployment was with us to-day. When the winter months came it would be seen more clearly, but when poverty was parading itself was not the time when the House should discuss the problem. It was now, and they asked the right hon. Gentleman to discuss it now.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) quite agreed with the right hon. Member for Wimbledon that everybody who lived in villages through which motor cars passed suffered very great hardship, and that Parliament ought to do its best to ameliorate their condition. He was in favour of reducing the speed-limit through villages to ten miles an hour. But when it came to the question of speed on the highroads, what was the use of a law which could not be enforced, a law which was broken by every Member of the House, from the Prime Minister downwards, who owned a motor car capable of going more than thirty miles an hour? With regard to the question raised by the hon. Member for Sunderland, and also by the hon. Member who had just spoken, the question of unemployed, he believed it was one of the most important questions this country had to face. Statistics showed that at present there was a far larger number of men out of work than probably was ever known for a similar period in modern times. They would be faced with a most urgent crisis during the coming winter, and it threw a responsibility upon the Government which entitled the House to some explanation as to their intentions. Judging from the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivered on Tuesday, it seemed that it was the deliberate policy of the Government to add to the number of unemployed. The right hon. Gentleman foreshadowed in the near future reductions in the national defences. That would be not only a danger to the Empire, but must add largely to the number of unemployed. He wished to know how the Government were going to provide for the thousands of men who would be thrown out of work by the passing of the Licensing Bill and the Miners (Eight Hours) Bill. He would suggest that a means of increasing employment could be found in preventing the dumping in this country of manufactured goods by the foreigner. He knew that the Government were pledged to free trade, but he could not understand the Labour Party fixing the standard of wages that should be paid to trade unionists, and at the same time allowing thousands of pounds worth of foreign goods to come into this country with the result of keeping down or destroying employment.

*MR. DOBSON (Plymouth) said he had not intended to take part in the debate and did not decide to do so until he heard complaints from certain hon. Members that there had not been a sufficiently hearty response on the part of the President of the Local Government Board to the demands they had made on behalf of unemployment. He supposed the right hon. Gentleman had been in office sufficiently long to be able to resist any of the attacks made on him. It was only fair, however, experiences having been given by certain Members after failure to obtain satisfaction from the right hon. Gentleman, that he should say that so far as his own experience went he had every reason to be satisfied. It fell to his lot to appeal to the right hon.Gentleman for a further vote from the Unemployment Fund for relief of the distress which existed in the constituency which he represented. Despite the fact that they already had been most liberally dealt with when he was able to prove that the money was wanted not for some charity or in relief of the poor rates, but for carrying out work of a useful and practical kind, he had no difficulty in inducing the right hon. Gentleman to give another large instalment, notwithstanding that an adjoining district where useful, practical work could not be shown they had received refusals from the right hon. Gentleman. He could state half-a-dozen cases which would show that the right hon. Gentleman was fully alive to the question and was always willing to help distress when he could conscientiously do so. As far as business-like aptitude was concerned, he would say that in the early part of last winter when the borough of Croydon resolved to erect a large swimming-bath, it was pointed out that if the work could be put in hand, a considerable amount of work could be given to the unemployed in the town during the winter months. The idea was at first scouted because it was supposed that many months must elapse before the Local Government Board would hold their inquiry and sanction the loan. The mayor and corporation, therefore, asked him to intercede with the right hon. Gentleman, and he called upon him at his office and represented the case, pointing out the great amount of distress that existed in the building trade at Croydon, and stating that if the right hon. Gentleman could expedite the matter it would be of great assistance in reducing unemployment. Within three weeks of that time an inspector had been sent down, the inquiry made, and the sanction of the Local Government Board given to the loan, and within five weeks of the original application the work was put into the hands of the contractors and fifty or sixty men were given useful employment who otherwise would have been without work. Hon. Members had accused the right hon. Gentleman of being indifferent to the unemployment demand of the country, and therefore he thought it right to get up and say that there were two sides to the question, and that if the facts were fairly and squarely put before the right hon. Gentleman he was always willing to do his best to assist them.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) called attention to the administration of the Local Government Board in connection with matters in relation to municipal and county boroughs. He did not wish to say a word against the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board, who was regarded by the municipalities as a most benevolent despot. The right hon. Gentleman did not always concur with their views or accept their conclusions, but on the whole, in all matters of administration except in the matter of finance, they had his ready concurrence and most useful advice. The first question he desired to raise was the position the right hon. Gentleman had taken with regard to the payment of wages to workmen out of borrowed moneys. During the last two years the Local Government Board when sanctioning a loan for the carrying out of public works had imposed a condition that the wages of any permanent workmen who might be engaged on such work should not be defrayed out of the loan so sanctioned. It might be a good condition, but it was a serious thing for the municipalities, and it had on one occasion resulted in the increase of one half-penny in the rates. It was not, however, a question of the incidence of taxation but of the fairness or unfairness of the action of the Local Government Board in relation to such work. Most local authorities objected to this new departure on the part of the Local Government Board. To show how injuriously this condition worked, he pointed out that the municipalities were not allowed to transfer their best men to the capital expenditure department for any new work that was being carried on, and the work had to be left to men who were employed by the contractor, who might not be so good. He could not see that it was a question of men being employed permanently or on contract at all; the question was whether the work on which they were employed was a capital expenditure work. If it was, the men employed upon it should be paid out of capital expenditure, and not out of revenue. The work of repairing a road should be paid out of revenue. If the men engaged upon that work were put on to making a new road they should be paid out of capital, but it was said that they must be paid out of revenue because they were employed permanently. Of course, that could be remedied by taking the men out of the permanent employment and putting them on to the contract job. The view of the municipalities was that the men engaged on these works ought to be permanent men of ability. They would far sooner have permanent men than contractors' men whom they had constantly to supervise in the conduct of the work. They often found that in contract work it was considered right to scamp it in some way and not to render work which the nature of the undertaking required. In the case of sewage disposal a large amount of casual labour was employed, but it was necessary to use gangs of overseers who were familiar with the work. Those men again could not be paid out of capital expenditure. In other matters where large amounts of casual labour were employed, the use of permanent men had a tendency to increase the cost of the structural work, which much discouraged the employment of permanent labour by the municipal authorities. It also resulted in the work being given out to contract and the importation of a large number of casual labourers instead of the work being done by the permanent staff. To the use of so much of casual labour was due the amount of unemployment that existed, and it was desirable to prevent the increase of casual labour by this system which was bound to employ many men for short and irregular periods. He failed to understand on what principle the President of the Local Government Board had taken up this stand as regarded these loans; it was only possible on one condition, namely, that he had no trust in the administration of the municipality. If he had he could not see why this question should be raised. But undoubtedly there was this in it, that with a large municipality the work was likely to be properly carried out and the allocation to be complete, and also there was not at all likely to be the taking of the men unnecessarily which might occur in smaller towns where they did not have a large amount of work going on and where they might take on a staff, and, allocating them improperly to capital work when they were engaged on revenue purposes, increase the cost of the work and relieve the rates improperly from the payments that ought to be made. While that was quite possible in the smaller localities where they only had a small expenditure on public works and did not have a large expenditure on repairs, it was absolutely impossible in big places like Birmingham, Manchester, or Liverpool, and it was a great hardship on larger cities that it should be impossible for them to use their permanent men on capital works without having to charge that expenditure to revenue and not to capital. It meant a very large increase in rates, and it introduced what was so objectionable—the employment of casual labour and contracting for work when it would be so much better done by the employment of a permanent staff. The next point he wished to raise was the question of the sinking fund on waterworks, which were fairly permanent works. They were not built for the purposes of a day, but for centuries, and they had evidence of what they could be in the great waterworks of Rome, Italy, and Spain as well as in many of more modern date in this country. What was the action of the Local Government Board as regards waterworks? The most serious case was that of the Halifax Corporation. In March, 1906, the Local Government Board were approached in reference to these waterworks and were asked to permit the sinking fund to run for a period of fifty years. The Local Government Board refused and fixed it at a shorter period which raised the rate by 7½d. in the £. That was a very serious matter, and there were many other instances of a similar nature. Resolutions had been forwarded to the Prime Minister from time to time by the corporation, and a deputation had been asked for though they had not been received. The Local Government Board had referred to a Select Committee's Report in which the reasons in favour of short periods for loans were set out, but so far as waterworks were concerned the reasons given were decidedly weak, indefensible, and contradictory. It might be right to have a short period for gasworks, tramways, electric works, or sewage disposal works, but, as regards waterworks, he failed to see the principle on which it applied. So far as regards the borough of Halifax, some of their waterworks were constructed in 1820, some in 1851 and some in 1870, and all these were as good as new and the cost had been absolutely written off at the expense of previous generations. The term of sixty years was by no means unreasonable, but the President of the Local Government Board gave them thirty years, which was entirely insufficient for such works as these. The burden of rates was constantly increasing, and while it was quite right that matters of short life should bear a short period, matters of long life should be so adjusted as to bear a long period and relieve the rates leaving the future generation to bear their share. In the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1903, eighty years had been substituted for sixty years, and in the Housing and Town Planning Bill, which he congratulated himself he was associated with the right hon. Gentleman in attempting to pass, and he hoped they would get it through very speedily—it was one of the best Bills ever brought before the House—eighty years was the period. He had every confidence in the right hon. Gentleman's judgment, but he hoped that the education and the growing resources of civilisation would make the inhabitants eighty years hence indisposed to accept as comfortable dwellings the dwellings they were now putting up to last eighty years. He questioned as a matter of comparison why eighty years should be allowed for these cottages and only thirty years for school buildings, thus adding enormously to the education rate. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to be the dictator of the Cabinet. The matter was brought before the late Prime Minister and the then Minister for Education, and they accepted the principle that eighty years was the proper period to give for school buildings, and school buildings of the present day would last that period. When it came to an application for a loan in order to raise these buildings, the President of the Local Government Board intervened and refused to accept the view of the Prime Minister and only gave them thirty years in which to repay the sinking fund. The result was that the education rate had increased and the cost of the buildings to the community was enormously put up. The present Prime Minister said in an interview last year that it seemed an anomaly that the period for repayment in this particular case should be, in consequence of recent legislation, as short as thirty years, and in the case of other buildings which were not *prima facie* more durable in character it should be as long as fifty years and in some cases sixty. It was strange that two leading lights should be absolutely satisfied that the longer period was sufficient for these education buildings, and that the President of the Local Government Board should override them and say the education buildings were rubbish, badly constructed, and unfit for the purpose—that they were jerry buildings upon which he could only allow a period of thirty years for sinking fund. It raised the question in the mind of the municipality "Where are we? Who is the head of the Cabinet, the President of the Local Government Board, or the Prime Minister?" They obtained approval and went away very cheerful from interviews with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Education, and were depressed shortly afterwards by a communication from the Local Government Board which overrode all their cheerful anticipations. Matters affecting the municipality in every possible way had increased the burden of rates, and prevented the municipality from being so willing as they would have been to expend money upon new waterworks and new capital expenditure because of the very excessive cost to the ratepayer. He failed to see how it could be right to give cottages for the working classes eighty years in which to survive while waterworks which would last centuries and schools which would last 100 years were only allowed thirty years within which the ratepayers should pay for them. He did not intend to join in any effort to reduce the right hon. Gentleman's salary, because he felt grateful to him for many things he had done in regard to municipal administration. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider this matter favourably with a view to seeing whether he could not place the Sinking Fund in relation to municipalities on a better basis.

MR. G. A. HARDY (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said he wished to associate himself with what had been said by the hon. Member for Plymouth as to the thorough manner in which the right hon. Gentleman had carried out the Act about which they were speaking. Perhaps they had never had a Minister who had controlled this great Department more sympathetically than the present President of the Local Government Board. There was one thing, however, he hoped the President would remember throughout the coming winter, and it was that they were going to be visited with an unusual crisis, an intimation of which had only just been brought to their notice. They had, in fact, only realised it that day, because the London County Council had decided to close down its Works Department, with the result that there would be thousands of men thrown out of employment. With that fact in front of them it might be well for the President of the Local Government Board to consider carefully what he could do to help the people of London who would be ruthlessly thrown out of employment by the action of the London County Council. Like many other hon. Members of the House he had received letters from his constituents with regard to the excessive speed of motor cars, and in the particular constituency which he had the honour to represent he was told that on account of the police not being active they were unable to obtain convictions. They had brought actions against the scouts, but they had failed. He had a letter only yesterday in which it was stated that in Stowmarket the police were not properly controlling the speed of motor-cars. He felt that the lead in this matter which had been given them by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, was one for which the whole House felt grateful. They had lost the liberty of the road and they all desired to recover it, and they believed that only through the instrumentality of the President of the Local Government Board and his power could they possibly recover that liberty which had been the right of the people of England for so long.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said the House had listened to an interesting discussion upon the estimates of the Local Government Board, and they had heard from various speakers of the wide range of duties which came within that Department.

With regard to the duties of that Department and the present *status*, he had been asked by the late President of the Local Government Board the Member for South Dublin directly to say a word or two before he dealt with other points. He had been asked to state with regard to the future *status* of the Board of Trade and the Local Government Board what the Government were doing in connection with both those offices. In reply to that kind question, put with so much sympathy and appreciation of the officers of the Local Government Board and himself, he could only say that the subject of the *status* of the Local Government Board and the Board of Trade was immediately before the Government. It was now before the Cabinet and he trusted that before long some of, and perhaps all, the desires and hopes that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had so sympathetically expressed might be realised by a recommendation of the Government. In the event of the *status* of the Local Government Board being raised, as he thought it ought to be raised, as co-equal with the Board of Trade, and even to the level of a Secretaryship of State, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that if that consolation was secured and they enjoyed a wider sphere of activity, a larger *status*, and perhaps, as occasionally came from both, an extended remuneration, there was no one to whom they would be more indebted than to the right hon. Gentleman and his generous questions to-day and his more generous speech when last this subject came within the purview of Parliament. He might add on this subject that concurrently with considering such exalted things as *status* and such sordid things as salaries, they were also considering whether the time had not arrived when there might safely be carried out an interchange of duty from several of the Departments which were now doing work which other Departments could more cheaply and more efficiently carry out. There ought to be an interchange of duties and a readjustment of powers and functions, and he was glad to say that the various offices whose *status* and salaries were being considered were in the most frank and friendly way, without any consideration for their own particular sphere of duty, undertaking investigations as to how this could best be done with the simple object of serving the public through better organised Departments with exchange of duties more efficiently than they now could. He trusted that when the result of the action of the Government was brought before the House of Commons their recommendations would be as unanimously received as the desire for them had been sympathetically expressed that afternoon. Turning from that subject, the right hon. Gentleman opposite and other hon. Members had raised the question of the administraton of the Motor Car Acts. He did not think it was necessary so soon after they had had an important discusson at an all-night sitting to deal at any great length or in any detail with this particular subject, because on that occasion he laid before the House what was being done and what they hoped to do in the future. The right hon. Gentleman had addressed to him this practical point. He suggested that the Local Government Board might consider the advisability of issuing a circular pointing out to the local authorities their powers and duties and liabilities in regard to motor car and vehicular traffic. The right hon. Gentleman was not to blame for raising this question, but as a matter of fact he had promised the House of Commons over a week ago that he would issue a circular not only upon the particular subject referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, but upon a number of other subjects akin to the point which the right hon. Gentleman had mentioned. That circular was under consideration, and he believed it would comply with the wishes not only of the right hon. Gentleman but also of others who had expressed their opinions upon the question. He agreed in the main that they ought to make Section 1 of the Motor Car Acts the basis of nearly all their actions in dealing with this subject. He believed that where a man drove any vehicle, whether horse-drawn or propelled by mechanical means, to the danger of the public and to the risk of the lives of foot passengers passing across or using the roads, whether driving at one, five, fifteen, or twenty miles an hour, the driver should be held liable and fined and, in extreme cases, imprisoned. He shared the view that it detracted from the efficient and proper discharge of the duties of a policeman engaged in controlling the roads to be watched by motor scouts, and that was a form of supervision which in his opinion the sooner they got rid of the better. He thought the Motor Association would be well advised to withdraw the motor scouts who watched the police, because he was perfectly convinced that the policemen could not do their duty as fairly and impartially as they ought to do, because both scouts and policemen were only human, and they could not get that impartial exercise of the duties of a policeman when he was supervised and spied upon by an army of unemployed scouts employed by motorists. With regard to sign posts, he had issued a circular on that particular subject and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman who raised the question and motorists generally would be glad to know that in the last few years nearly 10,000 sign posts had been put up by local authoities warning all sections of the public as to the dangerous conditions of certain roads. He had also issued another circular as to local authorities and private owners of land contiguous to the roadways so to co-operate with the local authority and the police and district surveyors that corners of roads should be rounded off, that hedges should be reduced in height at the cross roads, and generally speaking that the police, the local authorities, and others affected should co-operate in order to remove some of the dangerous places which existed upon many of our roads. He would deal with the various points in the circular which he contemplated issuing, and with some of the mechanical points suggested to him. As an engineer himself he did not attach much importance to mechanical contrivances, however skilfully designed, with the object of applying to a motor car any mechanical governors for preventing a vehicle going over fifteen miles an hour. He knew how governors could be manipulated. A large number of engines had governors, but there were methods of dealing with them and with safety valves which were known to engineers and which were not always approved of by inspectors. With regard to the question of the roads the Department had had an opportunity in co-operation with the local authorities of doing something; and he was sending an inspector, an engineer who knew the subject very well, to Paris, where the various cities of the Continent were holding an international conference on the question of road construction and maintenance and the adoption of reasonable and practical methods for the prevention of dust and the improvement of roads both in town and country. He had also asked the Motor Associations to consider seriously, not only in their own interest, but in the interest of the public who maintained the roads, whether they could not abandon the armoured, studded tires that were now general. He thought motorists would be well advised if they realised that public opinion was hardening considerably against the man who owned a motor-car and drove it under conditions and at a speed which were not in accordance with the neighbourly and kindly amenities that ought to exist among all travellers on the roads. They would be well advised if they recognised how public opinion was moving, and did not provoke the Department to go to the extreme length anti-motorists had advised them to go, which he would be very reluctant to do. They had to be told and, if necessary, compelled to put their house in order, and, if they did not, he would see that they were kept decently in order. He believed that the result of the circulars that had been issued, of the action now being taken, and of the hints he had given that afternoon to the motorists, would be that they would be able to allow a great industry to be developed consistently with a reasonable regard for life, and with a reasonable amount of safety.

He now came to the question of tuberculosis. The right hon. Gentleman opposite very properly referred to the Commission which he appointed. That Commission was appointed some six years ago, and it had been presided over by two gentlemen of great distinction, and the doctors and officers who served on it deserved the praise of the community. The final Report was in preparation, and he had been pressed by doctors and by some of the Commissioners to extend the reference and scope of the inquiry. That he was disinclined to do, because he thought that the £50,000 or £60,000 it had cost and the six or seven years of time it had taken were almost enough for the particular subject. He was, however, prepared to consider whether the present farm and laboratory so generously placed at the disposal of the nation at considerable cost and some inconvenience by Lord Blyth might not be carried on. On the general question of infectivity, both in men and in animals, of tuberculosis he need not dwell, because in connection with the Milk Bill, which he had promised, which he had in draft, and which he hoped to let the House have as soon as he could obtain from the Board of Agriculture their views on the question of tubercular cows, they would be able to discuss it at greater length. Serious though the scourge of consumption was, he did not hope for its discontinuance and final abatement so much from medical or laboratory work, as from other and better causes and remedies. Speaking broadly and generally, he regarded consumption, the world over, as a social disease, due to low wages, bad and insufficient food, and bad house accommodation. It connoted, as a rule, a low standard of comfort, and synchronised with bad economic and social conditions, and until we rose to a higher standard we could never hope to get rid of consumption wholly. It was satisfactory to know as Britons, that in this regard, as in many other aspects of public health, we were leading the world. In London one and a quarter persons died of consumption to two in Berlin and two and a half to three in Paris. To put it in a better form, in the last thirty years the death-rate from consumption had diminished from twenty-five to ten per 10,000. That had occurred since the Education Act of 1870 was passed, and the improvement had been accelerated during the past ten or fifteen years as the result of better public health legislation, and by cheap food which this nation commanded for its poorer people to a greater extent, perhaps, than any other nation in the world. The hon. Member for Liverpool had spoken about the restrictions of the Local Government Board with regard to the periods of loans to local authorities. They granted eighty years for land, sixty years for houses under the Housing Acts, and only thirty years for other buildings including school buildings. That was in no sense inconsistent or illogical. There was a great deal of difference in these objects. Houses paid rent and were self-supporting, but there was nothing financially self-supporting in education, though the expenditure upon it was one which it was beneficial to the nation to incur. It might not be realised how quickly designs in schools changed and how quickly things altered. He would take the case of the London County Council. In the last three or four years the London County Council had been in a position to spend £140,000 on the repair of schools before the loan period of thirty years became exhausted. That in itself was an argument for the policy which the Local Government Board pursued, and so long as he occupied his present post he would do his best to inculcate on local authorities that the present generation should bear, roughly speaking, its own burdens, and that loans should not be granted for too long a period. Considering how taste changed in regard to the designs of school buildings, and how rapidly other things altered, it seemed to him that a capricious generation which spent a great deal in the improvement of schools should bear the responsibility for payment. Complaint had been made that it was unfair to local authorities to refuse to allow salaried officers to be paid out of loaned money. He was not a banker, but he knew sufficient of good finance to know that this was in the interest of local authorities. It was essential that they should be noted for their credit because they had to get their money in markets that were very susceptible to unbusinesslike habits on the part of those to whom they lent money. Nobody in his position would allow salaried officers to be paid out of lent money. What was the hardship? Supposing a loan was granted of £10,000 for a sewer, £5,000 was for material and £4,500 for wages. It was not fair that the surveyor, the engineer, and the superintendent of works, who ought to be salaried officers regularly employed, should have a portion of their salaries paid out of lent money. It was bad finance which he did not intend to run the risk of promoting. One of the chief difficulties in the unemployed problem in this country was the extent to which local authorities, and even

Government departments, had borrowed money and spent it in a way which took no notice of the regular employment of a smaller number of men on work while it was being carried out. The process the Department had adopted of allowing no salary to be paid out of a loan had decasualised labour. Instead of interfering with direct employment, it had enabled local authorities to take a wider view of their duties, and to employ men more regularly than they otherwise would have done. Therefore, for financial reasons, he asked the House to support him. The hon. Member for Sunderland had raised the important question of the unemployed. It was only right that before he dealt with the speech of the hon. Member that he should congratulate the House on the absence of criticism, especially querulous criticism of his Department, and that the House should have the opportunity of knowing the facts in regard to the operations of the Local Government Board on the unemployed question. They had eighty-nine Distress Committees in England and Wales, of which thirty had received grants from the Local Government Board. England and Wales had received £124,000, of which £62,000 had gone to London alone, or £104,000 to London and district, which included West Ham, Walthamstow, Leyton, East Ham, and Tottenham. Scotland, with which, technically, he had nothing to do, had received over £19,000. Ireland had received £4,500. Whatever might be the outlook for Scotland and England and Wales—and he did not endorse the pessimistic outlook which had been uttered in the columns of *The Times* by a gentleman who ought to know better—he was glad to say that Ireland, this last winter, had not been so badly off as the year before, and, judging from what he heard, Ireland was not likely to share in the depression this coming winter in England and Wales—a depression which, in his judgment, was exaggerated. For the money expended, 90,000 men were registered, and 3,000 women. These figures must be taken with many qualifications, because registration was very frequently loose and indulged in by men who were only unemployed for a short time, but were not out of work in the ordinary sense of that phrase. Of those 90,000 registered, 54,000 were qualified, and of the 54,000 qualified 37,000 received work; or over 60 per cent. It was interesting to know that of the men qualified and registered, 5,469 refused work, he hoped because after registering they had got work through the ordinary channels of their own trade, which was much better than relief work. 80 per cent. of the total number of men registered were between the ages of twenty and fifty—rather a surprising thing; whereas, 26 per cent. were of the ages of thirty and forty. These figures indicated that the theory of "too old at forty" for many forms of work had in the past been exaggerated. Another interesting fact which he learnt from these figures was that 53 per cent. of the total number of men who were qualified and received work were general or casual labourers. 19 per cent. of the total were from the building trades, in which a large proportion of them would be general labourers, more skilled than casual, but still not mechanics, In other words, 72 per cent. of the total number who were registered, qualified, and received work were either general or casual labourers, or from the building trades. The men received from one and three quarters to sixteen weeks work; the women, he was glad to say, from twelve to thirteen and a half weeks' work. The men received an average of £3 10s. for the work they did on the relief works, whilst labour colony men received £6 8s. on an average for the period they were at the various colonies. Six thousand people were emigrated through the agency of the local authorities and a new form of relief, perhaps in many ways the best form that had come to light, migration from one part of the country to another was resorted to in the case of 776 men. He had given this summary of the work of the distress committees because he thought it would be as well for the House to have a conspectus of the facts before he dealt with the criticisms of hon. Members. He rejoiced to notice that not in one single instance had he received either outside the House or from Members of the House who represented distressed areas, a single complaint or criticism as to lack of promptitude on the part of the

Local Government Board in dealing with this problem of the unemployed during the past year. He thought that men who knew him would credit him with no lack of sympathy with this particular subject. It was true that at times one had to be more firm, or appear to be more firm, than one really was; but it was impossible to govern an Empire with a Cabinet of Sunny Jims. One could not administer an unemployed grant so as to satisfy a number of sentimentalists, who, if they were in his office and had uncontrolled power over £200,000 would give much of the money at their disposal to their own district, to the wrong people, and at the wrong time, with the most disastrous results. In so far as he had been able to do so he had spent this money with a due regard for work done, and every consideration for the claims of the local authority. That was demonstrated by the fact that he had received many votes of thanks which he had handed over to his colleagues. In fact, he was almost becoming more hardened to the votes of thanks which he had received from local authorities for the way in which the Department had carried on their work, than to votes of censure. He approached next winter, not with the gloomy expectation of some hon. Members. The hon. Member for Holderness had asked him, what the Local Government Board was going to do. He would tell him and he thought the hon. Member would approve. As soon as the Commission on Afforestation and Coast Erosion, of which the hon. Member himself was a useful Member, reported, which he hoped they would do in the early autumn, the Government were prepared to consider that report, to take the whole of it within their purview and, if possible, to be prompt and practical in interpreting the Report. But, as far as he was concerned he was not going to lose his head; or to be driven into foolish action at the instance of panic-mongers, political mischiefmakers, and people in certain quarters who, he did not hesitate to say, were putting forward uneconomic ideas, and using the unemployed to an extent which he hoped would not be continued. He intended to approach the winter with a golden heart but not with a head of quicksilver; and if the hon. Member would leave this problem to him to deal with through the winter, he hoped to do his duty sympathetically and promptly up to the highest level. The hon. Member for Sunderland, who had a perfect right to speak on this subject, and whom he understood very well, had asked him if he would deal with the exceptional distress in his area. The hon. Member had said, and it was echoed by other Members, that the Department should show a little more freedom in dealing with the subject, and a little more laxity in its treatment. The hon. Member had no complaint to make but thanked the President of the Local Government Board and his officers for the kindness with which they had treated the exceptional distress in Sunderland. He would tell the hon. Member why he should not be so depressed. The Local Government Board gave Sunderland £6,500, for which Sunderland was grateful, and when the local authority asked if it wanted more money, the reply was in the negative. The £6,500 in no sense represented what Sunderland received last winter; it was only the nucleus of contributions from other sources, and no less than £22,000 was available altogether last winter to meet the exceptional distress in that district. If Sunderland was as reasonable next winter, and its citizens as public spirited as the rich engineers and shipbuilders of that district ought to be in giving out of their plenty to their poor fellow-citizens who had made their great fortunes and had placed many of them in an extraordinarily wealthy position, then the district and the Local Government Board together would be able to tide over any distress which might occur. The hon. Member could safely leave his own district in his own hands.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I will not forget.

*MR. JOHN BURNS said that the hon. Member had made a reference to one or two things which he would have been well advised if he had left alone. He was much indebted to him for withdrawing the statement that any of the officers of the Local Government Board had written letters to the effect that Hollesley Bay was a place in which a subsidised industry was being carried on. He had said that he would be fair and even generous to Hollesley Bay during the experimental period. How had he shown it? Apart from the purchase money, £43,475, the gross cost of management for Hollesley Bay for less than three years was £62,000. The receipts from sales of produce were £13,976. The net cost—he would not say loss, so as not to offend susceptibilities—was £48,391. How could anybody say he had been stern and unbending? For this large sum 2,513 men had passed through the colony; they had from eight to sixteen weeks' residence there on the average. The net cost per week per man was between 30s. and 31s.; including loan charges it was 33s. For that they received board and lodging and 6d. per week pocket-money. The wife and children in London received maintenance up to 17s. 6d. per week. When an agricultural labourer who worked sixty and seventy hours per week, had to pay rent and maintain wife and children on an average of 2s. or 3s. a week less than what the man's wife and children received in London alone, no one could accuse him of harshness. What were the results? Of the 2,513, 148 had emigrated. Some people were under the impression that this was to be a school for training emigrants for America and Canada and the Colonies generally. He had been through America and Canada twice, and he had been told in both countries the farming was so different in those countries that the less a man knew of the British methods of intensive cultivation the better. There was a great deal of difference between market gardening near a town and work on a ranch or prairie farm in America and Canada, and he found that the town man who had been to the training colony was worse off when he went out there than he would have been if he had gone straight to the ranch or prairie farm with an energetic and adaptable mind. How many men had returned to the land? Thirty-seven only, and it was very significant that out of the 37, more than one-third were agricultural labourers before they went to Hollesley Bay. Only 18 per cent of the men had found work after they had left the colony, as far as could be ascertained. The settlement of the men in ordinary farm situations or in market gardens or in ordinary occupations had proved in most cases impossible; consequently the only considerable outlet for men trained at Hollesley Bay had been by emigration.

The hon. Member for Jarrow had appealed to him to spend in the forthcoming winter all the £200,000. He did not wish to misrepresent the hon. Gentleman, but if by that he meant that he was to spend this £200,000 without any regard to economic conditions he could assure the hon. member that, being Scotch, he was not likely to throw other people's money away without getting value for it. The hon. Member thought progress in this matter should be quicker. They all learnt experience by responsibility. The hon. member was of an adaptable nature and could readily assimilate himself to his environment, and he congratulated him on the way he was doing it. If ever the hon. gentleman found himself in the position of President of the Local Government Board he could assure himself that the same kind of criticisms would be levelled at him. The difficulty in dealing with unemployment was not so much to get money or to spend it, but how it could be spent for the employment of unemployed people without concurrently damaging better men than those they employed. The difficulty at Hollesley Bay was not how to employ the men, but how to get rid of the produce. And that was particularly true of women's workrooms. They had to be very careful in providing State or municipal work for unemployed women that they were not providing opportunities for loafing husbands or sons to exploit their sisters, wives, and mothers to the permanent undoing of the workman and demoralisation of the wife and children. He was now going to quote the testimony of one of the ablest and best-informed women workers in the best of causes, the cause of her poorer sisters, whom we had in this country. He referred to Mrs. Tennant, of whom he had always had the greatest admiration and respect. Mrs. Tennant said—

> "The year's working has shown the present system of employment to be but transitorily helpful. Limited as it has been to satisfying the requirements of the Emigration and Working Colonies Committees, chiefly by plain needlework, it provides no industrial equipment of permanent value. There is little market for needlework of the character required in the Poplar and Camberwell Workrooms; and though the women leave the workrooms in nearly every case considerably improved in

industrial capacity, they have not, owing to the poorness of the outside market, appreciably improved their wage-earning position.

> "In the St. Pancras Tailoring Workroom, . . . the women can learn a skilled trade under the guidance of an experienced tailoress; and for those women the future holds more hope. But, unfortunately, that market is at the moment well provided with workers, and though I hope individual women, previously unskilled, may now obtain the skilled employment for which their training in the workrooms has fitted them (especially where the period has been extended), I cannot feel that the present system contributes to a solution of the problem."

At the same time he must refer to the fact that the Central Unemployed Body for London had expressed the opinion—

> "That the Women's Work Department had possibilities of usefulness, but that there was a danger of women becoming the principal wage earners in families where the men are merely loafers, and also of their leaving other employment to enter the workroom because of the better rate of pay and conditions."

The difficulty of the Local Government Board had not been to spend money and to provide women with work, but to see that the work was done under conditions which would not damage other women who were equally entitled to their sympathy. His last point was this. What else could the Local Government Board do administratively, because they were not now dealing with legislation? They could not deal with the matter by legislation to-day, but only by administration. He could assure the House that they could rely on his facilitating every loan subject to the rules of sound finance, to the work being properly carried out, and to its being thrown into the winter months. He had given the departmental officers a standing order that no loan should be kept back, and that even it should be accelerated in order that work might be given from November to March that otherwise might be done from March to October. All inquiries would be facilitated, and he was now in personal communication with officers, surveyors, engineers, railway managers, and the owners of docks and other large works to do everything in their power to diminish casual labour, and to diminish overtime, and to see that their commercial house was in order so that the amount of work, without having overtime, might be spread over the largest number of men possible. And what was the Government doing in the direction of administration and in the direction of palliation? He did not want to have too much palliation in connection with the unemployed. He did not believe that any single administration in the course of three or four years was going to solve the unemployed problem. He believed that no single Act of Parliament, except in conjunction with other economic and social forces, could do the good that some people expected. On this subject what were the Government confronted with? First, they were confronted with the Unemployed Act, and it was not he who had asked the House to pass it. To be perfectly frank, he did not think much of that Act, from which he had never expected much. When he came into office not only had he this Unemployed Act, but he had not the money necessary to make it reasonably efficient. The Government had supplemented it with a grant which he had done his best to apply reasonably. As to any other legislative proposal or any other serious administrative change he had been unable to carry it out because the Unemployed Act, plus the grant, was accompanied by something which had tied his hands many times and in many directions. A Royal Commission was appointed to go into that special subject of the Poor Law. He hoped that their Report would be ready in October or November. Whether or not it was going to be as revolutionary as had been indicated in some quarters he did not know; he was not in the Commission's counsels and very properly so; but it might probably do as much harm in some directions as it might attempt to do good in others. But whatever it might do he was not going to prejudge it; he should duly consider it when it appeared. But beyond the Royal Commission on the Poor Law, this Government had thought it right to consider the question of coast erosion and afforestation, from which much had been expected. They had immediately appointed a Special Committee to deal with coast erosion and afforestation, and they had so arranged that the Reports on coast erosion and afforestation should be concurrent with the production of the Royal Commission's Report on the Poor Law. Beyond that the Government, by dealing with the small holdings question, housing, legislation for children, old-age pensions, by stimulating the building trade, and by other measures had done their best by legislation, by cash down, and by administration to discharge their duty towards the unemployed. He was convinced that the House was so satisfied with their administration and their conduct that it would pass these Estimates. He believed that they would do so mainly because they, the Department, had administered the Unemployed Act with sympathy and reasonable moral courage, and had never turned aside any good work that would benefit the community by giving it an unsympathetic ear or an unkind thought. Personally, it was not only with perfect confidence that he asked the House of Commons to endorse their action with regard to motor cars, vaccination, tuberculosis and many other matters that had been discussed, but he claimed his salary on the broad ground that he had earned and deserved it, and that the Government as a whole had done their duty to the unemployed.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he could not grudge the time that the Local Government Board Vote had very properly occupied that afternoon, and a longer time might have been occupied in the dissection of some of the remarks of his right hon. friend who had just sat down. The right hon. Gentleman had voted himself his own salary without a division, the circumstances being such that the House had no option but to give him his salary without a division, for the form of supply before them to-day was most inconvenient and without precedent. On former occasions when an arrangement had been come to such as that of to-day the step was taken to propose the Vote to be discussed as a separate Vote from its class, and then the Report being separate they were enabled to take it in the ordinary way. To-day, of course, there had been no question before the House when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin rose, and therefore his speech had the effect, it being necessary for Mr. Speaker to put a Question to the House, of allowing the President of the Local Government Board to vote his own salary. No division was then possible. The Home Office Vote on which he desired to speak, had to be put into a comparatively short period that night, and the effect of that, he was afraid, must be that those who had general confidence in the administration of his right hon. friend must cut out any praise which they might be disposed to give him—and he should be disposed to give a great deal—in order to save time by confining themselves only to points of criticism. If they did that, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would understand that the criticism was offered to save time, without praise. The Home Office Vote, although it had less time for its discussion, was more important this year than it had been for a long time past, because of the extraordinary consensus of opinion among inspectors in all parts of the country as to the immense increase in the employment of young girls and children in factory work. This was connected, he believed, with an illegality, that was to say with the admission that the employment was under circumstances distinctly not contemplated by the present law, the mere enforcement of which would put an end to many of the evils of which the inspectors complained. The House was aware of the extraordinary difficulties of inspection which were caused by the exceptional hours in certain trades, exceptional hours which had been the subject of frequent debate in that House. The exempted processes had often been the subject of attack on the Home Office in past years by the Christian Social Union Committee, and by many others. The exempted processes, such as fish curing, bottling or preserving fruit, and—also laundries—were specimens of the danger which that House incurred when it tried to treat individual cases by exceptional hours, or where there was a total absence of the regulation of hours which it was unable to treat. Last year he had made a strong attempt to obtain for the House the Reports on the fish-curing industry made by Health Officers to the Scottish Local Government Board. The Home Office had referred him to the

Scottish Office, and the Scottish Office refused to give them. They gave the reason that, for a few years past, had been given on several occasions, but to none of which it was applicable, that the papers were so bulky it would be too costly to print them. They might of course have been placed in the Library, but they had failed to do even that. In the Report laid before Parliament, Miss Paterson, one of the inspectors, stated that she had had an opportunity of perusing these Reports, and she had called marked attention to them. Might he complain that the lateness of the Home Office Vote was due partly to the lateness of the issue of the Report? In the time of the late Government they got the Report at the end of May, and over and over again they had the Home Office Vote six weeks before the end of the session, and in the first week of July. The result was that they had not on this occasion had an opportunity of eliciting many of the facts which earlier issue of the Report would have enabled them to ascertain. Miss Paterson said that she had had an opportunity of reading these Reports as to the fish-curing industry, and she had quoted them. Last year he had asked the Under-Secretary about this matter, and he had replied that a portion of the Reports would be incorporated in a special Report. It was quite true that the chief inspector had given up his well-deserved holiday to investigating the facts of this industry, but they had not had this Report. He had asked for it the other day, and he was told that it was incorporated in the inspector's principal Report. In the principal Report there was only a series of proposals with regard to hours, leading up to suggestions for further relaxation of the law in Scotland. It was entirely opposed to every other Report of the inspectors in every other portion of the Blue-book. Miss Paterson in her Report pointed out the lack of water supply, defective structural arrangements, absence of scavenging, and insufficient sanitary accommodation, and she hoped that the publication of the Scottish Reports would lead to some improvement. These Reports had never been placed before the House. She called attention, as did many of the other inspectors, to the impossibility of enforcing the law so far as hours went in these emergency processes, and to the extent to which exemptions were fraudulently used, not for the purposes stated in the Act of Parliament, but for the purpose of evading regulation of hours altogether—in the fish trade, for example, to catch a particular market, and in the jam trade in the same way. Here came in the first of these numerous allusions to the enormous increase this year in the employment of young girls in factory work, and in work of the heaviest and most straining kind. Miss Paterson said—

> "Girls are taking to this work at an earlier age than formerly. The young girl feels the strain of long spells. . . The irregularity of the hours is a heavy drawback, as well as the low standard of housing accommodation."

Miss Paterson's Report did not stand alone in this respect. At Great Yarmouth the inspector pointed out that the Home Office was far from having secured adherence to the standard which they had prescribed by order. For instance, he found one day working at Yarmouth 1,079 women, for whom there was only accommodation of twenty-four conveniences, which was far below the number required by the order. At Lowestoft there were 129 women on one plot, and 156 on another, with only three conveniences in each case, again far below the standard of the order. But in spite of these facts the chief inspector's words only appeared to point to further proposals for relaxation of hours, whereas the House had always viewed with the greatest jealousy all these exempted processes and knew from these Reports that the exemptions were invariably abused. There was a Report by Miss Vines, dealing with the other exempted process primarily, but who mentioned both together in words which ought to have the attention of the House. On page 175 of the Report Miss Vines, showing that the exemption was again fraudulently misused, said—

> "It cannot be too strongly impressed that exemptions should involve special care in seeing that the Factory Act is strictly carried out in the non-exempted processes. Special legal licence in one process should accompany strict compliance with the law in the other processes not exempted as far as hours go."

Miss Anderson, Principal Lady Inspector, dealt with the larger question in her

Report, and pointed out on page 147 the industrial change that was now taking place in the employment of young workers. She said that several inspectors noted the increased employment of little girls in factory work and in attending to machinery, and that four inspectors pointed out the need for increased watchfulness over the health and safety of young girls in factories who had just left school, not half-timers, but whole-timers, under fourteen years of age. Miss Squire went so far as to say that she had inspected, in the year, a number of factories which looked like schools, filled with girls in short frocks and long hair, and attention was drawn over and over again to the marked increase of the employment of young girls, notably in the pen trade, in work formerly done by women. The villages round Bradford were noted for the large proportion of persons under thirteen who were now employed. In seven mills there were 243 full-timers under thirteen years old, and Miss Lovibond stated that the strain of working in weaving was very great on children of that tender age. These were rather startling facts, because this kind of child slavery in the case of boys they thought they had got rid of a great many years ago, and it was undoubtedly rapidly increasing in the case of girls in factory and machinery work. The statement from Belfast no doubt concerned cases where prosecutions were attempted but under the wrong law. There they found very young children now working after ten at night. On Good Friday three children of twelve, nine, and seven years of age worked from nine o'clock in the morning till 8.45 p.m. In that case the magistrates decided by a majority that the place was not a workshop, and was exempted under Section 114 of the Consolidated Factory Act. It was admitted that the employment was injurious to the children, and the inspector stated that there was a distinct deterioration in physiqe caused by this increase of young employment, the children being "pressed into service" as he said. There was another case on page 178 where there was a prosecution which also seemed to him to have been taken under the wrong statute. Belfast was mentioned again there by another inspector, and the heat and moisture were distinctly stated to be worse in that particular set of mills than was the case even in Lancashire, and these were full-timers, girls under fourteen years of age. The conditions were particularly dangerous for children, the inspector said, and Miss Martindale, another inspector, continued on the same line. She pointed out that the effect of working ten hours a day on a child twelve years of age, underfed and unsuitably clothed, was most serious. She pointed out how she had come across cases of children being worked who were "quite unfit" for the work. She explained that in some of these cases the children had passed the certifying surgeon, but they were unfit for their work, in one case suffering from ophthalmia and in another from mill fever, and several of the family had died. All these children, she said, had been certified. One certifying surgeon complained to her that it was impossible for him to say at the time of the first employment that the child was unfit for work, but he referred certain doubtful cases to the inspector. Then there was suspension for re-examination under Section 67 of the Factory Act. Then came a case where the details were perfectly frightful—a child of thirteen so ill-developed as to be an average child of nine and quite unfit. There were most distressing details, and in this case it was specifically alleged that the child was working as a cager, and having to lift very heavy weights, and the results were pointed out in Miss Martindale's terrible words. Then Miss Squire had similar cases of the increased employment of young girls in machinery processes. In Leeds, little girls aged thirteen were, she reported, employed in the ironing work, which those who were familiar with the Pimlico factory knew was very heavy work, in a high temperature and where the weights which would have to be lifted with an effort would cause a strain to which girls of that age certainly ought not to be exposed. The certifying surgeon agreed with the inspector as to the unsuitability of the employment for small and undersized girls, spoke of spinal curvature, and declared it to be an employment for which children were quite unfit. Miss Squire went on to say—

> "Unfortunately the work to which girls are put is frequently not disclosed to the certifying surgeon, and the certificate is not given with any reference whatever to the class of employment in which the little girls should be employed. My colleagues and I have drawn the attention of the certifying surgeon to individual cases of girls who are unfit for the work, and processes which seem harmful."

There was a law recently passed for the purpose of dealing with employment of this kind, but that law was not enforced, and so far as he was aware no prosecutions had been taken under it. The Employment of Children Act, 1903, contained a general section called "General Restrictions," and there were two subsections which had been put in for the purpose of dealing with cases of this kind. In two or three of the most frightful of these instances the lifting of weights was one of the matters dealt with. Subsection 4 of Section 3, which was the general clause, had these words—

> "A child shall not be employed to lift, carry, or move anything likely to cause injury to the child."

Subsection 5 used these words—

> "A child shall not be employed in any occupation likely to be injurious to the health or safety of the child."

Why were prosecutions not taken under that law? Why was that clause a dead letter? When the employment of children under fourteen was increasing so rapidly, prosecutions ought to be taken in all cases where there was a reasonable chance of success. A very closely connected subject was that of infant mortality in certain trades, such as that of potting, in which a large number of mothers were employed and where the rate of infant mortality was very high. Miss Vines, on page 187 of the Report dealt with that question. Last year the Report gave an enormously high infant mortality for the Potteries as a whole. The medical officers, in their Reports for last year, said the rate of infant mortality for England was the lowest ever recorded, and the Potteries showed a fair proportion of that decline. The decrease was wholly due to summer diarrhœa. Miss Vine's Report on page 187 dealt with that subject. After pointing out that it was a very good year as far as infant mortality was concerned, she said that nevertheless at Longton she investigated certain cases which seemed to account for the extraordinary high rate of mortality in the Potteries. She gave some frightful cases of the illegal employment of women and girls and children on Sundays for long hours. At Longton a girl of fourteen was employed in transferring on a Sunday. A woman was told to come to work on the same Sunday, and because she excused herself on the ground that her baby was ill she was dismissed without notice. There were other cases of that kind. He had this year been able to obtain the Reports of medical officers of health for each of these localities where the mortality among working mothers was exceptionally high. Miss Vine's Report dealt with Longton, where the death-rate the year before was the highest in the country. The medical officer of Longton, in his Report this year, said the rate was the lowest ever recorded in the borough, and he went on to say that—

> "Although this is very pleasant, I must call attention to the fact that infantile mortality all over England was exceptionally low in 1907."

He further pointed out that the decrease was wholly due to summer diarrhœa, because there had only been twenty-three deaths in Longton from that cause, whereas the year before the number was 120. The figures given by the medical officer for Longton were very interesting, because he followed each case and showed the infant death-rate in the cases of employed mothers. It was a very terrible table which showed that in Longton of the cases examined 281 mothers were employed in the potting industry and twenty-seven "otherwise." Through the courtesy of the Staffordshire authorities he had seen the forthcoming report of Dr. Reid, the medical officer for the county, on infant mortality in the potting towns. He told them this terribly sad fact, that "in Longton . . . among infants artificially fed the mortality is increased four and a half times." Although there was not a very large proportion of mothers employed in the potting trade the mortality among their infants who were brought up by hand in the absence of the mothers was so frightfully high that it accounted for the pre-eminence of the potting towns, taken as a group, in infant mortality. He would not go through all the figures he had regarding other towns. In Tunstall, in spite of the decline in diarrhœa, there, as everywhere, the mortality was still frightfully high—a rate of 188, and the medical officer in reporting this "excessively high" rate said the cause was the "baneful factory employment of married women." In Fenton, although deaths from diarrhœa were sixteen as against forty-two in previous years, yet the rate had actually risen this year to 164, including sixty-two deaths from atrophy. The medical officer advised legislation against employment of mothers in potting, but of course it was outside that debate to discuss that. A larger number of mothers were employed in dusty processes and were exposed to fibroid tuberculosis. The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department, who had given so much attention to the dusty processes, knew what the probable effect of dusty employment was upon the mothers. Dr. Oliver, who was supported by scientific evidence from other countries, said—

> "Where both parents were working in lead the children, if born alive, died shortly after birth, as it had a peculiarly baneful influence in causing still-birth, short life or imbecility."

A comparison between the potting wards and the non-potting wards of the urban and rural districts which were around the potting boroughs proved that to be the case. In the potting ward of Fenton, although part of Fenton was rural, "nearly one-fifth of the total number of children born had died before one year." Hanley figures were rather better this year. The Stoke medical officer said although it was below the local average it was still "very unsatisfactory when compared with even the rate for the seventy-six large towns." In the Wolstanton potting ward the same thing was to be found, a rate of 172, and and the medical officer said—

> "This high infant mortality was no doubt due in a great measure to the greater number of women who are working."

The pressure which was constantly being exercised on the Home Office in regard to the use of lead was now more willingly received than it was a few years ago. He had cause to complain of a speech by Mr. Cunynghame of the Home Office some time ago, but he made a speech at Hanley last autumn, on November 22nd, to which he could take no possible exception, and it was what everyone would wish him to say. Mr. Cunynghame said, on that occasion—

> "The Home Office believed the use of lead must always be a source of danger."

and he recommended continued scientific research on the subject. Last year there was an increase of fatal cases and there had been an increase of cases in the last half-year. They had not got back to the same condition they were in when his friends started the agitation in the time of the right hon. Gentleman opposite who did so much to try and meet their views, but the cases were rising enormously fast again. He knew this must give some anxiety to the Home Office. In the first half of the present year the cases were seventy of lead poisoning in the potting trade as against thirty-eight in the corresponding six months last year and although the deaths were fewer, in the last month or two they had been rising again very fast. Last year he complained of some retrogression on the part of the Government Departments in regard to the example they set in the use of leadless glaze, and he was glad this year there were some signs of improvement. In the last large contract placed by the Postmaster-General for insulators there was a large proportion of leadless glaze, and there were some signs of a fresh attempt to induce the great offices outside the ordinary ken of the Office of Works and the Home Office to come into the general scheme. He believed it was the case that a conference was agreed to in principle at which the War Office, the Admiralty, and other Departments should be represented and that that conference only wanted the formal assent of the Secretary for War and the First Lord of the Admiralty, which no doubt would be immediately given. They were sometimes taunted with having "leadless glaze" not up to the official standard. Last week there was laid before the House the Official Report of Dr. Thorpe, the Government analyst, and he was glad to find from that Report that it was clear that all of the 1 per cent. or 2 per cent. standards which he investigated were all right and came within the margin, and were all they professed to be. But when they came to the five per cent. standard, there he found a great excess, and it was quite clear the old 5 per cent. standard was of very little use. The only other subject he wished to mention was that labour legislation was falling into arrear. There was a hope that the subject of truck might have been dealt with, and also that the larger question of general insurance for workman's compensation would have been the subject of the inquiry which was promised two years ago. He would say nothing on the second subject, because an answer had already been given. In regard to truck he might say that the appointment of the Committee was the result of a Motion carried on the first private Members' day of this Parliament. No doubt the subject was very difficult, but the Report was definitely promised for Easter. It was now put off till "November," and they saw the chance of legislation receding every day. The Annual Report was full of evidence of the necessity of dealing once more with this difficult subject, and, therefore, it was well to recognise fully the desire of his right hon. friend to initiate legislation as the result of the inquiries—inquiries themselves in arrear—and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would be pleased if the House would help him forward in the matter.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) said he wanted to call the attention of the Home Secretary to a matter in connection with the brass-founding industry which was of pressing importance to every district in which that important industry existed. He would state the facts as shortly as possible. In June of last year there were draft regulations issued affecting the factories where brass-casting was carried on. There were numerous objections raised to some of those recommendations by trade associations and chambers of commerce, with the result that the Home Secretary ordered a public inquiry to be held. The inquiry was held in Birmingham, Glasgow, and other places. It lasted six days. Expert and general evidence was given against certain details of the regulations. The manufacturers, while making objections, showed themselves most conciliatory and in agreement with the principle that the conditions of the workers should be made as favourable as possible. The expenses of the inquiry were heavy for providing evidence, counsel, and so forth, amounting in Birmingham alone to several hundreds of pounds. The Home Office then made a very wise suggestion in order to cut the inquiry short and save expense. Seeing that the Home Office and the manufacturers were not widely apart in their views, it was suggested that a conference should be held in order to come to some satisfactory agreement. It was agreed by the representatives of all parties concerned—including Mr. W. J. Davis, the representative of the National Society of Brassworkers and Metal Mechanics, an able man who, while keeping a jealous watch over the interests of the workers, was always ready to consider the reasonable requirements of the manufacturers—that certain modifications should be made in the regulations. Though the manufacturers were not satisfied with the concessions they received, they were prepared to accept them as a settlement of the matter. It was agreed to submit these modifications to the Commissioner. Seeing that a general agreement was arrived at by the conference and others concerned, the manufacturers naturally expected that the modifications agreed to by the parties would be embodied in the revised regulations. Evidently there had been a misunderstanding at the Home Office such as might easily happen in connection with a large Department like that, and he hoped the Home Secretary would be able to correct it. The Commissioner's Report to the Home Secretary was dated 21st March, this year. The recommendations made by the Commissioner were contained in the appendix to the Report. In those recommendations one important concession arrived at by the conference was granted, but there were other two equally important which, though also agreed to at the conference, were rejected. That Report, though dated 21st March, did not appear to have been published until 26th June. It was noticed in the

Press on 27th June. As soon as they saw it, the manufacturers met and made communications to the Home Office urging the Home Secretary, notwithstanding the recommendations of the Commissioner, to accept the modifications which his own advisers recommended at the conference —advisers who had more knowledge of the trade, and of the subject generally, than any Commissioner who was a lawyer could have. Shortly after that communication was made to the Home Office it was discovered that the regulations were actually signed on 20th June—six days before they were published, and seven days before those interested in them could obtain a copy. It appeared that no notification to the Chambers of Commerce was given until Friday, the 24th inst., and further that up till now there had been no public notification that the regulations had been agreed on and signed. With the exception of one point conceded, these regulations were word for word taken from the regulations contained in the appendix to the Commissioner's Report. The manufacturers naturally felt that they had been somewhat unfairly treated, especially after the manner in which they had shown their willingness to help the Home Office in every way, and after the unanimous decision which had been arrived at at the conference. He was far from blaming the Home Secretary in the matter. He thought it would be found that when the right hon. Gentleman signed the regulations he was under the impression that the recommendations arrived at unanimously at the conference were included in the final draft of the regulations. But he did very much blame the Commissioner for acting in such an arbitrary manner, and taking no notice of two of the most important recommendations of the conference. He supposed that the Commissioner was not inclined to be overridden in regard to the recommendations he had himself made. Under the Act of 1901 the regulations had to be placed on the Table of both Houses of Parliament for forty days. He had referred to the list, and it appeared that they were laid on the Table on June 29th—three days after the Report was published, so that there were thirty of the forty days gone. As the Session was practically ended, there would be no time or opportunity for raising a discussion in Parliament, although the object of laying regulations on the Table was that there should be an opportunity for discussion. He would respectfully suggest to the Home Secretary that, seeing there had been a misunderstanding or error—he was casting no reflection on anybody—he should withdraw the regulations and re-lay them on the Table at some time after he had considered whether or not they should be corrected in accordance with the unanimous recommendations of his own conference. Another reason why this should be done was that the draft regulations were originally issued after an interview with the representatives of trade unions, and that the manufacturers had no opportunity of expressing their views. It was afterwards found that there was one important point in the regulations which was absolutely impracticable. With regard to one section of the trade, if that regulation had been enforced it would have been disastrous, for it would have been impossible to make good castings at all. If the regulations as they now stood were carried out, they would involve thousands of pounds to the manufacturers, but if the concessions which were recommended to be made were adopted, the expenditure would be considerably lessened. Looking to the importance of the matter, he hoped the Home Secretary would be able to give some assurance upon it. The brassfounding trade in Birmingham was in a deplorable state. There was hardly a manufacturer who was making any money in that vast industry, which employed thousands of people. A large number in the trade were considerable losers. He trusted that his right hon. friend would give the assurance that those modifications which had been recommended, not only by his own advisers but by the representatives of all sections of the trade, would be adopted.

Mr. GILL (Bolton) said that no one could read the Report of the Factory and Workshops' Inspectors without being struck with the magnitude of our industrial position. It appeared to him and to those with whom he acted, that it was a pity they could not have had this Report issued much earlier in the year; because there had been too little time since its issue to study it carefully. There were no fewer than 257,193 factories and workshops in the country, and these were increasing every year. Last year the number added was no less than 2,000. To cope with this large number, there were only 165 inspectors of all classes; and no one could say that that number could deal adequately with the work of inspection. He was, however, glad to know that the Home Secretary was now increasing the number to something like 200, and he ventured to express the hope that a considerable number of the new inspectors would be practical men who had a knowledge of machinery. In the cotton trade they had had to complain of a mean practice which was known as "time cribbing,"—a practice which, so far as he knew, did not prevail in other trades. That practice consisted of taking a few minutes of the operatives' time at different meal hours. Complaints of this had been made for several years, and he thought that at last they had found a Home Secretary who was sympathetic to the workers, and was trying to do something to stop this particular grievance. During the past year the inspectors had been more active than previously. He found that 886 cases were reported in 1906, and penalties inflicted to the amount of £1,149, while last year 1,062 cases were reported, and in every one a conviction followed, with penalties amounting to £1,741. There had been difficulty in getting the magistrates to inflict penalties formerly, but that practice had been stopped, owing to the special efforts of the Home Secretary. The assistant inspectors had helped in obtaining convictions; and he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether the suggestion which had been made to him of employing the police in regard to violations of the Factory Act had been carried out, and with what success? The practice of "time cribbing" was still going on, and it was more active in some districts than in others, and he thought that every effort should be made to have the practice still further reduced. The number of accidents was increasing enormously. The total number of accidents in factories and workshops had increased from 111,904 in 1906 to 124,325 in 1907. That was at the rate of 400 accidents for every working day of the year. Out of that number 1,179 were fatal; which simply meant that on every working day in the year four persons were killed while following their occupation. In regard to card rooms in the cotton mills, a deputation had waited upon the right hon. Gentleman and had shown him certain models which, if adopted, would certainly reduce the number of accidents very much. Mr. Crabtree, inspector for the Oldham District, had favourably reported on the models for improved fencing in the card rooms, and he thought there was no excuse whatever for the Home Secretary's not insisting that this improved fencing should be put in operation, seeing that the appliances could be adopted without great cost. There had also been improvements in the spinning department, but there was room for still further improvements in the fencing there, as the number of accidents had increased during the past year. It had been said that there was now a Compensation Act in operation, but no amount of compensation was adequate for the loss of a limb. With regard to the ventilation in card-rooms, much remained to be done. The deputation had also submitted to the Home Secretary models for improving the ventilation. Lancashire operatives took care that they did not complain of what was going on in cotton mills unless they had some justification, and they also tried to find means for overcoming the difficulties by submitting models of improved apparatus. Mr. Crabtree, the inspector, referred in his Report to the exceedingly dirty condition of some of the card-rooms, and said that the only ventilation was by open windows, which only blew the dust more effectually on the workers. There was great improvement in the ventilation in some of the new mills. Anyone acquainted with the cotton trade knew that raw cotton was much charged with dust; and that dust had to be cleared before the cotton was spun into yarn. He gave credit to many of the employers for what they had done to improve the ventilation. Fans were in use for drawing out the dust and letting in the fresh air, but the appliances were still far from perfect. He believed that these could be improved at little cost, and the operatives were entitled to ask that something should be done in this respect. Chest diseases were very numerous in the carding-rooms, caused by the dust. He had a Report issued by the Amalgamated Association of Card and Blowing Room Operatives, containing fifty medical certificates relating to the illness of workers in the card-rooms caused by the dust. He would read one or two in proof of the case he was making.

> "I hereby certify that J. C., aged thirty-two years, suffers from bronchitis, and that the nature of his occupation in blowing-room of a cotton mill is conducive to the development of this complaint, owing to dust produced in the processes of manufacture."

That was signed by H. Ashton, Medical Officer of Health, Chadderton. Another certificate stated that—

> "J.J.B., thirty-four years of age, suffers from chronic bonchitis and emehysema of some years' duration, after nineteen years' work in the card-room of a cotton mill, and that, in my opinion, the disease is due largely to the dust amongst which he has worked."

The great bulk of these fifty certificates were of the same character. Seeing that there was so much suffering at an early age on the part of those engaged in this occupation, he asked the Home Secretary to push this matter forward and compel the employers to adopt the very best system of dust removal and ventilation. A deputation had also brought before the Home Secretary the conditions of employment in bleaching and dye works. The Act of Parliament of 1901 provided that women could work for five hours without an interval for meals; but that was only intended to be put in operation in exceptional circumstances. Latterly some of the firms had been trying to make the rule permanent. Women had to leave home at six o'clock in order to begin work at seven in the bleaching and dyeing works. They got nothing to eat until twelve o'clock at noon, and then had to resume work at one o'clock, and continue at it until six, probably not reaching home till after seven o'clock. That was too long for women and young persons to be without a meal, especially in such employment as they were engaged in in bleaching and dye works. The right hon. Gentleman had promised to make inquiry into the matter, and he wanted to know the result. He was glad that a Humidity Commission had been appointed, and the weavers were hoping for an improvement in that respect. He desired to thank the right hon. Gentleman for the sympathy he had shown to the textile trades. They had pegged away at these questions for a long time, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would continue to show his sympathy and do his best to remove these grievances.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said that that was the first time, during the twenty-two years he had been a Member of the House, that he had known the Home Office Vote occupy the position of second Order of the day, and be given only a fragment of the evening for its discussion. The Home Office dealt with the administration of justice, of the police of the kingdom and notably of the Metropolis; with the administration of factories, mines and workshops, and a variety of other matters, and that was the first time during the session that they had had an opportunity to criticise the work of that Department, to submit suggestions to the right hon. Gentleman or to interrogate him as to the work done by the various subordinate bodies which he controlled or had created. They were now at the fag end of the session. It was a most deplorable thing, it was unprecedented, and he hoped it would never happen again. He wished to refer to the question of the Police Commission. They had taken a long time over their Report, but they had shown most remarkable skill in investigating the details of a number of undoubtedly difficult matters in connection with the administration of the police force. With one result of that Commission everyone was gratified, although it was a matter that was known without the intervention of the Commission. The moral, physical, and intellectual character of the police force as a body was worthy of Metropolitan public confidence, and compared favourably with that of any police force in the country. But although that was true, the Report gave cause for grave disquietude. It presented a state of things of which the public at large was wholly unaware, and for which a considerable measure of responsibility attached to the Home Office for its lack of administrative control over the Metropolitan police force. The Commission found that, of eighteen cases which they investigated, some trifling and some grave, seven were substantiated, a rather large proportion. In one out of the remaining eleven cases, a serious matter, the bribery of the police by bookmakers, no acquittal was given to the officer concerned other than that the Commission found the case not proved—a very significant finding. In two others of the remainder, the censure applied to the superior officers as well as the officer concerned. During a period of ten years there were in the aggregate nearly 1,000 cases of misconduct, under three heads, charged against the police. There were 548 cases of complaint of improper relations between the police and bookmakers. It was perfectly true that only twenty of those cases which were complaints by private persons, were established, but concurrently with that, there were twelve complaints by superior officers which were all substantiated. There were ninety-two cases of improper conduct on the part of the police in regard to prostitutes and brothels, of which some, they were not told how many, were substantiated, whilst there were thirteen complaints by superior officers which were all substantiated. There were 215 cases of improper relations with publicans, of which some were substantiated, and nineteen complaints by superior officers which were all substantiated. He did not wish to exaggerate the effect of these figures on his mind, but although these complaints extended over a period of ten years they were sufficiently numerous to show that a higher standard should be if possible created in the Metropolitan police. The Commissioners' Report said—

> "The Force cannot, as a whole, be absolved from the charge of receiving money from bookmakers."

If those words meant anything they meant that the practice of bribery of the police by the bookmakers largely prevailed in the Force. In a body of 10,000 men it was of course impossible to secure immunity from improper conduct on the part of a constable, and on the whole they were satisfied that the police were well conducted, but these were matters that could not be lightly passed over. The Home Office was the Watch Committee of the Metropolitan Police, and how did it do its duty? He found from the evidence given by the head permanent official of the Home Office that the usual course when complaints came in from the public was to hand them over to the Chief Commissioner of the Police. That was to say that the Home Office, whose duty was to protect and vindicate the public, abrogated its duty and handed it over to one it was supposed to supervise, and the entire investigation was left to the Chief Commissioner. He was glad to say that that was a system that did not obtain in any foreign country or any town or county of Great Britain. Such supervision on the part of the Home Office was less than nil. It was easy to understand how it was that all complaints of the superior officers were substantiated while only a fragment of the public complaints were substantiated. The Chief Commissioner was a man most desirous of doing his duty. He was absolutely without control. He was an irresponsible officer in absolute control of the Metropolitan police. The Home Office had abrogated its function, not merely during the present administration, but also during previous administrations, and excused itself on the ground that there was no machinery in the Department for the purpose. Machinery, however, might very readily be arranged. What was the method of dealing with complaints made against individual members of the police? There ought to be some remedy for a wronged man, and the cases were sufficiently numerous to require proper methods of vindication. If he went to the Home Office, they referred him to Scotland Yard, and the chief there sent the complaint on to the superintendent or inspector of the station to which the officer complained of was attached. That officer asked the accused constable to make his report, and, when the constable had made it, either alone or in collaboration with his comrades, he handed it to the inspector, a mere petty functionary, who, if he chose, wrote his comments upon it and then forwarded it to the Chief Commissioner. The Chief Commissioner thereupon formed his judgment upon the *ex parte* statement of the accused constable. He was not, of course, speaking of cases which excited public interest, when perhaps the Home Office requested the Chief Commissioner to send one of the higher officials to investigate the matter. Another method adopted was to send the complaint to the superintendent or inspector who held an inquiry, calling before him the complainant and the constable complained of. These proceedings, however, were so grotesque that the complainant was not allowed to address questions by way of examination to the constable except by the grace and favour of that exalted functionary the inspector of police, and then only through his lips. The inspector adjudicated, and, upon his report the Chief Commissioner acted. Such was the ludicrous procedure. It would be serious if there were only a few cases of alleged police misconduct; but, although the police magistrates paid a high tribute to the police as a body, they said—and everybody knew—that complaints of the conduct of the police were fairly frequent. Whether they were frequent or not, however, an aggrieved member of the public had a right to go to the Home Office, and the Home Office should be bound to appoint a proper tribunal for the purpose of investigating such complaints and giving satisfaction.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): May I ask what kind of tribunal the hon. Member suggests?

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES said there should be the same kind of inquiry as took place in the case of Continental police forces. There was there a high official appointed independent of the police. He heard and investigated the complaint and adjudicated upon it. The right hon. Gentleman asked him what remedy could be suggested; but, when the thing was investigated by petty officers of the police immediately in contact with the accused constable, he should have thought any alternative would have been considered preferable to the present system. The absurdity of the thing did not end there. If the complaint was of such a grave character that it might be made the subject of a criminal charge, what, forsooth, the Home Office or Scotland Yard, with the approval of the Home Office, did was to say to the complainant: "Your remedy is by action." He, therefore, could not get the constable punished without he went to the trouble and expense of bringing an action against him. The whole thing read like a fairy tale, but anything more monstrous could not be conceived. These complaints were mostly in connection with night charges. The false charges were made at a time and under conditions when and in a locality where they could be made with impunity, and very often there were no witnesses who could appear on behalf of the person wrongfully arrested. Most of the cases were noxious and sordid cases of drunkenness and assault. When a man who was falsely charged with drunkenness challenged the charge and asked to see a doctor, the doctor he was allowed to have was the paid official of the police. He was far from passing any aspersions upon a highly honourable body of professional men, but it was notorious that the police surgeons had every inducement offered to them to report favourably to the police. The Commission recognised that, and said it was desirable that there should be a list of independent medical men placed at the disposal of the man complaining. These were matters in the administration of the Metropolitan police which required attention, and there were other matters with which time did not permit him to deal. It was a glaring injustice that there should not be any independent tribunal for the purpose of investigating these complaints. He had the greatest respect for the Metropolitan magistrates. There was no more painstaking body of men, but they told him that the amount of work imposed upon them was so heavy that it was absolutely prohibitive of any full and patient investigation of the night charges brought before them. It was, he thought, due to the parsimony of the Treasury that there was not a considerable increase in the number of police magistrates in the Metropolis. They were very hard worked, they were not overpaid, their occupation was certainly not very cheerful, and it was only natural they should follow the lines of least resistance and endeavour to dispose of their work with as great dispatch as possible. He was very much afraid that this general verdict of acquittal of the police force would cause the Home Office to be absolutely supinely indifferent to the investigation and removal of grievances to some of which he had referred. He should continue to press the matter upon the right hon. Gentleman, and he hoped he would pay attention to the recommendations addressed to him by the Commission. He admitted the difficulty of improving the supervision of the police and of affording proper facilities to persons who were accused of drunkenness of demonstrating that they were not in that state; but, if the right hon. Gentleman set up a proper tribunal to whom persons who felt themselves aggrieved might apply, he would satisfy every legitimate demand of the public. There was a tendency to overpamper the police. They were very highly paid as compared with men of their class [Cries of "No."] Hon. Members were not perhaps acquainted with the comparison of the industrial classes.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): Yes we are, and the police are the worst paid of the lot.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES said he did not agree. The policeman, after serving a period of a little over twenty years, received a pension of about £1, and where could the hon. Member point to any other occupation, civil, military, or naval, where a similar pension was given? He admitted the high standard and efficiency of the force and that the present chief was discharging his duty with ability, tact, and discernment; but he certainly thought it was necessary to have something like a rational system of administration.

***SIR HENRY CRAIK** (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said he would not follow the example of the hon. and learned Gentleman in speaking for thirty-five minutes when the opportunities open to all other Members of the House were so short. He had listened with astonishment to the verdict which the hon. and learned Gentleman had passed on the Report of the Police Commission. However opinions might have varied before the appointment of the Commission it would be a matter of surprise if after the Report there should be any other verdict than that it had fully established the high character which many of them attached to the Metropolitan police—a character above suspicion—which was not altered by anything, to his mind, that the hon. and learned Gentleman had adduced.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES said he hoped the hon. Member would not misinterpret and impute to him the utterance of opinions which were entirely contrary to what he had said. He had said he had the highest opinion of the police force in London and he entirely agreed with the Report.

SIR HENRY CRAIK thought that most of those who had heard the hon. and learned Member's speech would come to the conclusion that it was wanting in that generosity which was the fair meed of the police after the Report—a generous verdict which he was certain few in the House or outside it would have any difficulty in accepting. He wished to bring before the House a matter of the first importance with regard to the Metropolis. The object of his criticism was to bring to the notice of the Home Secretary points in which he thought his administration of the present law relating to motor 'buses had been defective. There were a great many important bodies concerned in that matter. There were the Home Office, the Board of Trade, the Local Government Board, the County Council, the Borough Councils, and the City Corporation. The right hon. Gentleman was too apt in meeting various deputations and in answering questions to try to suggest that the duties which now rested upon him should be laid upon some of these other bodies. But he regarded the right hon. Gentleman as the chief sinner under the present legislative conditions. He had allowed opportunities which might have checked this evil to pass by, and he seemed to place upon each statute which he had to administer the interpretation which would most limit his own powers. He would like to point out a certain inconsistency in the suggestions which the right hon. Gentleman had made. In an answer to himself as to whether some authority might not be entrusted with the prescribing of routes and the checking of the grossest anomalies and nuisances created by these motor 'buses, he answered that it would be impossible to confer the necessary powers on the London County Council or any other local authority, and, in fact, that no municipal authority could have such duties laid upon it. To a deputation from the City on 14th July the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Under the law as it stood there was not the power to direct the traffic from one street to another. That to his mind was much more a municipal question, and it should be dealt with by the municipal authorities."

The very course that he deprecated in his answer to him was the course which he suggested to the deputation. The right hon. Gentleman asked what were the powers which he might make use of and had not used. That which he had chiefly in mind was the Metropolitan Streets Act, which in Section 11 perfectly clearly provided that the Chief Commissioner of Police might make regulations subject to the approval of the Home Secretary with respect to the route to be taken by all carts, carriages, and other vehicles. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that this section was practically inoperative because of the proviso that—

> "This section shall not authorise the Commissioner of Police or the Secretary of State to limit the number of Metropolitan stage carriages which may pass down any street."

But how was that inconsistent with the original provisions of the clause? What was the meaning of the section as a whole? It must have some rational meaning, and if the fact that they could not prevent fair competition between different licensed vehicles was to be extended to the further point that they could not exercise the power of prescribing the route which was distinctly laid down in the earlier part of the section, what was the use of enacting the section at all? What meaning did the right hon. Gentleman draw from the section? It seemed to be perfectly clear. It meant that if they opened a certain route to these Metropolitan stage carriages they must not by any arbitrary restriction prevent fair competition amongst different stage carriages. It did not mean that they relinquished the power conferred upon the police by the earlier part of the section. As a matter of fact that power was assumed in various other instances, in all the larger municipal boroughs in Scotland, and in many boroughs throughout England. The view that made the section inoperative was only adopted on certain legal advice. It had never been the subject of any judicial decision. But even supposing this restriction on his powers to exist, had the Home Secretary no other powers? He had the power of licensing vehicles, and he contended that that power had not been sufficiently or properly exercised. There were some 1,037 licensed motor buses, and there had been 8,500 reported as defective. That meant that each existing motor bus had been reported as defective on more than eight occasions. Could he contend that the licence in the hands of the police was anything but inefficient when it was exercised with such undue laxity that vehicles were allowed to run which had no proper place upon the streets? It was this undue ease and laxity in licensing vehicles that had produced all the evils—over-weight, defective machinery, and difficulties as to vibration, noise, and smell. Those were the things that had introduced a number of vehicles in the streets of London which were unfit for traffic and were rendering the life of the people almost intolerable. It was impossible in the time at his disposal properly to elaborate the argument, but it was one of the first importance to the inhabitants of the Metropolis who were exposed by the laxity of licensing to added trouble and danger to life.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) said he wished first of all to take issue with the hon. Member for

Durham with regard to the comments he had made upon the Metropolitan Police and upon the Report of the Commissioners. The hon. Member said the Report gave rise to great disquietude. After considering it very carefully, he had come to exactly the contrary conclusion. He certainly thought the Report had given great confidence to the public who now knew that they had not only an efficient, but a perfectly properly conducted police force. The Commission was to inquire into and report upon the duties of the Metropolitan Police, especially in dealing with cases of drunkenness, disorder, and solicitation in the streets, and the manner in which these duties were discharged. The result of the Commission, he thought, must be most satisfactory, and their findings practically welcomed by all dwellers in the Metropolis, and those inhabitants of the country who valued the due administration of law and order. The Metropolitan Police had extremely difficult duties to perform, and they performed them, not only as the Commission had shown, but in the knowledge of all those who had had anything to do with the administration of justice in London, in an extremely able manner and with very great tact. They had some very delicate duties to perform, and they had shown that they were a force to be proud of. On this question he dissociated himself altogether from the remarks of the hon. Member for Durham. An important recommendation was made in the Report of the Police Commission in regard to complaints as to the misbehaviour of constables made by private persons to the Commissioner of Police. It was to the effect that a proper officer should be appointed who had had great experience of law as well as of administration to deal with such complaints. He wished to ask the Home Secretary whether he proposed to carry out that recommendation. He was certain that if he did he would give great satisfaction to the public and to the police themselves. The House should remember that the members of the Metropolitan Police Force welcomed the appointment of the Police Commission, and they would equally welcome the carrying out of their recommendations. He would also like to know when the Report of the Vivisection Commission was likely to be presented to Parliament. Although he was one of those who did not agree with the views of those who desired to put an end to vivisection, at the same time he thought a great deal of unnecessary criticism would be put an end to when the Report of that Commission was laid on the Table of the House. The time was so limited that evening that it was almost impossible for him to take any further part in the debate on the subject which had been raised by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, who always took up these factory questions. It was no fault of the Home Office that this Vote was put down so late. While they all wanted to have the Report earlier they could not take it until they had received the Report of the factory inspectors. If in future years it was impossible for this hard-working official to make his Report earlier they might, if the Home Office Vote had been put down on an earlier date, discuss those questions which did not deal with the Factory Report and on another occasion later discuss factory questions.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he would like first of all to say a word or two upon the lateness of the debate. Nobody had greater sympathy with the complaints of hon. Members on this point than he had himself; it was just as inconvenient to the Home Secretary as to hon. Members that this debate should take place at so late a period of the session, but it did so by force of circumstances. He quite appreciated the difficulty which always arose on account of the Report of the Chief Inspector not being available earlier, and he could assure the House that he would make a determined effort to secure an improvement in this matter next year even at the cost of some curtailment in the Report. He would consider the matter very carefully and he would try to secure that the debate on this subject should take place somewhat earlier in the session in future. His right hon. friend had asked him a question with regard to the Vivisection Commission, but he was afraid he could not answer him definitely. He had been informed some time ago that the Commission had ceased to take evidence, and they were considering their Report. He had good reason for assuming that in the course of a month or two the Report of that Commission would be presented to the House. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had also asked him a question about one of the recommendations of the Metropolitan Police Commission relating to the appointment of an independent police officer to deal with complaints made by private persons against the police. He was taking that matter at once into consideration. and he thought he might say that the Government would give effect to that recommendation. He quite agreed with his right hon. friend's criticism of the speech of the hon. and learned Member for North-West Durham. The hon. and learned Member brought several charges against the police administration in conjunction with the Home Office, but as the hon. and learned Member had left the House, perhaps it was not necessary to deal with them. But he would like to say one or two words about the Police Commission. So far as he was concerned he would never have consented to the appointment of the Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Police had it not been for the fact that its appointment was strongly pressed upon him by the Commissioner of Police himself. He had the fullest faith in the Metropolitan Police. When things were being said about them he was quite prepared to stand by them, because he always felt sure that he had a strong case to defend; but so persistent were the attacks on the police in the House and in the Press that the Police Commissioner himself came to him and said that in the interests of the force he thought there should be an inquiry. As the Commissioner himself had made that request the Government came to the conclusion that it ought to be granted. He wished to emphasise the fact that the Commission was never appointed because the Government had any doubt as to the efficiency of the Metropolitan Police. To the many services rendered by the present Commissioner of the Police during his admirable administration, should be added the setting up of this Commission. The Report of the Police Commission had given universal satisfaction, especially to the Metropolis, which was proud to have such striking testimony to the character and efficiency of this famous civil force. On the careful and exhaustive judgment of the hon. Member for Swansea and his colleagues he would only say that to officers and men alike it would prove a splendid and a permanent encouragement to them in the discharge of their difficult and trying duties. The recommendations which the Commission had made would receive the most careful consideration. As regarded the evils which were alleged by his hon. friend to exist now he would remind the House that they were the very matters which the Commission were appointed to inquire into and report upon. They had the Report, and let the House remember the effect of it. During the years 1903, 1904, and 1905, which were under review, the arrests for drunkenness and prosecutions for disorderly conduct numbered 210,000. The Commission only found it necessary to inquire into nineteen cases of arrest out of that vast number. They found that there were only five cases of arrests which were not justified, and only nine members of the force were found guilty of misconduct. That in a force of 17,000 men and covering a period of three years was the most remarkable record of any police force in the history of modern times. With regard to the subject of motor omnibuses he had not the time to deal with the whole of it. He had already stated his views, but he wished to remind the hon. Member who had attacked him for not putting into force the Metropolitan Street Act that he was only inheriting the condition of things which prevented the police from directing the omnibus traffic. The hon. Member seemed to think that he had suddenly refused to put the law into operation, but the Law Officers of the Crown some time ago advised his predecessors that under the statute to which he had referred authority was not given to divert omnibus traffic. The deputation which he had received the other day from the City authorities stated that they had themselves been advised by their own local legal authority that no such power existed, and they impressed upon him that it was advisable that they should have such power, and he quite agreed with them. This was not a difficulty of his own creation! Hon. Members appeared to think that the authorities were satisfied with the present type of motor bus. On the contrary, with hon. Members, the Government desired to have effective improvement, and nothing would please him better than to find some speedy method of producing an improvement if it was only to defend themselves against these constant attacks. He could assure the House that the police had, as a matter of fact, been doing all they could under their powers to deal with this question, short of prohibiting these motor omnibuses from using the streets.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said it was the licensing of motor omnibuses that he referred to.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that with regard to licensing he was considering whether as a condition of granting a licence he should not reduce the speed to twelve miles an hour.

SIR HENRY CRAIK: And the weight.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that there again the hon. Member would find that the matter would rectify itself with a little patience. To-day they were running some motor omnibuses carrying a full complement of passengers which were three-quarters of a ton lighter than the old type. They were getting gradually to a better type of vehicle, and as regarded speed he was now considering as an alternative whether they should not require every motor omnibus to affix an automatic regulator which would come into action as soon as the vehicle reached a speed of twelve miles an hour.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said he did not speak of speed but of weight and vibration.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he had to answer a variety of questions—weight, vibration, speed, smell, and oil-droppings. Speed had to be considered in relation to weight. As regarded the dropping of oil, and smoke emission, a number of prosecutions had been undertaken and some convictions had been secured. He thanked his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean for his speech. It was throughout expressed in terms which would be most helpful to his Department. In regard to fish-curing, his right hon. friend would agree with him that it was a most difficult question. The Chief Inspector had shown that that was the case, and he had made certain suggestions which were deserving of consideration, He had only come into possession of the Report in the last few days. The attention of the Department would certainly be directed to the matter with the view to effecting an improvement. He would send the Chief Inspector to the Scottish Office, and he would suggest that extracts from the Scottish Reports should be published. The question of the employment of young girls was a most important point. His right hon. friend had shown from the quotations which he read what was going on, and there was certainly necessity for something being done to bring about an improvement. He had been asked why the Employment of Children Act had not been used. He was unable to say at present, but he assured his right hon. friend that he would go closely into the matter in order to see if more effective action could be taken under that Act. He reminded his right hon. friend that a Committee was now sitting on lead poisoning, and it would inquire into the subject of infant mortality in the pottery towns. Last November a Conference of Medical Officers had been held at the Home Office, and a statistical inquiry was proceeding in a number of towns with a view of ascertaining the relation between infant mortality and factory employment. The results of the inquiry were being tabulated, and he hoped they would get some useful information in that way. As regarded Government Departments and the use of lead a conference would be held in the course of the next few months. His right hon. friend had referred to legislation. There were already some arrears of legislation regarding matters coming within the scope of the Home Office work. That was not their fault. They had been pretty busy with legislation. They had this session the Children Bill, the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, the Prevention of Crime Bill, and the

Licensing Bill. All he could say was that they would do their best to deal with the Reports which came to them, and notably with the Report on sweating. They would consider the Report of the Truck Committee as soon as it was received. There was also the question of Shop Hours. They were increasing the strength of the lady inspectors by 40 per cent., and it was important that the House should have some intimation in regard to any changes which might attend this increase of strength. The divisional system was to be extended. The time had come when the demands of the country for the services of more lady inspectors could not be resisted. The main strength of the lady inspectors had hitherto been concentrated in London. A large new division was to be established with its centre at Manchester. Other divisions would follow at Birmingham and Leeds, but it was impossible to go ahead quickly with this formation of divisions. The strength of the lady inspectors was too low, and it would be futile to increase that strength beyond the capacity of the senior ladies for the effective training of probationers. There was going to be no change in the character of the excellent work done by the lady inspectors. Part of their work, as now, would consist of special inquiries, but regular duties would be allotted to them similar to those they were now doing in London, Scotland, and elsewhere. He referred to inspection and reports in connection with laundries, dressmaking, fruit-preserving, fish-curing, infant mortality, lead poisoning, accidents in certain industries, and generally all those questions which specially related to the industrial requirements of women and girls. A conference between the superintending inspector and senior lady inspectors would be held, and a scheme of work would be submitted for the approval of headquarters The special sphere and functions of lady inspectors would be maintained, care being taken to give as much elasticity as possible to the new organisations. He thanked the hon. Member for Bolton for his appreciation of the work done in regard to time-cribbing. They had not yet had much success through the agency of the police in regard to prosecutions, but what they had done was to strengthen public opinion, and to form it in condemnation of this very reprehensible practice, and therefore all these matters were, so to speak, "weighing in" to secure that desirable object. In regard to the Regulations for brass works to which his right hon. friend the Member for the Bordesley Division had called attention, he would like to say that the usual practice in regard to inquiry had been followed in this matter. In 1907, draft Regulations were drawn up affecting the brass industry. There was an inquiry ordered under the Act, and a gentleman of great experience was directed to inquire into the subject on behalf of the Home Office. Before the completion of the evidence there was the informal conference to which the right hon. Gentleman had alluded, and some arrangement, also informal, was come to with regard to the recommendation of certain modifications. He wished to remind the right hon. Gentleman, however, that this conference was for the purpose of laying suggestions before the Commissioner who had gone to Birmingham to hear both sides. He had all the evidence in front of him, and upon that information he made his decision. In the usual course the Report came before himself, and it was signed on 20th June. It had been lying on the Table for thirty days, no objection had been taken to it, and he could hardly think, therefore, that there was anything in it to which serious exception could be taken. The right hon. Gentleman had not told him the precise point to which exception was taken by the Chamber of Commerce. He promised the right hon. Gentleman, however, that he would look into the matter and find out what had really happened, but he could assure him that there had been no departure from the usual practice of inquiry in this particular case.

*Mr. JESSE COLLINGS: Will the right hon. Gentleman say why he did not accept the unanimous recommendations of a very strong conference held on the subject?

*Mr. GLADSTONE said that the parties concerned in the question met together in order to submit views to the Commissioner, and these parties apparently had a friendly and entirely informal conference. The Home Office was not concerned in it.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: It was the Home Office's suggestion that the conference should be held.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that what they agreed about were certain points which they decided to submit to the Commissioner. These points were submitted to the Commissioner, who, upon his own discretion, took the course now complained of.

MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire) asked whether there would be an opportunity in the autumn session of continuing this discussion.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he was not responsible for the lateness of the debate. He would suggest that hon. Members had themselves been a little lax in not taking steps in the usual form to have the Vote discussed earlier.

And, it being Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 15, proceeded to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Report of the Resolution then under consideration.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 15, to put forthwith the Questions, That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of each Class of the Civil Services Estimates, the Navy Estimates, the Army Estimates, and the Revenue Departments Estimates.

CIVIL SERVICES ESTIMATES, 1908-9.

CLASS I.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class I. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided:—Ayes, 247; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 232.)

AYES.

Abraham William (Cork N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland. Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Byles, William Pollard
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)

Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, T. A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn Sir Thomas P
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)

Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
M'Arthur, Charles
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie

Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.

Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. George D. Faber and Mr. Joynson-Hicks.

CLASS II.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class II. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 233.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Byles, William Pollard
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William

Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.

Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.

Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price,C.E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs.
Robertson,Sir G.Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H (Somerset,E
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach, HnMichael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clive, Percy Archer
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham
Gordon, J.
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Arthur, Charles
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm.G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Gretton and Mr. Stanley Wilson.

CLASS III.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class III. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 254 ; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 234.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W.(T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J.H.(Essex, Romf'd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Causton, Rt.Hn.Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Brst'l, S.
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Ross'nd'le
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H.(Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M.(Whitechapel)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt.Hn.Sir ThomasP
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, RtHn.Sir Alex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F.(Lewisham)
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robt.(Lanark, Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Arthur, Charles
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm.G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Hicks Beach and Mr. Wolff.

Class IV.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class IV. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided:—Ayes, 249; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 235.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W.(T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J.H.Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan

Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Suss'x,E Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S.
Dewar,Sir J.A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards,Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch,George Peabody(Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis(Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold(Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John

Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren,Sir C.B.(Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James(Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs,Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W. H. M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E.(Edinburgh,Central
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')

Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H. (Somerset,E
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.Hn. E.(Clackmanna
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt Hn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W. R.)

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. McKinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hon. Michael Hugh Hicks
Becket, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'gham)
Craik, Sir Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Houston, Robert Paterson
Idris, T. H. W.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
McArthur, Charles
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. James Hope and Mr. Arkwright.

CLASS V.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class V. of the Civil Service Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 258 ; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 236.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Alston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter

Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Liecester)
Mackarness, Frederick C.

Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
McKenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
McLaren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
McLaren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
McMicking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowden
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Seaverns, J. H.

Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Straus, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E.
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope

Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George

Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks

Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates,Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birm'gham)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robt.(Lanark,Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir JohnH
Keswick, William
Law,Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Arthur, Charles
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone,W.)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Roberts and Mr. Staveley-Hill.

CLASS VI.

Question, " That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class VI. of the Civil Services Estimates," put, and agreed to.

CLASS VII.

Question, " That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class VII. of the Civil Services Estimates," put, and agreed to.

Question, " That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Navy Estimates," put, and agreed to.

Question, " That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Army Estimates," put, and agreed to.

Question, " That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Revenue Departments Estimates," put, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS [28TH JULY].

Resolution reported,

" That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, the sum of £69,157,274 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Hobhouse.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION BILL.

" To apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and nine, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time to-morrow.

PUBLIC OFFICES SITES (EXTENSION) BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL [LORDS].

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (MASTERS) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

In the Committee.

Clause 1:—

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) moved to leave out words with respect to dismissal for misconduct. He did so on the ground that they were contrary to the present law in the matter. What the law said now was that when a person was dismissed for misconduct the specific acts of misconduct need not be stated by the employer. He thought it was desirable that the law should remain as it was, but under this clause the obligation was placed on the person dismissing to give a statement of the grounds of dismissal, and if that was not done the dismissed person might have a ground of action. That would create bad blood between employer and employed, and it would be unjust to the employer. He hoped the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury) said he had told the hon. and learned Gentleman that the last portion of the subsection was inserted as the result of an agreement between the various parties conerned. There must be a clear understanding on that point.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:—

MR. RAWLINSON moved to leave out "April," and insert "September." As the Bill stood at present it would come into operation at a retrospective date. That form of legislation was obviously open to many disadvantages, and if allowed in this Bill it might be used as a precedent. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the word 'April' and insert the word 'September.'"—*(Mr. Rawlinson.)*

Question proposed, "That the word 'April' stand part of the clause."

MR. RUNCIMAN said that the words used in the clause were taken from an Act passed in 1906, to remove doubts as to the powers and duties of justices under the Licensing Act of 1904. He would suggest to the hon. and learned Gentleman to insert "July" instead of "September," as that was the date at which the Bill had been introduced in the House of Lords.

MR. RAWLINSON said that the Act referred to by the right hon. Gentleman was an explanatory Act, which kind of Act was invariably made retrospective as it merely declared what the law was. But this Bill did not explain the rights of parties but would create new rights on the part of assistant masters of endowed schools by saying that they were not to be dismissed except with the consent of all parties. There was no precedent for retrospective legislation in Bills of this kind, which altered the right of parties which had been acquired in the Law Courts. He pressed very strongly that the right hon. Gentleman should not allow this precedent, which might be disastrous not only in this case, but in many other cases of great importance, to come into this kind of legislation.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said that this was not an explanatory measure. The object of the Bill was to get rid of a difficulty that had arisen with regard to the position of the assistant teachers of the endowed schools in consequence of the wording of the Endowed Schools Act of 1869. No doubt when the agreement was come to between the parties concerned it was expected that this Bill would have come into force earlier, and they chose the commencement of the financial year as the nearest Parliamentary date that occurred to them. The date, however, of April 1st had long since passed, and he contended that retrospective legislation was not desirable unless for some exceptional purpose. If they said the date should be "the date of the passing of this Act," the whole difficulty would be got over.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD thought that if the date was made the 1st of August the difficulty would disappear.

MR. RUNCIMAN suggested that the hon. Gentleman should act on the advice of his hon. friend.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON pointed out that the Amendment was to leave out "April" and insert "the date of the passing of this Act."

THE CHAIRMAN: We have now got a little further than that. The Question is that the word "April" stand part of the clause.

Question put and negatived.

Question, "That the word 'August' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL [LORDS].

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, three to be nominated by the House, and two by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented five clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee.

Ordered, That the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents, be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That three be the quorum.—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

EAST INDIA LOANS [RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION WORKS AND GENERAL PURPOSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom, on the security of the Revenues of India, by the creation and issue of capital stock, bonds, debentures, or bills. (1) A sum not excluding £200,000,000 for the following purposes:—(a) The construction, extension, and equipment of railways in India by State agency or through the agency of companies. (b) The repayment of the principle of any bonds or debentures issued by any such company under the guarantee of the Secretary of State. (c) The discharge of any obligations incurred by the Secretary of State by reason of the purchase of any railway or the determination of any contract from or with such company. (d) The construction of irrigation works in India. (2) A sum not exceeding £5,000,000 for the general purposes of the Government of India—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered.

Lords' Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'eleven' and to insert the word 'ten.'"

MR. MOONEY (Newry) asked for some explanation why this Amendment was necessary. There was a right of appeal under Clause 11 and not under Clause 10. The effect of this Amendment would be to take away that right of appeal in Clause 11, and if it were so taken away it certainly ought to be given in Clause 10. He much regretted that no member of the Irish executive was present to give some explanation.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) said that this was really a consequential Amendment. As Clause 7 had been omitted the numerical order of the succeeding clauses was changed and Clause 11 became Clause 10. As the Bill was, when it went before another place there was no right of appeal in Clause 10 and it was never intended to give a right of appeal under that Clause. Clause 5 did give a right of appeal in Clause 11, and if Clause 7 was struck out the Clause necessarily became Clause 10.

Lords' Amendments agreed to.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Twenty-one minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 30th July, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [H.L.]; River Wandle Protection Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Gosport Gas Bill; Central Ireland Electric Power Bill; Padiham Urban District Council Bill; Criccieth Water and Improvement Bill; Dover Graving Docks Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments, agreed to.

Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons, agreed to.

Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1^a; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 201.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Moved, "That Standing Order No. XXI. be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting; and that the order for the Third Reading of the Old-Age Pensions Bill have precedence of the other notices and Orders of the Day."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

Agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I beg to move that Standing Order XXXIX. be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting. That enables us to take Bills through more than one stage, but I desire to say that this power, which is so very ordinarily taken, as noble Lords opposite know, at this time of the year, is not intended to be unscrupulously used. I shall, however, ask your Lordships to deal with the Irish Universities Bill in that manner, so that the Bill with any Amendments that are made may be returned to the House of Commons to-day.

Moved, "That Standing Order No. XXXIX. be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH): My Lords, the notice which stands in my name is one which, when the House is about to adjourn and Parliament is not being prorogued, is quite usual according to precedent, and I hope your Lordships will agree to it.

Moved, "That Standing Orders Nos. 92 and 93 be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, also the time for depositing Documents relating to any Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, which would otherwise expire during the Autumn Recess, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill.—The King's consent signified; Bills read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Report of the Consultative Committee upon the school attendance of children below the age of five.

STATISTICS.

Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1893–1907. Fifty-fifth number.

RAILWAY RETURNS.

Returns of the capital, traffic, receipts, and working expenditure of the railway companies of the United Kingdom for the year 1907, with a general report thereon and summary tables for a series of years.

WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOUR.

Report on changes in rates of wages and hours of labour in the United Kingdom in 1907, with comparative statistics for 1898–1906.

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.

Report on strikes and lock-outs and on conciliation and arbitration boards in the United Kingdom in 1907.

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Annual Statement of navigation and shipping of the United Kingdom, for the year 1907.

PRISONS (IRELAND).

Thirtieth Report of the General Prisons Board for Ireland, 1907–1908.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4075. Brazil (Santos).

No. 4076. Persia (Bunder Abbas and Lingah).

No. 4077. France (St. Pierre and Miquelon).

No. 4078. Argentine (Rosario).

No. 4079. Russia (Finland).

No. 4080. Turkey (Damascus).

No. 4081. China (Chungking).

No. 4082. China (Canton).

NAVY (PAY).

List of exceptions to the King's Regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, with the approval of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, pursuant to the Order in Council dated 19th December, 1881, during the year 1907–1908.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL, 1908.

Table of comparison between the provisions of the Bill and existing enactments.

METROPOLITAN POLICE (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Report of the Commissioners upon the duties of the Metropolitan Police. Vols. II. and III. Minutes of Evidence, with Appendices and Index.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

FORESHORES.

Treasury Minute, dated 29th July, 1908, directing the application of moneys received by the Board of Trade in the year ended 31st March, 1908, in respect of the rights and interests of the Crown on the foreshores of the United Kingdom.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS, 1894 TO 1906 (DISPENSING POWERS).

Report by the Board of Trade of the cases in which they have exercised their powers under Section 78 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1906, during the year ended 31st May, 1908.

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT, 1888 (SECTION 31).

Tenth Report by the Board of Trade, of proceedings under Section 31 of the Act, including proceedings upon complaints made under Section 1 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1894.

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Report by the Board of Trade respecting their proceedings under the Railway Regulation Act, 1893, 56 & 57 Vict., c. 29, during the year ended 27th July, 1908; together with the appendices thereto.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be printed, and to be considered To-morrow. [No. 200.]

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

PUBLIC OFFICES SITES (EXTENSION) BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Report from the Joint Commitee that the Bill ought to be allowed to proceed. The proceedings of the Committee and the minutes of evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Viscount WOLVERHAMPTON): My Lords, I am sure your Lordships will forgive me if I do not trespass upon your time. The Bill has been thoroughly discussed, and I hope the House will consent at once to give it a Third Reading, so that we may send it down to the House of Commons as soon as possible with a view to their considering the Amendments which your Lordships have inserted.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

*THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, before this Motion is put and agreed to I beg to ask your Lordships' indulgence while I say a few words regarding the speech which was made by the noble Earl in moving the Second Reading of this Bill. I feel some temerity in making any such statement in the presence of so great a financial expert as the noble Viscount who addressed us last night on the finances of the Empire; but I feel that I must take a plunge into this channel of finance. It is an Irish channel; and I trust we shall have some elucidation from the noble Earl the Leader of the House on the subject. There was very little discussion upon this matter during the Committee Stage of the Bill in another place. Before I deal with the point, I should like to quote what the noble Earl the Leader of the House said in moving the Second Reading of the Bill as to its finance. The noble Earl said—

> "At present Queen's colleges each receive £7,000 a year from the Consolidated Fund. This is brought up by Votes and allowances to £13,000 in the case of Belfast, £11,250 in that of Cork, and £10,600 in that of Galway. The Royal University gets £20,000 a year, making a total endowment of £55,466.

There is a mistake of £1,000 in that addition, but I will not quarrel about that. The noble Earl continued—

> "The new proposal is that £20,000 of the Irish Church surplus is to be divided between the two Universities, Belfast getting £10,000 and Dublin £10,000. In addition to that Belfast gets £18,000 a year, Dublin £32,000, Cork £20,000, and Galway £12,000, making altogether a total of £102,000, which is £46,544 more than they have hitherto been receiving. As regards buildings, Dublin University and college receive a building grant of £150,000, Belfast one of £60,000, Cork £14,000, and Galway £6,000.

I now come to the point as to which I desire to get some elucidation. The noble Earl said—

> "Then as to Dublin the buildings of the Royal University, which cost £77,000, were handed over, and the colleges which formed part of the new University and cost originally and with additions altogether £186,000, making a grand total of £493,000."

I object to the inclusion in the Estimate made by the noble Earl of the sum of £77,000 for the buildings of the Royal University. I know every inch of these old buildings, and they will have to be pulled down and rebuilt. I maintain that it is hardly fair to take the old buildings at their original cost. The grand total of £493,000 refers to new building grants *plus* the original cost of the University and colleges. They were erected in 1868 at a cost of £77,000, and they ought now to be regarded rather as a *minus* quantity, for I, personally, would not give £10 for them. Then, when we take the £186,000 which the colleges forming part of the new University cost originally and "with additions," I should like to ask, what is their present value? The buildings are between thirty and forty years old. Is there any depreciation? The noble Earl concluded—

> "That, I think, cannot be said to be illiberal finance."

I should like to separate the word "illiberal" and to apply the first part of it to that portion of the finance I have spoken of, and the other to the sort of finance we are forced to endure under the present Government. I hope the noble Earl will explain what he means by including the original cost, because I hardly think it is fair to make up a grand total in this way. I have one more question to ask—Where are, and what has been done with, the savings of the Royal University, amounting to about £70,000? If there are these savings, I think the money ought to be applied to the University in Dublin. Have the Treasury, so to speak, put this money into their pockets? It is most interesting to us Irishmen to know what has become of the £70,000 which this examining University, much to its credit, has saved.

Lord KILLANIN: My Lords, I am glad that my noble friend Lord Mayo has availed himself of this opportunity of drawing attention to the finance of the Bill, which, of course, we have no opportunity of touching directly; and I cannot help thinking that those of us who are really anxious to see this new University started successfully must have grave misgivings as to the adequacy of the funds provided under the Bill. I have made all the inquiries I could, and from the information I have received, I think it will be practically impossible to equip a new University in a proper up-to-date manner for the sum of £150,000.

The other day Lord Curzon, as Chancellor of Oxford University, made an appeal to the public for funds merely to fill up gaps in an old University, and for this purpose he asked for no less a sum than £250,000. But we in Ireland are to build a completely new University, which will require all the modern and expensive scientific apparatus, for £100,000 less than Lord Curzon requires to bring Oxford University up to date. I think those figures ought to suggest to the noble Earl how wholly insufficient is the sum provided for the new University and college in Dublin. To my mind, it is practically impossible to secure for that sum a University and college worthy of the important position it should occupy as a great central University in the capital of Ireland.

In that connection I would remind the noble Earl of what was said by the Royal Commission. The Royal Commission recommended that the University should be established on a liberal scale, and expressed the opinion that unless it was done on an adequate and impressive scale it need not be done at all. They added—

> "It is necessary that in the dignity of the buildings, the emoluments of the teachers, and the equipment of the institution, it should command respect and enthusiasm."

It is, in my opinion, impossible to dream of filling in any of that picture with the funds provided under this Bill. The noble Earl, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, said he did not think the finance illiberal. But does he think it liberal? I am inclined to think that it is illiberal; but, whether it is liberal or illiberal, I suggest to the noble Earl that it is distinctly inadequate. For the sake of the success of the scheme I hope His Majesty's Government will see that another £100,000 should be given to the foundation of this new University and college. I do not see why there should be so much trouble about it. I hope the noble Earl will not say that the Chief Secretary agrees but that the Treasury will not give the money. I am sure the noble Earl will admit that that is an absurd argument. The Treasury is the servant and not the master of the Government, and if the Government say that this money is necessary, it will, of course, be at once given. The Government are embarking on experimental legislation and contemplating an expenditure which I hear estimated at between £8,000,000 and £16,000,000 a year. I think a Government that can contemplate that expenditure should not unreasonably object to giving another £100,000 to so excellent an object as this. I therefore ask the noble Earl to see if he cannot do something in that direction.

Galway College is, in my opinion, being specially badly treated in this arrangement. That college is in the poorest part of Ireland, and, therefore, will have less chance than any other college of receiving local assistance. I know that the noble Earl will say that in the past there were not a great number of students at Galway College. I quite admit that the number of students may have been small in the past, but there is a good explanation of that. The reason Galway College had so few students was that it is in the most Catholic part of Ireland, and that when the Queen's Colleges were condemned, students were advised by the Catholic Church not to go to it. But now there is reason to believe that students will flock to the college from those parts. Galway College is to be a constituent college, and it will have to develop itself in order to meet the requirements of its new position. Its equipment, however, is defective. There are professors there who fill four chairs. One professor is professor of history, English, logic, and metaphysics; another is professor of zoology, botany, geology, and mineralogy. I think that in any other University in the United Kingdom those subject are specialised and distinct. If Galway College is to get on its legs again it will be necessary to appoint a number of other professors. Let me compare Galway College with Cork College. Cork had £11,200 a year, and under the Bill that is raised to £20,000—that is to say, you add £8,800 a year to the finances of Cork College. But in the case of Galway College the £10,600 which it received is only raised to £12,000. Therefore, while an additional £8,800 a year is given to Cork only £1,400 is given to Galway. Yet there is no reason to suppose that Galway will not develop proportionately even more than Cork. I therefore ask the noble Earl to consider whether it is not possible to increase the figure from £12,000 to £14,000 a year. I think that would meet all the requirements of the situation. I do not think I am making an excessive demand in asking that this additional money should be given.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, the noble Earl who opened this discussion made, I think, no criticism on the figures which I announced with regard to the future finance of the colleges so far as their yearly income was concerned.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: I said the figures were correct.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The noble Lord not only said the figures were correct, but he kindly repeated them. But it was on the question of the building grants in which he joined issue with me to some extent. I carefully guarded myself, I think, in what I said from allowing it to be supposed that I gave the values of £77,000 for the Royal University and £186,000 odd for the Queen's Colleges as their existing value. I said that it was what they cost. The noble Earl joins issue with me on that, and says that if these buildings were put into the market nobody would give that for them. You have to consider for what purposes buildings are used. It is not the value they might be to anybody, but the value they might be to a University. I do not know what Christ Church, Oxford, would sell for if put up for sale, but there is no doubt as to the great value of the buildings there for the particular purpose for which they were designed. The noble Earl said that all the buildings were old. My recollection certainly of some of the buildings of the Royal University in Dublin is that they are in an exceedingly good condition. The laboratories, which, if I remember right, are only used now for examining purposes, are undoubtedly the best in Dublin, and they form a very valuable asset indeed of the new University. Then as regards the Queen's Colleges, these buildings, the noble Lord said, were thirty or forty years old. But many of them are extremely good buildings. It is impossible to value these things at the value of the moment. Buildings of that kind, set apart for a special purpose, have not got a market value. All you can say is that they are of a certain value for the purpose to which they are to be devoted under this Bill, and it is relevant to state the total sum of money which is to be applied for University education in Ireland under this Bill, and to mention the cost price, stating, as I did, that it is the cost price, of these buildings. Then as regards the £70,000 of the Royal University, that £70,000 will be available for the superannuation of the present officers, and if the noble Earl will look at Clause 14 of the Bill, subsection 2 (a), he will see that the Commissioners may make a scheme for certain purposes, and the £70,000 under that scheme will be set apart for meeting the claims of existing officers.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: Is that stated in the Bill?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: It will be stated in the scheme.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: Then it will be pin money for the Commissioners to do what they like with.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: So much less, therefore, has to be spent out of the sum voted, or out of the general means of the University in satisfying those claims which have to be met under the Bill. Then the noble Lord, Lord Killanin, joined issue with us as to the general finance of the Bill, and he said that we are behaving in an otherwise than liberal manner towards Ireland. I quite agree that this Irish University is not to be judged by the rules which apply to Universities in England, Scotland, and Wales. We have all agreed that under the special circumstances it is necessary to devote to this purpose sums of public money which we should never think of applying in the case of the other three countries; but I am bound to say that I do not think that that fact necessarily means that we are bound to institute a University which, in all respects, is going to leap into existence fully armed as a rival to any other University in the three kingdoms. I do not think that there is anything in the circumstances of Ireland which absolves Ireland from the necessity of contributing, according to its means, to this University. Ireland is spoken of as a poor country. In a sense it is a poor country. There are a large number of poor people in it, but there are a considerable number of well-to-do, and for various purposes, as we know, large sums of money can be raised in Ireland. We fully admit that the particular circumstances make it necessary, if this scheme is to succeed at all, that a considerable sum of money should be found, but we certainly do look to Ireland to follow the example, in particular, of Wales, which is not a rich country, and where the subscriptions of quite poor people have been devoted to these educational objects, and we do not think that that is by any means an unreasonable or unjust claim to make. Therefore, when the noble Lord talks in an airy way of another £100,000, I think that is a consideration which has to be borne in mind. Of course, these are all matters of opinion; but I still maintain, and I appeal to noble Lords who do not come from Ireland, with some confidence, that the finance of this Bill is not of an illiberal character. The noble Lord, in his character of "the man for Galway"—a well-known phrase —very properly spoke up for his local college. I have a very pleasant recollection of the Queen's College at Galway. The buildings are both substantial and ornamental, and I know that the education that is carried on there has been of a high grade, and that the general business of the college has been carried out with great devotion by the professors. As to the precise merits of the allocation which has been made as between the four colleges, I confess I am not entirely competent to speak; but I think it is pretty clear, from the course which my right hon. friend has taken in allocating more of the new grant to Cork than to Galway, that he did consider that the capacity of extension in Cork was somewhat greater than the capacity in Galway. On that he has undoubtedly been advised by those best competent to judge, and at this time of the day it would be useless to ask him to reconsider this point. Personally I should have been glad if Galway had had a little more, but it is useless to proceed further with the matter at this stage.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved to omit from subsection (3) the words—

> "And provision shall be made by any such new charter or alteration of an existing charter for adequate representation of graduates and professors on the governing bodies of the constituent colleges."

and to insert the following new subsection—

> "(4) In every charter granted under this Act by which a governing body is constituted for a constituent college, provision shall be made by which those members who are officers of the college, together with those who are elected by either the Senate of the University or the graduates of the University who are members of the college, shall jointly amount to at least three-fourths of the total number of such governing body, exclusive of any co-opted members who shall in no case exceed four in number."

He said his primary object in moving the Amendment was to decrease the element on the governing bodies of the new Universities which was not chosen by the colleges themselves. He believed that as the Bill was introduced the Government retained complete freedom as to what should be done in future charters, but as a result of an Amendment moved by Mr. Butcher in the other House the words which he now desired to strike out were inserted. He would for a moment draw a parallel between Ireland and England in this matter. There was a college in the University of Cambridge which had the privilege of reckoning amongst the most distinguished of her sons the noble Earl the leader of their Lordships' House. Let them imagine that a new statute of that college was lying upon the Table of their Lordships' House and that some Member of the House moved to alter the constitution, so that 30 per cent. of the governing body should be nominated by the county councils of Cambridge and three neighbouring counties and that 45 per cent. of the whole of the governing body of the college should consist of people not chosen by the college at all but nominated from outside. He would certainly hesitate himself to submit any such Motion, for he could imagine the dressing down he would receive at the hands of the noble Earl. Yet that was an exact parallel with the scheme now proposed for these colleges. The central idea with which he approached the Amendment was that of trying to set up an atmosphere in the college founded upon *esprit de corps* and pride in the college, which could only grow from a consciousness of membership of a complete entity ruling itself. He should have preferred no representation whatever of municipal authorities, but, as the Government had urged that it was all-important that local interest should grow up in those colleges, he proposed in his Amendment that the University *plus* the graduates and professors should have two-thirds of the representation on the governing body of a college, and that the outside element should amount to one-third. Under the Government scheme the representation of the University and the college on the governing body in Dublin would be sixteen and of outside influence fourteen. At Cork the academic representation would be thirteen and the outside element eleven, while at Galway the proportion would be twelve to eleven. In each case the academic element was allowed a majority, though nearly the smallest the Government could give it. His Amendment provided for twenty-three academic and seven outside representatives at Dublin, and eighteen and six respectively in the cases of Cork and Galway. It might be asked, "Why are you trying to cut down those nominated by the Crown?" He was not, but it was perfectly reasonable to count those nominated by the Crown in the non-academic element. He thought it was very unlikely that they would be an academic element. His Majesty's present advisers in Ireland were not always happy in the appointments they made to particular posts. He noticed in a copy of the newspaper *Sinn Fein*, the organ of an extreme body of opinion in Ireland, dated the previous November, that the Government had made four very important judicial appointments, the qualifications of those appointed being, more or less, but principally less, legal, but they all happened to be members of the staff of the *Freeman's Journal*. If the Chief Secretary went for his judicial appointments to the staff of the *Freeman's Journal* he thought their Lordships were justified in being a little nervous as to where his appointments would come from to the governing bodies of these colleges. He might be asked why be objected to large municipal representation. He was informed that until quite recently the important town of Oxford existed solely on the sufferance of the University, and he believed that until quite recently it was necessary for the representatives of the town to attend before the University once a year, bareheaded and kneeling, in order to pray humbly that the important town of

Oxford might be allowed to exist for another twelve months—a leave which was always given. He did not pretend that the outward and visible sign of this ceremony was anything else than ridiculous, but it fairly illustrated what was the proper relation of a municipal authority to a seat of learning. He submitted that the 30 per cent. representation which was given to municipal authorities upon these governing bodies was out of all proportion to the needs of the case. County councils in Ireland were very active agents of political parties, and it would be regrettable if these new seats of learning were to be turned into political machines.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, to leave out from the word 'them' to the end of the subsection and to insert the following new subsection:

"(4) In every charter granted under this Act by which a governing body is constituted for a constituent college, provision shall be made by which those members who are officers of the college, together with those who are elected by either the senate of the University or the graduates of the University who are members of the college, shall jointly amount to at least three-fourths of the total number of such governing body, exclusive of any co-opted members, who shall in no case exceed four in number.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

*THE EARL OF CREWE: This is an Amendment on a point of great interest, and undoubtedly a point of very considerable complexity; all the more so because it seems quite impossible to lay down any principle—so far experience guides us—as to what the position of these governing bodies ought to be. You take one class of University and you find argument on the side of the noble Lord. You take another class of University, and you find argument in the other direction. The noble Earl asked what I should think if there was a question of altering the constitution of my old college. What he said is perfectly true. The old English Universities are, no doubt, entirely independent of any kind of civic representation. Civic representation was hardly realised when the colleges which comprise the great Universities were founded, and although modifications of all kinds have taken place in their constitution, yet that particular element has not been introduced. The same applies to the Universities in Scotland. In the case of the Scottish Universities there is some slight and almost nominal municipal representation; but, take them altogether, they are no doubt almost purely academic in their governing bodies. But when you look at the modern English Universities you come to an entirely different state of things. The supreme body of the great modern English Universities is the court. Well, the court of those Universities has a very small academic element upon it. There are members of the various local authorities, members representing all sorts of scientific and other interests, and members appointed in respect of the offices they hold; but the actual academic element is very small. The court is the great legislative body for these Universities. The same thing applies to their executive. Their executive body is the council, and there, again, the academic element forms a small minority of the total number. It is perfectly true that, so far as the internal administration of a college goes, that is confided to academic hands; but that will equally be the case with these new colleges. The academic council will be the body which will manage the actual daily work of the college, and it is only with questions of principle and of what may be called constitutional changes that these governing bodies will be concerned. The problem which the Government had to consider in dealing with this matter was, no doubt, a different one from any other. The Queen's Colleges have to some extent served their localities, but they have not, except in the case of Belfast which, I think, has been subscribed to, aroused any local support. I do not think the noble Lord will contradict me there. One of the reasons has been that all their officers have been nominated by the Crown, and that, I quite agree, is by no means a happy state of things. Our idea in reconstituting these colleges was that they should rouse the greatest possible degree of local interest. They are not—I so far agree with the noble Lord—constituted and endowed on a scale that is intended to make them independent of local support. We do not profess that they should be; and in order to secure that local support, it certainly did seem very important to us that a large element representing the different neighbourhoods should be placed on the governing body. I wish to repeat once more, because it is important to remember it, that the actual affairs of the college will be managed by the academic council. Those persons representing the county council and other bodies will have to come a considerable distance, and I know how it is on the courts of English Universities. A great many of these members only attend when some specially large question is under consideration. Some people do not go that far, and therefore I think it is not safe to assume that these people will be continually busying themselves with the minor affairs of the college, or that they will in any way assist to create what the noble Earl is afraid of—a political atmosphere, or an unacademic frame of mind. This is a question, no doubt, on which different opinions are certain to be held. The noble Earl has admitted the idea of municipal and outside representation, and therefore we need not argue that point. Then it comes to be a question of numbers. Unlike, remember, the modern English Universities, we are giving these councils a very distinct academic majority, and, that being so, I cannot think that there is any real argument to be used against the number of those who are to represent the particular municipality. They represent people over a very wide area, as a rule one for each body, and if you cut them down I am not quite sure whom you will exclude. It means that you leave out the representative of some one particular county, and although I quite admit that there are two sides to this question, yet I hope the noble Earl will not persevere with his Amendment, principally on this ground that these constitutions do not appear in the Act but in the charter. If it should be found, which personally seems to me almost incredible, that the working of these colleges should be in any way interfered with by the presence of this municipal element, which we believe to be all for the good, it will be open to those concerned to apply for a modification of the charter. I do not expect noble Lords opposite to look at it precisely in the way we do, because they entertain a very rooted distrust of the county councils, and, therefore, I can appreciate a certain dread which they feel of the considerable number of members of these bodies; but as it is only a question of numbers I hope the noble Earl will be induced to withdraw his Amendment.

LORD ASHBOURNE agreed that the question was a difficult and delicate one. They could not get rid of a difficulty by saying it was a question of numbers, as nearly everything connected with these topics was a question of numbers. There was no comparison between the size of the local representation on the governing bodies of the new English Universities and that proposed in the Bill. Was it reasonable to give the great controlling power to those who had not had the advantage of a University training and scholastic knowledge? Was it wise to start the colleges with such a large representation of the local authorities as to expose the whole machine to the danger of their over-control? He admitted that the question was difficult and delicate and a question of numbers, but the point was that the Government's figures were too high. They did not work out a delicate problem in a way that showed that they recognised its delicacy.

*THE EARL OF MAYO assured the noble Earl the Leader of the House that they had no rooted fear of county councils in Ireland. He thought they did their county work very well, but it was another question when it was proposed to give them such large representation on the governing body of a new University. Therefore, he welcomed the noble Earl's admission that there were two sides to this question. He had no rooted fear——

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I do not think I said anything about rooted fear. I said rooted distrust.

*THE EARL OF MAYO said he had no rooted distrust of those nominated by the Crown, notwithstanding that they heard that some of the gentlemen appointed recently to judicial positions were connected with the *Freeman's Journal*. He contended that when once the charter was granted it was exceedingly difficult to get it altered. Mr. Birrell had stated that he was disposed to place the constitution of the governing bodies in the charters instead of in the Act itself, because this was an experiment and he preferred to proceed by way of charter which could be easily modified without the risks and dangers attendant upon getting a measure through both Houses of Parliament. For himself he would rather have the criticism of Parliament and the necessity for a Bill than that the provision should be placed in the charter, for it was an extremely troublesome and difficult matter to get a charter modified. If the noble Earl divided upon his Amendment he would support him. He was of opinion that no fair comparison could be made between a modern English University, upon the governing body of which the academic element was small, and the Irish Universities. The members elected by the county councils would give to the governing bodies a strong political complexion, and there was a danger of political questions of a very acute nature being introduced into the composition of those bodies. The noble Earl had said it was desirable to introduce local interest; but under the provisions of the Bill they would have parochial interests, and all sorts of jobbery would be brought in, and discussions would arise upon matters which ought to be academically treated by an academically-elected body.

The LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON) said the noble Earl who had moved this Amendment had been very frank and had admitted that, if he had his way, he would get rid of the representatives of local bodies altogether. That was the spirit, though not the exact wording, of the noble Earl's Amendment. The experience which he (Lord Ripon) had gained in connection with building up Leeds University satisfied him of the necessity of obtaining increasingly large assistance from local bodies in such an enterprise, and it would be impossible to obtain such aid unless the local bodies were encouraged by being given a fair share of representation upon the governing bodies. He thought the introduction of a local representative element would do much to help towards the success of the Irish Universities. He believed that if the representatives of local interests were reduced to one-fourth it would be merely a first step to their being got rid of altogether, and he could not think that that would help the success of this great and noble experiment.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the noble Earl who leads the House admitted very frankly that this question was a complicated and difficult one, and he said that the difficulty of dealing with it was increased because we had no analogies and no experience to guide us. I rather agree with him in so far as his argument is founded on the absence of analogies, because I think that an analogy drawn between these new Universities in Ireland, and the old Universities with which we are familiar would be a misleading one; and when I heard the noble Marquess who spoke last cite the case of a younger University with which he is connected, the University of Leeds, I almost ventured to tell him that I doubt extremely whether an analogy drawn from the local bodies of Yorkshire is one which counts for much when you are dealing with local bodies in parts of Ireland. As for our absence of experience, I think that argument is not so strong. We have experience, and a great deal of experience, of the manner in which Irish local bodies conduct their affairs, and it is no use mincing words in regard to such a subject. We know that they do manage their affairs in a political, and, I am afraid, a strongly partisan spirit. My noble friend, very rightly, I think, suggests that it is not desirable that these partisan bodies should be too powerfully represented upon the governing bodies of the colleges, and I certainly agree with him in thinking that the proportion of members assigned to them is very much too strong. It is a number which would probably in many cases turn the scale. Does the noble Earl believe for one moment that these elected members of the governing bodies will really be selected upon purely academic grounds? I for one am quite unable to put myself in that frame of mind, and I would point this out, that in the case of the governing body of the Dublin College no less than eight members are to be selected by the General Council of County Councils. We know something about the General Council of County Councils. It was a body which in its inception was intended to be of a more or less impartial and non-political character. Several well-known Irishmen, one or two Members of this House, were at first connected with it, and bore a conspicuous part in its proceedings; but, as time went on, affairs were so conducted as to make it absolutely impossible for them to retain their connection with this council, and it is now a purely partisan body. The noble Earl told us—I think I correctly apprehended what he said—that the matter did not signify so much because what he called strict academic questions would be dealt with by the academic council. But I would ask the noble Earl to bear in mind these two points. He says that the governing bodies have only to do with large questions of policy. But am I wrong in believing that the governing bodies virtually elect the professors? Is it not the fact that the governing bodies have to put forward three names from which the choice must be made. That is not a question of policy, that is a question of patronage, and it is exactly the kind of question which I believe——

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Perhaps "policy" was not exactly the right word to use. What I meant was that the daily life of the college and the atmosphere, of which the noble Earl opposite spoke, did not seem to me to fall within the purview of these bodies so much as of an academic body.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I still think my argument is a sound one, and that the bodies which are charged with the election of professors, are bodies which ought, if possible, to be constituted on purely academical grounds. What you really want is academical strength, and that, I think, will be best gained by keeping out, so far as you can, purely partisan spirit. But I do not want to prolong this discussion. I do not know whether my noble friend would be wise in pressing this Amendment if it is greatly objected to by His Majesty's Government; but I should like to ask the noble Earl whether he will not keep an open mind on the subject to this extent, that he might accept, perhaps, instead of the larger number given by my noble friend, a smaller number—let us say, for the sake of argument, two-thirds.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am afraid I am not in a position to accept anything on this point; but if the noble Earl likes to insert that figure in this House, it will remain with my right hon. friend in the other House to see whether he will accept it or not.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment. There were, he thought, few persons in their Lordships' House, who, if they had a free hand, would not make the composition of the governing bodies very different from what was proposed. They were not engaged in an academic discussion, but in a political discussion, for nobody doubted that the composition of these governing bodies had been drawn up on political grounds in order to conciliate that body of opinion which had to be conciliated in this matter. He was a member of the governing body of the University of Wales, and on that body there was a large municipal representation; he believed twenty-six members of the court of the University were chosen by the counties and county boroughs. He thought that where people were keen about education an admixture of the municipal element might be useful. In Scotland they had had experience of both forms of Government. Years ago Edinburgh University was governed by the town council, and Glasgow University by the professors; and an essay written by Sir William Hamilton was adverse to government by the professors and favourable to government by the municipality. Therefore municipal government was not necessarily bad. On the Second Reading noble Lords opposite united in most enthusiastic and emphatic approbation of this Bill, which they thought would lead to a settlement of a vexed question in Ireland. He would ask the noble Earl opposite whether it was worth while to press the Amendment and so, perhaps, prevent this scheme from being accepted as a settlement of the University question, not because it was the best, but because it was the only possible solution that could secure anything like unanimity.

THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN hoped that after what had been said by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, his noble friend would not press the Amendment. If he did, and His Majesty's Government did not accept it, he would feel compelled to vote with His Majesty's Government. It was of vital importance to associate local opinion with this scheme. The real ground of the Amendment seemed to be the apprehension that the local authorities, the county councils, could not be trusted to fulfil the duties which this Bill would put upon them. He could only speak personally of one county council, on which he sat for nine years, and he did not think the political opinions of the majority, who were Home Rulers, ever interfered in the slightest degree with the way in which they conducted public business, and he did not think it was quite fair to say that in a matter of this kind they would allow their political opinion to influence them.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said they all recognised the special circumstances of this case, and did not desire to dissociate local interest from these colleges. All they had urged was that too much representation was being given to municipalities as compared with the representation given to the college itself. If he did not press the Amendment, would the noble Earl ask the Chief Secretary whether, in issuing these charters, this point might not be reconsidered with a view, not, if they liked, to diminishing the municipal representation, but to giving the college itself a little larger representation than what was being offered to it now?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I will, of course, lay that point before my right hon. friend.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*LORD CLONBROCK moved an Amendment, the object of which was to empower "The Commissioners and, after the powers of the Commissioners determine," the Senate of the University, to proceed to the recognition of any college. They had every reason to believe that these Commissioners would be selected with great care, and that they would be eminent men possessing considerable knowledge of all University matters. Therefore, without throwing any slight upon the Senate, he thought it might fairly be said that the Commissioners would be in a better position to proceed in this matter than a newly elected Senate. Their power of recognition could be most usefully exercised in the case of the Royal College of Science in Dublin, and in that of the Royal College of Surgeons. It would be of the greatest importance to the new University that the College of Science should be affiliated. Their laboratory and plant would be most useful to the University in its future work. The Royal Commission presided over by Lord Robertson recommended the affiliation of the College of Science, although they were opposed to affiliation generally. He hoped, therefore, that His Majesty's Government would consent to the insertion of these words.

The Earl of Dunraven.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 15, after the word 'which' to insert the words 'the Commissioners, and after the powers of the Commissioners to determine.'"—(*Lord Clonbrock.*)

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am afraid we cannot accept the Amendment. I quite understand the motives which have actuated the noble Lord in proposing it; but it seems to me it would be rather an anomalous course to take. These Commissioners are a temporary body; they include several people who have no connection whatever with Ireland, and who will, I conceive, cease to have any connection with these Universities when their work is done. In those circumstances it seems an anomalous and strange thing to place this recognition in their hands rather than in the hands of the Senate, which is to be the regular governing body of the University. It is perfectly right that these experienced men should have the power of drawing up the statutes, those statutes including the general principles on which recognition should take place; but when it comes to deciding whether or not a particular college should or should not be recognised, it seems to us only possible to leave that to the permanent governing body of the University.

LORD ASHBOURNE said it was, of course, for the Government to decide how they would work their own scheme. But, personally, he thought the proposal of his noble friend was a reasonable one, and that it provided a means of, if he might say so, getting this University on its legs in the quickest possible way. The noble Lord had mentioned the Royal College of Science. He believed that it would be expedient for the new University to recognise that college at the earliest possible moment. It was fully equipped, and he would have thought the matter one worthy of immediate and prompt attention.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

LORD ASHBOURNE moved an Amendment providing that the University might "by statute" give recognition to students who are pursuing a course of study of a University type in any recognised college in Ireland. At present, he said, the power, not only of affiliation, but of recognition, was not regulated at all. It was left open, and was, he supposed, intended to be exercised by resolution, without any form, without any schemes laid down, and without any appeal. He thought it was most essential that this should be one of the most important acts of the University and that it was most desirable that it should be by statute.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'may,' to insert the words 'by statute.'"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am afraid we cannot accept this Amendment, for reasons which I will explain as shortly as I can. The effect, of course, is to make the process of recognition more difficult, and not only the process of recognition, but equally the process of withdrawing any form of recognition or the imposition of any conditions on that recognition. Therefore, supposing a particular college is to be recognised, and supposing that the governing authority of the University desire to raise the standard of education required in that particular college, they are not at liberty, if the noble Lord's Amendment is carried, to do so without the matter being brought before the Privy Council. I have an Amendment on the Paper which gives an appeal to the Universities Committee of the Privy Council. It seems to me a preposterous suggestion that the affiliation of a particular college should be placed in the hands of this body rather than in the hands of the University itself. So far as the English Universities are concerned, there is no restriction of this kind. Liverpool can affiliate any college it likes by ordinance; Birmingham, Leeds, and Manchester, I think I am correct in saying, can affiliate simply by resolution. What is important is that the standard of the affiliated college should be high. That is provided for and clearly should be maintained; but as to the question of whether the religious views entertained in a particular college, or anything of that kind, should or should not debar it from recognition, I should be very sorry indeed if that became a matter of controversy, as I think it possibly might if the noble and learned Lord's Amendment were accepted.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3:

*THE EARL OF CREWE moved, in reference to subsection (2) of the clause, which ran—

"Every professor upon entering into office shall sign a declaration in a form approved by the Commissioners jointly under this Act, securing the respectful treatment of the religious opinions of any of his class."

to add the following proviso—

"Provided that no test of religious belief shall be imposed by the governing body of either of the two new Universities or any constituent college on any such professor or lecturer as a condition of his appointment or recognition by the governing body as such professor or lecturer."

The noble Earl said: This relates to the lecturers in theology and divinity. They are not to be paid out of the University funds, and are not to form part, in any real sense, of the constituent body of the University. As a general rule it may be assumed that they will be appointed under some trust, and, of course, in that case the trust might impose conditions of test. On the other hand, it is conceivable that a fund might be left to endow the professorship but leaving the appointment of the professor to the University. In that case we do not think it proper that the University should impose any test. That is the object of this Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 43, after the word 'divinity,' to insert the words 'Provided that no test of religious belief shall be imposed by the governing body of either of the two new Universities or any constituent college on any such professor or lecturer as a condition of his appointment or recognition by the governing body as such professor or lecturer.'"—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

*LORD ROBERTSON said this Amendment not merely touched a highly important subject, but it had a political significance which he thought deserved attention. The main object of the Bill was to give satisfaction to the Roman

Catholic people and clergy of Ireland. He knew something of the subject, and he was certain the more impartial attention was given to it the more it became clear that the only thing that would satisfy those classes in Ireland was a Roman Catholic University pure and simple. The gravity of the question, whether the Imperial Parliament should set up such an institution, he did not in the least minimise; but what he protested against was that they should put masks on their faces in dealing with that question. He supported the Bill because he had understood that it was an honest attempt to establish in Ireland a Roman Catholic University which would give satisfaction to the people of Ireland. He recognised that it was a large departure from the principles which had hitherto guided the party opposite in dealing with questions of education, and, moreover, it was a complete reversal of the policy which had prevailed during what he might call, roughly speaking, the reign of the Liberal Party. He was no more an advocate of a reactionary policy in regard to Universities than any noble Lord opposite. But he was convinced that, unless power was given to the Roman Catholics of Ireland within the University to give full effect to their religious propensities, and, he would add, without offence to their prejudices, this offer of a University was a mockery. It must be remembered that the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland were to a large extent masters of the situation, and unless they were satisfied with the Bill the same influence which wrecked "the godless colleges" would wreck this University. It was a complete fallacy to suppose that in setting up a Roman Catholic University they were doing what was called handing over the youth of Ireland to the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy. The bulk of the youth of that country were in the hands of the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy at present. The only question was whether Parliament should not afford an opportunity of having infused into the domain of higher education in Ireland those humanising and liberalising influences which the Roman Catholic Church—to give it its due—knew so well how to use, as was illustrated by the signal success of the Jesuits in education, and he was sure their Lordships would agree with him in saying that that distinguished man Dr. Delany was a worthy representative of these traditions and achievements. It was a strong step; it was a final step; but he, for his part, took his share in the responsibility of taking it. He thought it ought to be done, and accordingly he was a supporter of the Government in carrying forward this Bill; but when he turned to the clause about tests, and particularly to the Amendment of the noble Earl the Leader of the House, he must say he began to feel not very proud of his work. What was the good of putting in a clause about tests when they had a governing body such as that described in the Bill? If he were having a University to please himself, he would say, "Abolish tests to your heart's content, if you give me the right governing body." When they looked to the proposed governing body of the new Dublin University they must feel convinced that not a man would be placed in any high office unless he satisfied the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy. He asked the noble Earl and his colleagues on the Front Ministerial Bench, to whom he had given not less valuable because silent support up to now, whether they were really going to contend that this was an undenominational University. Was this Amendment intended to carry that joke so far as this, that they would say that they had actually put in a clause which prevented even the chairs of divinity and theology from being denominational? Did they think that even their own supporters would find their credulity untaxed by that? It seemed to him that the third clause, with its huge apparatus, was a complete farce. He was speaking now of the institution in Dublin. He perceived that the skilful hand of the draftsman had coupled Belfast and Dublin together, so that it was possible for the noble Earl's colleagues to say on the platform, "We are treating the subject generally, and will anyone say that it is wrong to have no tests in Belfast?" He contended that that ignored the vital difference between the two institutions. He took no interest in the University of Belfast, because it did not give rise to the political problem in which he was interested. But in the University of Dublin it was absolutely certain that what they had done was to hand over the teaching in that University to the Roman Catholic Church. As he had said, he approved of the Bill. It was an entire reversal of Liberal policy. It was a reversion to what was called, in former days, "concurrent endowment" giving to the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland money for the teaching of its own doctrines. Why attempt to conceal it? He understood that fig leaves were required in another place, where there were some pruderies that required a little delicate cultivation; and this Amendment, he suspected, was part of that rather elabortate apparatus of make-believe and concealment. They had now a very adequate explanation of the mysterious disappearance of the English Education Bill. It had been relegated to a rest cure to avoid the open shame which would have come upon its authors if the English Education Bill and the Irish Universities Bill had been run through the House of Commons in double harness. Even the most hardened supporter of the Government would hardly have consented to Monday and Thursday being devoted to Cowper-Templeism, and Tuesday and Friday to Maynooth. That was the difficult problem which was mitigated, if not solved, by relegating the Education Bill to a later period, by which time it was hoped that something would have occurred to draw a sponge across this latest achievement in which he was helping the Government. He was afraid that the only inference which the man in the street would draw when he saw the supporters of the Government in Ireland getting denominationalism and their supporters in England getting undenominationalism was that Liberal policy about education was simply a job from beginning to end. He had used these straight words because he wished to emphasise the position of the Government in bringing forward those two Bills. Let them not put on masks for the purpose of discussing this Bill, let them speak the truth about it, and the truth was that this was an honourable attempt by a purely denominational University to satisfy the aspirations of Roman Catholic Ireland.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The noble and learned Lord implied that he had earned our gratitude by maintaining a strict silence during the recent discussion of this subject. I can assure him that that is not the case. It might conceivably be the case as regards some noble Lords, though I do not think it is so as regards any of those who have taken a prominent part in this discussion, and certainly it never is likely to be the case with regard to the noble and learned Lord, whom we always hear with the greatest pleasure. I do not propose to discuss with the noble and learned Lord the question of whether we are, or are not, consistent in bringing forward this measure, and in bringing forward the English Elementary Education Bill. He and we start from different premises on that subject. He regards England and Ireland as one country. We regard them as two. I cannot admit that there is any inconsistency whatever in applying different remedies to the different circumstances of the two countries. If the preponderance of Roman Catholics in England was the same as it is in Ireland, I frankly admit it would be impossible for us to bring in our Education Bill in the shape we brought it in. As regards this particular point, the noble and learned Lord says that in connection with this University we were wearing a mask. He did not say so, but he meant that we were playing something of the part of hypocrites. I am disposed to challenge that statement. This University is, if you like, on paper, an undenominational University. It is perfectly true that we do believe and design that it should have a Catholic atmosphere. That is its object. But, my Lords, Trinity College, on paper, is an undenominational University; but it is a Protestant University, and it seems to me it would be equally reasonable to suggest the imposition of tests at Trinity because all that you have done, and all that Mr. Fawcett attempted to do in 1873 in removing tests from Trinity, has not succeeded in making anything but an essentially Protestant University unacceptable to the Catholics of Ireland. But there is another argument. We are determined to keep this University undenominational, if you like still upon paper, and for this reason. Several noble Lords have lamented that instead of instituting this University on the lines we have, we did not institute it on lines which would enable Protestants and Catholics to be educated together. They assume, and probably rightly assume, that now this University will be mainly Catholic in character. But we are not legislating for to-morrow or the day after to-morrow. It is quite conceivable that a change might come over opinion in Ireland in that respect. A time may come—it may be distant—when Irishmen will be glad that Protestants and Catholics should be educated side by side. There is nothing to prevent their being now so educated in Trinity. There will be nothing to prevent their being in future educated in this new University; but if we are to impose Roman Catholic tests and to endow Roman Catholic professorships, which, on the noble and learned Lord's argument, would be an equally rational thing to do, we should close the door in the face of that possibility. I am not in the least ashamed of admitting that this Dublin University will be in essence Catholic, but neither am I in the least ashamed of keeping it in terms rigidly undenominational for the reasons which I have endeavoured to explain.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I rise for the purpose of expressing my entire concurrence with what fell from my noble friend on the back benches to whom we listened with so much pleasure. Indeed, I ventured the other day to say something very like what he said in the debate on the Second Reading. I accept the Bill of His Majesty's Government with my eyes open, and knowing that it is intended to produce a University which shall be in substance undenominational, but which will be accepted by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, because it is going to be a denominational University in essence. The noble Earl himself admitted that the University was to be undenominational on paper only. With regard to the particular clause before us, I confess that I attach very little importance to it.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: It is a very small matter.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Yes, a very small matter. It is, if I may say so, put into the Bill for the purpose of shop front decoration, and very little more. The reference of my noble and learned friend to the Education Bill now before Parliament recalls to my mind another Education Bill—the Bill of 1906. Your Lordships will recollect that it was a prominent feature in the Bill that tests were to be abolished, but it also was a prominent feature that there were to be schools with a predominant denominational atmosphere, and we asked what means were to be provided to satisfy ourselves that the teachers who in those schools would be entrusted with the duty of imparting religious education possessed any knowledge of the kind of education they would have to impart; and I remember we extracted from the noble Earl opposite the admission that although these teachers would not have to submit to tests, there would be no difficulty in finding some means of ascertaining quite sufficiently whether they were or were not qualified to give religious instruction of a particular kind. So it will be under this Bill. You have no tests in theory, but in practice we know perfectly well that the whole atmosphere of these colleges will be frankly denominational. We had better look that matter in the face, and, having looked it in the face, I admit it is not our business to cavil at proposals of this kind.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5:

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The Amendment standing in my name to this clause represents a promise which was made by my right hon. friend in another place to deal with the question of appeal. He proposes, therefore, to make the appeal to the Lord-Lieutenant in Council and the Universities Committee to be appointed under this Bill. An Amendment to be moved later on, after Clause 17, deals with the appointment of this special Universities Committee. It is very much on the lines of the Scottish Universities Committee. It is worth noting that this Committee will deal not only with appeals against statutes but with appeals against schemes. That is provided for later on in the Amendment after Clause 17.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 35, after the word 'statute,' to insert the words '(3) The governing body of a University or constituent college to which the statute relates, or any other person, corporation, or body directly affected by the statute, may, within three months from the notification thereof in the Dublin *Gazette*, petition the Lord-Lieutenant in Council to disallow the whole or any part thereof. (4) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may refer any such petition to the Irish Universities Committee, with a direction that the committee hear the petitioner personally or by counsel, and report specially to the Lord-Lieutenant in Council on the matter of the petition. (5) If the committee report in favour of the disallowance of the statute or any part thereof, the Lord-Lieutenant may, by Order in Council, disallow the whole or part thereof accordingly, but any such disallowance shall be without prejudice to the making of a new statute.' "—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

LORD ASHBOURNE regarded the proposed new subsections as correctly framed to work out the object in view. Under the previous system, where the question concerned had reference to property or the *status* of professors the appeal was to members of the Privy Council who were Judges. He did not wish to interfere with the general scheme of this Bill, but he thought it should be provided that where questions of property and *status* were involved there should always be two Judges at the hearing of the appeal; and on this he had an Amendment which he would move later.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6:

*THE EARL OF CREWE: This Amendment merely inserts the names of the Commissioners, which have already been made public.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, lines 1 to 3, to leave out subsection (2) and to insert the following new subsection: '(2) The Dublin Commissioners shall be the Right Hon. Christopher Palles, Alexander Anderson, John Pius Boland, Sir William Francis Butler, Denis Joseph Coffey, Stephen Gwynn, Henry Jackson, Sir John Rhys, the Most Rev. William James Walsh, Bertram Coghill Alan Windle; and the Belfast Commissioners shall be His Honour James Johnston Shaw, Samuel Dill, the Rev. Thomas Hamilton, Donald Macalister, Robert T. Martin, Sir Arthur William Rücker, Johnson Symington.' "—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7:

LORD KILLANIN moved an Amendment to provide that some money might be spent in providing residential buildings. It was regarded as a great blot upon the Bill as it stood that there was absolutely no provision for any residential quarters in Dublin. The students who would attend the new University and college were nearly all extern students at present. They were nearly all educated at home, or at small institutions in the neighbourhood of their homes. Under this Bill they would have very properly to go to these colleges, and at first there would be a certain disinclination to let students go there, above all when the parents saw there was no provision for residential quarters. That would have an injurious result, and it might lead the colleges to affiliate institutions which he did not think ought to be affiliated. Parents would be disinclined to send their sons to the new colleges when there existed other institutions with residential quarters, and he foresaw that pressure would be brought to bear on the authorities to affiliate those institutions. That might turn out to have a very serious and dangerous result. Moreover, the Protestant University of Trinity College had now residential quarters, and the Catholics would feel that they were in a position of inferiority. This, he ventured to think, would deprive the solution of finality. He fully recognised that it would be impossible to start residential quarters unless the funds were increased. The bishops had expressed this unanimous view on the question of residence—

"A most important, and, indeed, vital question is that of the *status* and condition of the college to be established in Dublin. We have seen with dismay that it is not to be residential, and if this determination is persevered in we fear that the consequence for the University and the college may be disastrous."

He hoped His Majesty's Government would pay some attention to this matter.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 22, after the word 'buildings,' to insert the words 'including residential buildings.'"—(*Lord Killanin.*)

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The noble Lord was quite right to put down this Amendment if he desired to draw attention to the subject, but he is aware that as a matter of fact it is not necessary, for there is nothing whatever to prevent any part of the voted sum being devoted to residential quarters if thought desirable. But what the noble Lord wanted was that a further sum should be voted in respect of the need for residential buildings. I have great sympathy with much that the noble Lord has said. I should have been very glad, if it had been possible, to make the sum large enough to supply a certain number of residential buildings, especially in Dublin, in view of the fact that Trinity is a residential college; but the claims of other institutions and of other objects prevented my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer from doing that. This object may very properly be regarded as one for private benefaction.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: This is an Amendment of the same character as the one which led to the interesting speech of the noble and learned Lord opposite, Lord Robertson. It is desired that these theological and divinity professors should not be eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology; and, so far as I know, no exception is taken to this Amendment by those most concerned.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'benefaction,' to insert the words 'and the professor or lecturer is not eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies, or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology.'"—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

Lord Killanin.

LORD ASHBOURNE raised no objection to the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD KILLANIN moved an Amendment, the effect of which would be to permit "the erection of any church, chapel, or place of religious worship or observance by means of private benefaction within or without the precincts of the University or college." This provision, he reminded their Lordships, was inserted in the Bill in Committee in the other House, but in the House it was unfortunately dropped. The contention was that the giving of a few square yards of a site originally bought with public money would be devoting public money to religious purposes. Objection was also taken to the presence of a chapel belonging to a denomination within the precincts of a University at all. Those objections seemed most unreasonable. A great misunderstanding existed on this question. He read the other day in the *Daily News*, a mouthpiece of the Nonconformists of this country, this statement—

"In reference to the Amendments likely to be moved, it may be necessary to utter a strong protest against the Amendment to reinsert the clause enabling a Roman Catholic chapel to be built out of public funds."

Nobody had ever suggested that a Roman Catholic chapel should be built out of public funds. This statement showed how far away from the facts of the situation prejudice could carry people. He could not understand how Gentlemen who had swallowed the whole of this Bill could strain at this gnat. Moreover, it was provided in Clause 7, subsection (4) that nothing in that provision should prevent the recognition by the governing body of the University of any professor of or lecturer in theology or divinity as a professor of the University. Therefore, under the Bill, not only might theologians and professors of divinity come in and teach religion, but they were to have the use of buildings which would be actually erected with public money. Surely that was a violation of the rights of secularism in this matter. It was curious why that should be permissible, when it should not be permissible to erect a place of religious worship or observance by means of private benefaction within or without the precincts of the University or college. In these circumstances he hoped the Government would see their way to agree to the reinsertion of this subsection.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 39, after the word 'funds,' to insert the words 'or (*b*) the erection of any church, chapel, or place of religious worship or observance by means of private benefaction within or without the precincts of the University or college.'"—(*Lord Killanin.*)

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The noble Lord is quite right in stating that these words were inserted in the Standing Committee and were afterwards struck out by a large majority on the Report stage in the House of Commons. I do not think that it is possible to regard this really as a matter of principle on either side. Personally, I frankly admit I should have raised no objection from my own point of view had the words been retained; but this Bill, as your Lordships know, represents a coming together of people of extremely different sections of opinion. Each side has had to give up a good deal which it values. It would be very easy to point to clauses in the Bill to which strong objection may be taken from the Roman Catholic point of view, and others to which equally strong objection may be taken from the Protestant point of view. This is one of the latter. It is regarded as the hoisting of a flag of denominationalism in the case of a particular college, and it is objected to on that ground.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Hear, Hear!

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am very glad to know that the noble Marquess agrees. I do not know whether he was in the House when I made my observations on the question of the undenominational character of this Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Yes.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: In that case I need not repeat anything of what I said then. I am given to understand that there is no prospect of this Amendment being accepted in another place. I, therefore, trust the noble Lord will not press it.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN congratulated the noble Earl the Leader of the House upon the dexterity he had displayed that evening in skating over the thinnest of thin ice. He congratulated him on his speech, which he thought was one of the cleverest speeches of its kind that he had ever listened to in their Lordships' House. They were then passing a sham clause about tests. Now they had got exactly the reverse clause—a clause to enable chapels to be erected. The noble Earl was very skilful in passing over the manner in which that subsection was defeated in the other House, and he said as little as possible, very wisely, as to the reason. Let them not wear any masks, as Lord Robertson had said. They knew that nothing could be done in the other House without the assent and approval, whether tacit or not, of the Government, and therefore it was quite clear that it was with the consent and the goodwill of the Government that this subsection was omitted in the other House. He advised the noble Earl not to strain at the gnat after swallowing the camel.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, we on this side of the House are ready to go great lengths in facilitating a settlement of this question; but I really think that in regard to this particular Amendment the noble Earl has asked us to do more than he has any right to expect. What is this proposal? Simply this, that it should be lawful for the friends of the people who frequent this University to erect, at their own cost, a chapel which the students can attend. There is no question of public money. We all regret that this University cannot be given a residential character. We can quite understand that at this moment it should not be possible to go as far as that; but is it not fair to say that the absence of residences renders it doubly necessary that we should provide whatever means we can of bringing the students of this University together, and is it not, at any rate, important that they should have an opportunity of frequenting the same place of worship? What are the objections? I understand that one of them is founded upon the fact that these chapels, or this chapel, would be built upon a site which was once acquired at the expense of the public. That seems to me to be pure pedantry, and I will not spend time in examining the argument. Then comes the real reason, the reason frankly avowed by the noble Earl who has just spoken. He says that if a chapel were to be built, we should thereby be hoisting the flag of denominationalism in this University. My Lords, really has it come to this?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I did not say that that was my opinion. I said that a great many people thought so.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I really would not attribute such a view to the noble Earl; I have too much respect for his common-sense; but he is the mouthpiece for people who entertain this extravagant, and, I must say, absurd opinion. You are going to have a college which we all admit is going to be a Roman Catholic college; yet in order to save appearances you go the length of saying that you will not allow friends of these students to provide a chapel in which they can worship on Sunday. This is a kind of hypocrisy to which I cannot be a party, and, therefore, I hope my noble friend will press his Amendment. If it meets with an adverse fate elsewhere we shall submit to the inevitable; but I do not think the House of Lords ought to be a party to such a disingenuous proceeding as that which is recommended to us. This proposal has had many vicissitudes. It was not in the original Bill; it was put in with a good deal of acceptance; it was afterwards rejected from the Bill, and I venture to think your Lordships would do well to reinsert it in its place.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON entirely sympathised with the object of the Amendment and with a great deal that had fallen from the noble Lord opposite and from the noble Marquess who had just sat down; but he would make a strong appeal to their Lordships not to introduce the Amendment into the Bill, because the effect of that proceeding would be, he was afraid, to reopen controversies in the other House of Parliament which he had hoped, and which he was sure all their Lordships hoped, were dead in respect of this question. His noble friend Lord Crewe had told them, and he was convinced the noble Earl was right, that there was no chance of this Amendment being accepted in the other House. The proceedings in Committee that evening had been marked by great forbearance on the part of many noble Lords opposite. They had displayed a great desire to pass the Bill to settle a controversy which had been open for more than thirty years, if not much longer, and they hoped the Bill would prove to be, as far as anything in this world could be, a final settlement of this long-contested question. But if their Lordships inserted this clause in the Bill, its removal again in the House of Commons must lead to a long discussion, and to a discussion touching upon the most delicate portions of the question. The Bill, as the noble Earl the Leader of the House had said, was in the nature of a compromise—a compromise which did infinite credit to both sides. Mr. Gladstone, in his first and strongest Government, attempted to settle this question and failed. Mr. Balfour made a speech at Manchester, in which he said he found it difficult to defend the existence of the Union as long as this question was not settled. Nothing came of that declaration. The question had remained open to the present moment, and now that a Bill had been passed successfully through the House of Commons and had come up to their Lordships' House, it was very undesirable to start afresh what might be an angry and keen discussion upon the most vital point of difference in the Bill. He was not prepared to say that if their Lordships inserted the Amendment it would be fatal to the measure; but he did say that it was of the greatest possible importance, in the interests of religious peace and satisfaction in Ireland, and in the interests of those who desired and for long years had desired to see this grievance removed from the Irish people, that this measure, now having passed one House and almost having passed the other, should be brought to a conclusion in a spirit of harmony. If it were not for these considerations, he would be greatly tempted to vote for the Amendment, but he felt bound, not because of his official position, but because of his earnest desire to see this question settled in that spirit of compromise with which it had been approached, earnestly to entreat their Lordships not to adopt the Amendment.

On Question, "That those words be there inserted,"

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 32; Not contents, 31.

CONTENTS.

Devonshire, D.
Wellington, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.

Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cawdor, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Haddington, E.
Mayo, E.
Morton, E.
Orford, E.
Plymouth, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
St. Aldwyn, V.

Peterborough, L. Bp.

Addington, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Collins, L.
De Mauley, L.
Elphinstone, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L. [*Teller.*]

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Ripon, L. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Carrington, E.
Crewe, E.
Russell, E.
Althorpe, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Wolverhampton, V.

Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Balfour, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Farrer, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Hemphill, L.
Herschell, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Lochee, L.
Lyveden, L.
Marchamley, L.
St. Davids, L.
Sanderson, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Tenterden, L.
Weardale, L.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 16 agreed to.

Clause 17:

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 17, as amended, agreed to.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The new clause which I move after Clause 17 is the one upon which I said a few words at an earlier stage, and in which I understand the noble and learned Lord opposite desires to make some slight Amendment. The clause sets up this special Irish Universities committee, giving the Lord-Lieutenant power to appoint it as he thinks fit. The proviso is that two of the members of the committee must be persons who are either Judges or ex-Judges; the quorum of the committee is to be three, and one of these Judges must be part of that quorum. The noble and learned Lord, as I gather, thinks that as regards certain matters the composition of the body would be hardly sufficiently judicial. I should have thought the point was not a very material one, as the presence and advice of a judicial member would ensure that the legal aspect of the case was thoroughly brought out. I have not considered the point, but if the noble and learned Lord desires that both of the Judges should be on the Committee for the consideration of schemes I do not know that there would be any objection. The only objection that occurs to me at this moment is that it might in some cases delay or hamper the passing of the schemes if it was necessary that both Judges should actually take part in the deliberations of the Committee. But if the noble Lord desires to insert that Amendment to see what my right hon. friend thinks of it, I shall make no objection.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 17 to insert the following new clause: '(1) There shall be a committee of the Privy Council in Ireland styled the Irish Universities Committee. The committee shall consist of such number of members of the Privy Council in Ireland, not being less than five, as the Lord-Lieutenant may think fit to appoint, two at least being persons who are or have been Judges of the Supreme Court. (2) The powers and duties of the Irish Universities Committee may be exercised and discharged by any three or more members of the committee, so long as one of those members is a person who is or has been a Judge of the Supreme Court. (3) The costs of all parties of and incident to the hearing of any petition or appeal under this Act which is heard by the Irish Universities Committee shall be in the discretion of the committee. (4) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may make rules generally for regulating the procedure of the Irish Universities Committee, and may, by those rules, prescribe the time within which any appeal under this Act may be made, and the mode in which any costs allowed under this Act may be recovered.'"—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

Lord ASHBOURNE moved the addition of the words at the end of Subsection 2: "and in the case of appeal under Section 17, then so long as two of those members are persons who are or have been Judges of the Supreme Court." He assured the noble Earl that his Amendment was not conceived in any spirit of hostility. The previous scheme was that no one but Judges should be on the Committee. That was intelligible because the appeals were only to be on questions of property and *status*. But now it was proposed to have one common appellate system. What he desired was that when the committee were dealing with the matters previously dealt with by the Irish judicial body, there should be two judicial members present. He thought that was a very reasonable requirement.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To add, at the end of subsection (2) the words 'and in the case of appeal under Section 17, then so long as two of those members are persons who are or have been judges of the Supreme Court.'"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

***The Earl of CREWE**: I shall not oppose that Amendment to my Amendment. But I do not know that the noble and learned Lord has a precedent for it.

The Earl of Crewe.

Lord ASHBOURNE said that if the noble Earl desired only to follow precedent in legislation concerning Ireland, he did not know how far he would get.

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Amendments reported; Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.
BEE PEST (IRELAND) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order). Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bills read 3ª with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

FINANCE BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª, (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

NAVAL MARRIAGES BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 3ª, and passed.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

LUNACY BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

NAVAL LANDS (VOLUNTEERS) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX having been suspended), Bill read 3ª, and passed.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

GRAND JURY (IRELAND) ACT, 1836, AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Read 2ª (according to order). Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

Commons' Amendment considered (according to order).

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): The Amendment sent to your Lordships' House from the Commons is—

"In page 20, line 41, after the word 'date,' to insert the words 'Provided that where such a tenancy was a tenancy from year to year, the compensation payable in respect of an improvement comprised in the Third Schedule to this Act shall be such (if any) as could have been claimed if this Act had not been passed.'"

It is a legal point entirely. It has been most carefully considered by the Parliamentary counsel, by the Parliamentary draftsman, and by the Board's legal advisers, and they assure me they are satisfied that this Amendment will secure the landlord's rights, which, of course, everybody is anxious to maintain. The point is rather an intricate one, and I respectfully ask your Lordships to be good enough to agree with the Commons' Amendment.

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Commons in the said Amendment."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

LORD CLINTON: Before your Lordships pass this Amendment I should like to say one word upon it. This Amendment, I think I am correct in saying, is the result of an agreement come to between the Board of Agriculture and those who are desirous of continuing the existing definition of tenancies from year to year that Parliament applied to tenancies at the passing of the Market Gardeners Act, 1895. I believe this Amendment is very carefully drawn for that purpose, and I think that to a very considerable extent, and perhaps entirely, it will carry out the purpose which we have in view. While I should like to express my gratitude to the noble Earl for having managed that this Amendment should be inserted in another place, at the same time I am rather inclined to express my regret that these particular words should be employed in the Amendment. The Act itself is of really great value to the agricultural interest in that it expresses in an admirably clear manner all the details of the different Agricultural Holdings Acts, and, in fact, we are given in this one measure the whole of the law dealing with the subject. Perhaps the greater advantage of the Act is that it is simple and free from any reference to existing statutes. I am sorry, therefore, that in this particular Amendment this practice has not been entirely carried out, because reference is made to an existing state of the law on the subject. The existing state of the law on the subject is exceedingly difficult to find out. If the tenant of a market garden whose year-to-year tenancy was covered in 1895 wants to find out his exact position in the matter, he looks, no doubt, first of all to this Consolidation Act, and finds nothing at all about it. He then, perhaps, is advised to refer to the Market Gardeners Act, and again he will discover nothing as to his position, although at the beginning he is referred to another Agricultural Holdings Act, that of 1883, and he may wade through sixty clauses of that Act without finding out anything.

In the sixty-first clause he will come to the matter relating to his position, but expressed in such complicated terms that no farmers and very few land agents would be able to translate it without the assistance of a lawyer. While this Consolidation Act is brought in for the express purpose of simplifying the law on the subject, I am very sorry that this particular Amendment, which does express our views, is not couched in more clear and precise terms. I was going to raise the question whether this Amendment is competent, because it refers us to certain Acts of Parliament which under this Bill are repealed. Both the Acts I have referred to are repealed; but I understand the noble Earl has consulted his legal advisers on that matter, and is satisfied that it is correct. What I should like particularly to ask the noble Earl now is whether he could not at this period of the session so alter the wording of this Amendment that it would express in clear and precise language what the Government and we intend.

EARL CARRINGTON: I have to thank the noble Earl for what he said about the Bill, and I can assure him that the greatest possible pains have been taken to meet the wishes of himself, the Duke of Northumberland, and other noble Lords who had doubts on the subject. Our great object has been not to bring into this Consolidation Bill any fresh matter of any sort or kind, in accordance with the pledge I gave, and our legal advisers thought that the Bill as it stood covered the whole ground; but to meet the wishes of the noble Lord and the Duke of Northumberland we proposed these words, which were shown to noble Lords opposite, and they agreed that the Amendment was perhaps in the best language that we could find. I hope the noble Lord will not object to this Amendment. It is very important that we should get it through. I can assure him that all the rights of landlords are perfectly safeguarded, and that no fresh matter has been brought into the Bill in any shape or form.

LORD CLINTON: I do not wish to express any objection to this matter at all. I know it brings in no fresh matter, but I think the Amendment might have been expressed in language which the ordinary farmer or other person could have understood.

On Question, agreed to.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Commons' Amendment considered (according to order).

Commons' Amendment—" In page 1, line 13, to leave out from the word 'commission' to the end of the clause."

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I dare say your Lordships will remember that this was a somewhat important Amendment moved by the noble and learned Lord, Lord Atkinson, which caused a considerable difference of opinion in your Lordships' House, which was not confined to one side. The case involved is where a tenant consents in writing to a compulsory acquisition of land by the Estates Commissioners; it was provided in the Bill that he should sign in the presence of two witnesses, and it was added that the consent should be filed as a record in the office of the Land Commission. That Amendment was inserted at the instance of Lord Atkinson, who added that notice of such filing should be given to the landlord and inserted in two successive issues of a newspaper; further, that such consent should not be acted upon if the landlord interested in or having a claim on the land should satisfy the Judicial Commissioner that the tenant had been compelled to give consent by unlawful means. That is the Amendment with which the Commons have disagreed, and I am in hopes that your Lordships will not insist on your Amendment, because in another place, when my right hon. friend moved to disagree with it he was supported in the strongest terms by Mr. Long on behalf of the Opposition. Nobody will dispute Mr. Long's experience in dealing with Ireland, and when he went so far as to say that he considered this Amendment made the Bill practically useless it must be taken as an expression of opinion by one who is qualified to speak from experience. Our argument was

—and it was the argument, no doubt, which appealed to Mr. Long—that the process would be so long and troublesome, and possibly so expensive, that the purpose of the Bill, which is generally admitted to be a reasonable one, would be very seriously interfered with in these particular cases. I hope, therefore, your Lordships will agree not to insist upon this Amendment.

Moved, " That this House doth agree with the Commons in the said Amendment."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Your Lordships may perhaps remember that when this Bill was before us I expressed great doubts as to the value of the second part of the Amendment inserted by your Lordships' House, so much so that I was unable to vote with my noble friend who moved it. I think the Bill as it came to us at first was much too loosely drawn, and that the Amendment made by this House, as it was accepted by the other House, has very materially improved the Bill. It requires that the consent of the tenant should be given with proper formality and in a manner which, to a certain extent, would preclude fraudulent consent being given; but the latter part of the clause I look upon in a different light. I cannot bring myself to believe that anything would be gained by allowing the landlord to set in motion the very cumbersome machinery provided by the second part of the clause. The remedy would be one of extremely doubtful value to him, and it would be open to the great drawback that it would lead to an amount of litigation which could not fail to have a very bad effect in the country and in the neighbourhood. It is also to be borne in mind that the proposal was objected to by a number of the tenants most concerned in this particular matter. Under these circumstances I earnestly hope that your Lordships' House will not insist upon your Amendment, or, at any rate, will not insist upon the whole of the Amendment, but will be content with that portion which has been accepted by the House of Commons.

*LORD CLONBROCK: After what has fallen from my noble friend on the front bench I feel it would be useless to press this Amendment on the House, but I should like to point out that this Amendment, moved by Lord Atkinson, was not so much directed in the interests of the landlord —at least in the opinion of most of those who supported him—as against intimidation practised in the district. We do not think it likely that intimidation is going to cease, taking into consideration the present policy of His Majesty's Government in Ireland, but at least it might be made more difficult, and though the people who are practising intimidation might gain their point in the end there would be considerable delay about, and additional publicity would be given to the existing state of things. The Amendment would not affect the tenant who was ready to go in consideration of the pecuniary advantages offered to him. On the other hand those in the neighbourhood who wished to remain would be to a limited extent protected from exposure to intimidation by the process indicated in the last sentence of the clause. It would be perhaps more of a protest against intimidation than anything else, but it might have had some effect.

On Question, agreed to.

METROPOLITAN POLICE—REPORT OF COMMISSION.

EARL RUSSELL rose to call attention to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Police, and to ask His Majesty's Government: (1) Whether the constables found to be guilty of misconduct will be suitably dealt with; (2) Whether it is proposed to compensate the man Gamble or Pearce who was found by the Commissioners to have been injured by a police constable; (3) Whether steps will be taken to impress upon all ranks of the Metropolitan Police Force the supreme importance of telling the truth at all times and warning them not to commit perjury in order to conceal a breach of duty.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, in dealing with the Report of the Royal Commission upon the duties of the Metropolitan Police, and in calling attention to one or two individual cases of misconduct, I cannot more fitly begin than by stating how entirely I endorse the general findings of that Commission as to the excellence of the police force as a whole and to the services they render to the public. It has been my misfortune to appear, to a certain extent, as a person attacking the police in isolated cases, but I am glad of the opportunity of saying that I have never suggested that the police force as a whole were corrupt or unworthy of our confidence, or that they did not render very great services to the law-abiding public in the Metropolis. A good many individual cases, as they are called, were investigated by the Police Commission, and I do not propose to detain your Lordships with details of them; but in a certain number of those cases the police constables were found to be guilty of misconduct of a more or less grave character. In one case a constable was found to have been misconducting himself when he should have been on his beat. In another case a constable was found guilty of misconduct in arresting a respectable married woman in the street. In yet another case a constable was found guilty of misconduct for arresting a man because he had lost his temper without sufficient reason. Then there was the case of a market porter named Mullins, in which the Commission found that Police Constable Morgan lost his temper and assaulted him, and subsequently arrested him, making a charge against him which the Commission found not to be proved.

In addition to those cases, there is one case of a most serious character to which I refer specifically in my second Question, namely, that of a man called Gamble or Pearce. In that particular case, after a very long and minute investigation, the Commission found that the police constable was guilty of misconduct. The allegation was that he knocked this man down and kicked him when on the ground, injuring him so seriously that he had to spend many months in hospital and will not ever entirely recover. Sergeant Sheeney was guilty of misconduct in not intervening between Gamble and the constable and also in omitting to make a report to the inspector or any other responsible officer. Those cases, however, in no way bear out the suggestion that the police as a whole deliberately make false charges or do anything which could be described as behaving in an improper way at the beginning of an assault or disturbance. But when the police have made a mistake or when there has been some little lapse on their part they sometimes attempt to cover it up by taking more severe measures, or by making charges which cannot be supported against people with whom they have differences. I assume that the Report of the Commission has been considered by the Home Office and the Commissioner of Police, and that these constables will be dealt with according to the character of their offences. In the particular case of the man Gamble I hope the Home Office will see fit to compensate the man, because he has suffered by the wrongful action of the constable as found by the Royal Commission, an injury which is not only very grave, and which confines him to hospital for several months at a time, but has really made him unfit ever again to do a good day's work.

Earl Russell.

On the third Question your Lordships have to bear this fact in mind, and I regard it as very significant and important. Whatever the particular degree of misconduct of which these constables have been found guilty, in every case they have gone into the witness box and sworn a statement of facts which the Royal Commission have found to be false, not only in the police court but in the inquiry before the Commission, where they have attempted to cover up their misconduct by deliberate perjury. I think it might be said without injustice that when a mistake has been made there is some tendency on the part of the police to prefer to stick to the original story, or the story which they think they ought to stick to, without proper regard to the truth, and for that reason I hope steps will be taken—some have already been taken since Mr. Gladstone became Home Secretary—to impress upon all ranks of the Metropolitan Police Force the importance of telling the truth. It has been suggested to me—of course, not by the police themselves because one has not the opportunity of ascertaining their opinion—but by those who say they know something about it and the discipline of the force, that these men sometimes do not tell the truth about these matters because the discipline is so extremely strict and severe that they are likely to be punished for an oversight or a comparatively trivial error or trivial breach of discipline as if they had done something very blameworthy from a moral point of view. I recognise there must be reasonably strict discipline over a large body of men, but I think your Lordships will probably feel that this discipline goes rather too far if every error which any man may commit in the very trying, anxious, and sometimes doubtful work he has to perform, is to be regarded with severity. If for an innocent mistake a man is to be treated as if he had committed a grave wrong you increase his inclination to cover up his mistake and back it up, I am sorry to say, by perjury afterwards.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: The reply to the first Question is in the affirmative. It had been decided to take judicial proceedings against the constable concerned in the Gamble case. The question whether any proceedings should be taken against any of the other officers concerned in the same case is under consideration. As to the other constables whom the Commission found to have been guilty of misconduct, one was dismissed forthwith. In another case the Commission reported that the punishment inflicted at the time was adequate. Another case which the Commission thought might have been more severely dealt with at the time it is not proposed to reopen, seeing that the incident took place five years ago. The cases of the four remaining constables have been referred to the disciplinary board at New Scotland Yard to be dealt with. The second Question of the noble Earl cannot be considered until after the result of the judicial proceedings has become known. With regard to the third Question, there is no need to impress upon the force the importance and necessity of telling the truth. A regulation already exists which directs a constable to speak the truth at all times and under all circumstances, and, when called on to give evidence, to state all he knows without fear or reservation, and without any desire to influence the result either for or against the prisoner. The Commission report very favourably as to the observance of this regulation, and as to the general trustworthiness of police witnesses.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I desire to express my regret that the noble Earl opposite should have put his third Question on the Paper. To any ordinary mind it conveys the impression that in the noble Earl's opinion the Metropolitan Police Force as a whole is open to the odious imputation of habitual untrustworthiness. That is putting an entirely unwarrantable affront on a very worthy body of men. The result of the inquiry has been to exonerate the force of very many of the charges that were brought against them and redounds greatly to their credit and their reputation. The noble Earl disclaimed any desire of charging the Metropolitan Police with untruthfulness, but I think he cannot be acquitted of having put on the Paper a Question which certainly suggested the idea that the force was open to a charge of the kind.

SCOTTISH DIVORCE LAW.

EARL RUSSELL rose to ask the Lord Chancellor whether the law of Scotland allows a divorce *a vinculo* for desertion; whether this amounts to divorce practically being obtained at discretion or had led to other evils; and whether His Majesty's Government propose to alter the law of Scotland.

The noble Earl said: The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack the other day in discussing the question of divorce for desertion stated that the effect of such a proposal, as I understood him, was that divorce might practically be obtained at discretion, or almost at discretion, by the parties to the marriage. I understood that that is the existing law of Scotland, and I thought the noble and learned Lord was speaking with some knowledge of the state of affairs in his own country, and I should be glad to know whether this is found to be the result of it. The particular evils suggested by the noble and learned Lord could hardly take place in this country under the Matrimonial Acts, as conduct conducing to the offence would be a bar to the remedy, but there may be facts with which I am unacquainted which make a ground for granting divorce which has led to these evils. Perhaps the noble and learned Lord will inform the House whether it has been found to be the case in Scotland, and whether it is proposed to alter the law. I wish to put the Question on the Paper.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I believe that according to the law of Scotland if there has been malicious and obstinate non-adherence for four years there may be a divorce after public admonitions in the pulpit and a sentence of excommunication under an ancient Act of Parliament. I am not aware that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to alter that law. In regard to the remainder of the Question I think the noble Earl will agree that his question is argumentative, and I hope he will excuse me for not offering an argumentative answer.

House adjourned at Ten minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 30th July, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dover Graving Docks Bill.—Lords' Amendments, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 23rd July, considered, and agreed to.

Lower Thames (Grays) Dock Bill (by Order).—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Considered; read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill; Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland) Bill; Costs in Criminal Cases Bill; University of Durham Bill; Finance Bill; Naval Marriages Bill; Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill; Married Women's Property Bill; Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill; Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill, without Amendment.

Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, with an Amendment.

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill; Telegraph (Construction) Bill; Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill; Old-Age Pensions Bill; Irish Universities Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to:—Agricultural Holdings Bill [Lords]; Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Amendments to:—Registration Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Thames River Steamboat Service Act (1904) Amendment Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against: From Alton and other places; and East Somerset; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: From Aberkenfig; Caeran; Cluny; Colwyn Bay (three); Cwmfellin; Ifton Heath; Liverpool; Long Sutton; Maesteg; Nantyffyllon; and Street; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glenmuick, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth Common, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS (ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of the Annual Local Taxation Returns for 1905–6, Parts V.–VIII. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276.]

PRISONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Thirtieth Report of the General Prisons Board (Ireland) for 1907–8, with an Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.

Copy presented, of Report on Strikes and Lock-outs of 1907, and on Conciliation and Arbitration Boards [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT) (CHANGES IN WAGES, ETC.).

Copy presented, of Report on changes in Rates of Wages and Hours of Labour in the United Kingdom in 1907, with comparative Statistics for 1898–1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Copy presented, of Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY RETURNS.

Copy presented, of Returns of the Capital, Traffic Receipts, and Working Expenditure of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (UNITED KINGDOM).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom, in each of the last fifteen years, from 1893 to 1907. Fifty-fifth number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under the Railway Regulation Act, 1893, during the year ended 27th July, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 278.]

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACTS, 1888 AND 1894.

Copy presented, of Tenth Report by the Board of Trade of Proceedings under Section 31 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, including Proceedings upon Complaints made under Section 1 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1894 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 279.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS, 1894 TO 1906 (DISPENSING POWERS).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade of the cases in which they have exercised their powers under Section 78 of the Merchant Act, 1906, during the year ended 31st May, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 280.]

NAVY (EXCEPTIONS TO KING'S REGULATIONS).

Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the King's Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances during the year 1907–8 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FLEETS (GREAT BRITAIN AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th April; *Sir Charles Dilke*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277.]

NAVAL EXPENDITURE (PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 7th May; *Mr. Thomasson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 281.]

NAVAL CASUALTIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th May; *Mr. Bowles*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 282.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2075 to 4082 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Report of the Consultative Committee upon the School Attendance of Children below the Age of Five [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

METROPOLITAN POLICE (ROYAL COMMISSION)

Copy presented, of Report of the Commissioners upon the duties of the Metropolitan Police. Vols. II. and III. Minutes of Evidence, with Appendices and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 29th July; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 283.]

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL, 1908.

Copy presented, of Table of Comparison between the Provisions of the Bill and existing Enactments [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPERS AND DEPENDANTS (SCOTLAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th July, 1907; *Mr. Sinclair*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 284.]

GUARANTEED 2¾ PER CENT. STOCK.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 24th July; *Mr. John Roche*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 285.]

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 29th July; *Mr. Hobhouse*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 286.]

FORESHORES.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 29th July, 1908, directing the application of moneys received by the Board of Trade in the year ended 31st March, 1908, in respect of the rights and interests of the Crown in the Foreshores of the United Kingdom [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Devon).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 26th July 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 287.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING, 1907.

Copy ordered, "of Tables showing the Progress of Merchant Shipping in the United Kingdom and the principal Maritime Countries."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

IRON AND STEEL, 1907.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum and Statistical Tables showing the production and consumption of Iron Ore and Pig Iron, and the production of Steel, in the United Kingdom and the principal Foreign Countries in recent years, and the Imports and Exports of certain classes of Iron and Steel Manufactures (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 350, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

COAL TABLES, 1907.

Copy ordered, "of Statistical Tables relating to the production, consumption, and imports and exports of Coal in the British Empire and the principal Foreign Countries in each year from 1885 to 1907, as far as the particulars can be stated, together with Statements showing the production of Lignite and Petroleum in the principal producing countries for a series of years (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 349, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

TEA AND COFFEE, 1908.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum and Statistical Tables showing the consumption of Tea and Coffee in the Principal Countries of Europe, the United States, and certain British Colonies; together with information relating to the principal sources of supply in recent years, so far as the particulars can be stated (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 304, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACTS, 1879 AND 1884.

Address for "Return showing the working of the Regulations made in 1886 for carrying out the Prosecution of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884, with Statistics setting forth the number, nature, result, and cost of the proceedings instituted by the Director in accordance with those Regulations, from the 1st day of January, 1907, to the 31st day of December, 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 230, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

NAVY AND ARMY (INQUIRIES).

Return ordered, "giving in chronological order, according to the dates of publication of the Reports, a list of all Inquiries into Naval and Military affairs which have been held since the year 1800, the Reports of which have been published as Parliamentary Papers."—(*Mr. Bellairs.*)

SCOTTISH LOCAL AUTHORITIES (DEPUTATION EXPENSES).

Return ordered, "arranged according to Counties, of Expenses during each of the five years ending the 15th day of May, 1908, of Deputations to London in connection with (*a*) Public General Bills; (*b*) Private Bills or Provisional Orders; and (*c*) other purposes; incurred by the following bodies in Scotland (to be separately stated for each body), viz.: Town councils, county councils, district committees, district lunacy boards, parish councils, distress committees school boards, educational trusts, and water, gas, dock, harbour, or other commissioners or trustees liable to make Returns under the Local Taxation Returns (Scotland) Act, 1881."—(*Mr. Pirie.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Congestion Commission.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the total cost of the recent Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The cost of the Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland, so far as it was borne on the Vote for Temporary Commissions, amounted to £9,465. In addition an expenditure estimated at £5,800 has been incurred in respect of stationery and printing.

Crookenden and Casey Estates, Cavan.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have received a reply from the owners of the Crookenden and Casey Estates, County Cavan, to their formal offer for the purchase of this estate; and will he state the effect of the same, with the dates of the offer and reply.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners' offer to purchase the estate in question was dated the 7th instant. They have not yet received a reply to it. It would be contrary to their practice to make any statement as to the details of pending negotiations.

Drumlinny Evicted Tenant.

MR. LARDNER (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the case of Peter M'Guirk an evicted tenant reinstated on a farm in Drumlinny, County Monaghan, on the sale of the estate of Lord Rossmore, no advance appears to have been sanctioned; will he state when the tenant was put into possession of the farm; why no annuity has been collected from him, though his name is listed in the Return issued under the Evicted Tenants Act of tenants reinstated; and whether it is the intention of the Commissioners to ask this evicted tenant, who has no means whatever, to pay all the accrued interest since his reinstatement.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners cannot trace the name of Peter M'Guirk, of Drumlinny, but one Peter M'Guirk has been reinstated in a holding on Lord Rossmore's estate in the townland of Effernagh, and the holding was vested in him as purchaser on 1st June, 1906. He has paid the purchase instalments punctually.

Grant to Reinstated Tenant at Effernagh.

MR. LARDNER: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what decision the Estates Commissioners have arrived at in reference to the application of Peter M'Guirk, an evicted tenant, who was reinstated in his holding on the sale of the estate in County Monaghan, of Lord Rossmore, for a grant to enable him to begin farming again; and is he aware that at the time of the tenant's reinstatement the land was covered in furze, the fences broken down, and the houses in ruins, and that since the time when he was reinstated he has lived in an out-house without chimney or fireplace; and will he now have this case taken up and dealt with.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received from Peter M'Guirk, of Effernagh, an application for a grant, and the application is at present under their consideration.

Port of London Bill.

MR. W. PEARCE (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what procedure the Government intend to follow with regard to the Port of London Bill after it has been reported by the Joint Committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Bill when reported by the Joint Committee will, I understand, be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House, and the subsequent procedure will follow the usual course in regard to Public Bills.

Patent Acts, 1907.

MR. CROYDON MARKS (Cornwall, Launceston): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether there is any intention on the part of His Majesty's Government to waive any condition as to compulsory working of patents in this country beyond that provided for in the Patents Act of 1907, whereby the patentee is afforded an opportunity of giving reasons for his failure to work before the patent is revoked by the Comptroller or the Court.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) No, Sir.

Spitalfields Market.

MR. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received any recent Report from the police directing attention to the number of market carts standing in the vicinity of Spitalfields Market on market days; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any steps with a view to the removal of this inconvenience to the public.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have not received any recent Report from the police on this subject. The matter was considered by the Royal Commission on London Traffic, who reported that the Corporation of the City, on acquiring this market, would take steps to remove the grounds of complaint. As the Attorney-General stated yesterday, in a reply to a Question by Mr. Stuart Samuel, litigation respecting the purchase of the leasehold of the market by the Corporation is still proceeding, and the Corporation will do everything that is possible to expedite matters. The police have no power to act within the market limits.

Council of Judges—Annual Report.

MR. BERTRAM (Hertfordshire, Hitchin): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received the Annual Report of the Council of Judges of the Supreme Court in accordance with Section 75 of the Judicature Act, 1873, for the years 1907 and 1908, or either of such years; and if so, whether he can inform the House what proposals are contained in such Reports or Report to remedy the dislocation of the business of the King's Bench Division consequent upon the passing of the Criminal Appeal Act; and, in case no Report has been received in conformity with the statute, whether he will take such steps as may be necessary to procure it, and particularly in view of the fact that only three Reports were made between 1873 and 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) No Report has been presented by the Council of Judges for 1907 and 1908, but I understand that a committee has been sitting during the last month and has made a Report, which will shortly be issued, dealing with the business of the King's Bench Division and other subjects.

Ely Estate Evicted Tenants.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received and considered applications from Bernard M'Garrahan and William M'Cullagh, sons of evicted tenants on the Ely estate, County Fermanagh, to be restored to the holdings formerly held by their fathers, or to have new holdings allotted to them; and will their claims be considered in the division of the untenanted lands on the Ely estate in the course of the sale now pending.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received applications from Bernard M'Garrahan and William M'Cullagh, but, as the evictions in respect of which they claim reinstatement took place previous to 14th August, 1878, the applicants do not come within the provisions of Section 2 (1) (*d*) of the Act of 1903.

Open Air Meeting Prosecutions.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that three prosecutions have taken place recently at Dartford police court, under the circumstances that for over twenty years meetings and religious services have been periodically held in front of the Bull Hotel, Dartford, within the knowledge of the authorities; that on the 24th instant Ensign Roy of the Salvation Army was summoned for obstruction at this spot by holding a religious service, and was convicted and fined 20*s*., or in the alternative, fourteen days imprisonment; and that the Salvation Army held another service on the same spot on Sunday last, and the same action has been followed by the authorities in the case of Mrs. Roy; and whether he will advise the extension of the clemency of the Crown by remitting the sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I had not previously heard of the matter, but I will make inquiry.

Deaths from Anæsthetics.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can give the number of deaths from anæsthetics in England in each year ending 30th June from 1901 to 1908; whether the percentage of deaths to administrations has increased; whether the increase, if any, has been in private as well as in hospital practice; and whether he will consider the advisability of asking the Royal Society or the Royal College of Physicians to institute an inquiry into the cause or causes of the increase in the number of deaths, and advise him whether any rules are required regulating the conditions under which anæsthetics are given.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The number of deaths under anæsthetics administered for the purpose of operations which occurred in England and Wales in each year ending 31st December, from 1901 to 1906, is given in the Reports of the Registrar-General. The figures are: In 1901, 133; in 1902, 148; in 1903, 146; in 1904, 156; in 1905, 155; and in 1906, 183. I am unable to give the other information asked for; but the whole question is already receiving consideration by the Government in consultation with the General Medical Council.

Motor Ambulances.

MR. COOPER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the proposal made by the London County Council in its General Powers Bill, 1906, to establish a system of motor ambulances to deal with street accidents in London, was opposed by the Corporation of the City of London, before a Committee of this House, in favour of horsed ambulances; whether he is aware that the Corporation of the City of London have now adopted and are successfully working in the City a system of motor ambulances on the lines suggested by the London County Council for the whole of the county; and what are his reasons for opposing the extension of this system to the County of London.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The proposals made by the London County Council in their Bill of 1906 were opposed by Sir Ralph Littler on behalf of the Corporation of the City, but the ground of the opposition was only in so far as the County Council proposed to take powers in the City as well as in other parts of the Metropolis. The electric motor ambulance service in the City was inaugurated in 1907. I understand that up to the present only one ambulance has been started, but the service as at present working, gives, I believe, complete satisfaction. The reasons for opposing the proposals made by the London County Council in 1906 are given in the Home Office Report which was before the Committee of both Houses. The view taken in that Report was that it was a question whether any additional facilities required would not be more efficiently and economically provided by a development of the existing services, rather than by the establishment of a new public service acting independently of existing agencies. It was decided that the best course was to appoint a departmental committee to consider the whole question, and it is hoped that this committee will report in the autumn.

Wheeled Litter Ambulances.

Mr. COOPER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department where the expenditure on the wheeled litter ambulances placed in the streets of London during the last two years by his authority is set out; whether he is aware that the London County Council submitted in its General Powers Bill of 1906 a proposal to establish a motor ambulance system for accidents for London, and that proposal received the unanimous support of this House; whether the clauses dealing with this proposal were struck out of the Bill in another place on his suggestion; whether the expenditure on wheeled litter ambulances was authorised by him after these clauses were struck out of this General Powers Bill; and whether he has power in any other county or town in England to charge the rate without the consent of the ratepayers and, if not, why is London the exception.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Particulars of the expenditure from the Metropolitan Police Fund in respect of wheeled litter ambulances are not shown separately in the accounts of the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District. The London County Council's Bill of 1906 provided for general powers to establish an ambulance service, but their intention was only to provide a service of an experimental and limited character. The clauses dealing with the matter were thrown out by a Committee of the House of Lords after consideration of the Home Office Report on the Bill, and a Departmental Committee was shortly afterwards appointed to inquire into the whole question. Wheeled litters have been sanctioned since 1906, and others previously sanctioned have been placed out since that date, according as it has been found possible to meet existing needs. I have no similar powers elsewhere than in the Metropolitan Police District, the powers as regards the provision of litters in that district belonging to the Secretary of State as police authority for the Metropolis.

Ridenham Village Green.

Mr. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board has made any representations or inquiries of the Andover Rural District Council relative to the recent enclosure of the village green at Ridenham; and whether he has any further information as to the steps being taken by the district council to protect public rights in this matter.

(*Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board are in communication with the Andover Rural District Council, and have been informed by them that their investigations into the matter are not yet completed. I shall be pleased to inform my hon. friend of the result of the inquiry.

Fishery Authorities.

Mr. WILLIAMSON (Elgin and Nairn): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been drawn to the Addendum to the Report of the Committee on Fishery Investigations; whether the representatives of the Board signed an Addendum recommending the creation of one fishery authority for the whole of the United Kingdom and the abolition of the Scottish Fishery Board and the Irish Board of Fisheries; and whether the representative who signed the Addendum correctly represented the view of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries on this matter.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The reply to the first and second parts of the Question is in the affirmative. Mr. Rew in the Addendum to the Report expressed his personal opinion only. The Board themselves, as I have already stated, do not desire the creation of a single Board of Fisheries for the whole of the United Kingdom.

Distemper in Dogs.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to inquire into the question of distemper in dogs have carried on or intend to carry on any experiments on dogs by inoculations or otherwise for the purpose of their inquiry; if so, where will such experiments be conducted, by whom and at whose expense, and how many dogs have up to now been used for this purpose, and with what results.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The experiments will be conducted on registered premises by members of the committee, who hold the necessary licence, and the expenses will be defrayed out of public subscriptions. Thirteen dogs have up to the present time been used for the purpose mentioned. It is too early to make any statement as to the results of the inquiry, but a full Report will be issued by the committee in due course.

Old-Age Pension Regulations.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Regulations under the Old-Age Pensions Bill will be issued before the adjournment, or, if not, will they be circulated during the Recess.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I hope that the Regulations will be ready in the course of a few days. I propose that they should be presented to Parliament at the earliest possible moment.

Volunteer Quartermaster-Sergeant.

Mr. GUY WILSON (Hull): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that certain Volunteer quartermaster-sergeants obtained their discharge from their old corps in order to take commissions as quartermasters in the new Territorial units, and that these commissions were refused them by the War Office because they were over forty years of age, whereas if they had remained as non-commissioned officers they could have served until fifty-five years of age; and whether he can see his way to alter this Regulation.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*) The War Office is aware of one case of a staff-sergeant (sergeant-major), which is being considered specially. It is not considered desirable to alter the Regulation referred to.

War Office Uniform Contracts.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that khaki uniforms are being made in the homes of the poor in the East End of London; whether this is in conformity with the Fair Wages Resolution of this House; whether he can state who are the contractors; whether this domestic employment is a case of sub-contracting; whether he is aware that some of the contractors are working their employees seven days per week; and, if this is not sweating, what action he intends to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) If the hon. Member is referring to the making of uniforms for the Regular

Forces, all home work is strictly forbidden by the contracts, and I have no reason to think that the rule is being broken. If the hon. Member will bring to my notice any specific case of alleged infringement of the rule or any case where employees are working seven days a week inquiry will at once be made and stringent action taken if the allegations are found to be justified. If the reference is to the making of uniforms for the Territorial Force, I can only refer the hon. Member to my Answer of the 28th instant.

Woolwich Ammunition Stores.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the quantity of stores and ammunition available at Woolwich is insufficient for a week's normal supply; and, if so, whether he will cause an inquiry to be held to ascertain who is responsible for that state of things, and take steps to promptly remedv this shortage.

To ask the Secretary of State for War what are the present stocks of small-arm and gun ammunition available for immediate use at Woolwich, and how the figures relating to such stocks compare with the corresponding figures for the year ending 31st July, 1907 and 1906 respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) May I reply to Questions No. 82 and 83 together? I can assure the hon. Member that the state of things which he suggests does not exist. I do not consider it advisable to publish the figures asked for, but I may say that the present stocks of gun and small-arm ammunition are in accordance with the scales laid down. Woolwich is, of course, only one of many places where these stocks are kept.

Long Service Medals for Volunteer Officers.

MR. FIENNES (Oxfordshire, Banbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that non-commissioned officers and men of the Territorial Army obtain a long service medal, he will grant the same to the officers as a reward for long service in the Volunteer Forces.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The grant of a decoration for officers of the Territorial Force, corresponding to the Volunteer officers' decoration, is at present under consideration.

Exchequer and Audit Department Staff.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the number of Exchequer and Audit Department officials who are likely to retire on pension before the end of the present year, and the approximate amount of pension to which each of them will be entitled.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I am not prepared to make inquiry as to possible retirements in the Department. Information on both these points will be available in due course in the Estimate for Class 6, Vote 1, for 1909–10.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will give the dates on which the members of the promotion Committee in the Exchequer and Audit Department met in 1905, 1906, 1907, and 1908, the total membership of this committee, and the number present at each meeting.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) This Question relates to matters that, under Section 9 of 29 and 30 Vict., c. 39, are entirely within the discretion and authority of the Comptroller and Auditor-General, and I have no power to interfere.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the recommendations of the Inter-Departmental Conference on removal expenses of members of the Army Accounts Department and of holders of appointments under similar conditions under the Admiralty and Exchequer and Audit Department have been adopted by the latter Department; and, if not, will he explain why.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The recommendations are in force for removals, the cost of which falls on Imperial revenues. In the case of removals the expenses of which are repaid by the Colonies, special rules have been laid down by the Colonial Office.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the amount realised for 1907–8 by the Exchequer and Audit Department from the sale of stamps attached in prepayment for carriage to official parcels of accounts received from the Crown Colonies and Protectorates.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) Nil.

Colonial Audit Branch.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that three-fifths of the Old Colonial Audit Branch nominated officials passed no actual educational test examination on entry to the public service and possessed no academic qualifications of any kind he will explain how the Comptroller and Auditor-General satisfied himself as to the educational qualifications of these men; and why salaries, varying from £65 to £115 per annum in excess of those of their ex Second Division open-competition contemporaries and colleagues employed on the same duties, are now granted to such of these officials as return from unhealthy climates abroad.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I have nothing to add to the previous replies in connection with these points.

Cost of Birth Certificates.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of reducing the cost of obtaining a copy of a certificate of birth to 1s. or a less sum in the case of any applicants for old-age pensions who may be required to produce such certificates.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The point is one which is receiving careful consideration in connection with the regulations under the Act. I hope that as a general rule it will be found to be practicable, by checking the statements of applicants against the records of the Registrar-General to dispense with the necessity for the production of actual certificates by the applicants themselves.

Mohill Seed Loan.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH (Leitrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received a copy of the resolution passed by the Mohill, County Leitrim, board of guardians at their meeting held on Thursday the 9th instant, with reference to extending the time for repayment of the seed loan to four years from two years as at present arranged; and, if so, will the said recommendation be carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have received a copy of the Resolution referred to. A period of two years has in the past proved sufficient for the repayment of the cost of the seed, and I am not aware of any adequate reason for extending the time on the present occasion.

Evicted Tenant on Lord Harlech's Estate.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners' inspector has sent in his report with regard to the reinstatement of Mrs. Alice Reilly, Aughavas, County Leitrim, an evicted tenant on the estate of Lord Harlech.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have considered Alice Reilly's application, and, as they have not been able to arrange for her reinstatement in her former holding, they have placed her name on the list of persons suitable to be provided with a holding should untenanted land become available in the neighbourhood.

Mong Evicted Tenant.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners will reconsider their decision as regards the reinstatement of Michael Dunne, son of the late Thomas Dunne, an evicted tenant at Mong, Carrick-on-Shannon, County Leitrim, on the Marsham estate; and, in the event of his being unable to get the farm from which his father was evicted, will he be provided with another farm elsewhere.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that Michael Dunne is at present in occupation of a farm. The holding to which he seeks to be restored has been occupied by the present tenant since 1881. The Commissioners do not consider the matter to be one calling for any action on their part.

Croften Estate Evicted Tenant.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from John Reynolds, Drumbeira, Garvagh, Mohill, County Leitrim, on the Croften estate, as the direct representative of the evicted tenant, and which is at present in the occupation of a man named Michael Reynolds; and will the Estates Commissioners offer compensation to Mr. Reynolds with a view to reinstating the evicted tenant's representative, John Reynolds.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are unable to trace the receipt of any application from John Reynolds for reinstatement in a holding on the Croften estate, County Leitrim, and they have no information in the matter.

Portadown Orange Arch.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of Catholic and Protestant householders in William Street, Portadown; how long, prior to the present month, was it since an Orange arch had been erected in this street; and whether any police patrol was in the street on the night of the 12th instant when disorderly conduct took place.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The numbers of Catholic and Protestant householders in William Street, Portadown, are twenty-one and thirty-five respectively. The last occasion, prior to the present month, on which an Orange arch was erected in the street was 11th July, 1907. The police patrolled through William Street and the adjacent streets from 9 p.m. on 12th instant to 4 a.m. on 13th instant continuously. No disorderly conduct came under the notice of the police patrols in William Street.

Caledon Petty Sessions Court.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, after the business of the Caledon petty sessions was over on the 10th instant, Mr. Townsend, the resident magistrate, ordered the public to leave the Court, cautioned two reporters who remained not to take any notice of his remarks, and then, with the concurrence of Dr. Patterson and Mr. Mercer, the only other magistrates present, rebuked the police for not using their batons and dispersing a Nationalist band which paraded the streets of Caledon on the 7th instant, notwithstanding the fact that this band played both Nationalist and Orange airs alternately and had a large number of Protestant followers; whether any of the magistrates present on the bench were Catholics; how many Catholics are on the bench in the district; and whether Mr. Townsend was exceeding his duty in making the remarks referred to, and, if so, whether any official notice will be taken of the incident.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police have reported that on the 6th instant, from 7 p.m. until a late hour on the following day, a band, followed by a large crowd, paraded the streets of Caledon. The band played Orange and Nationalist airs alternately, and the crowd shouted and yelled. The occasion was the expected eviction of a publican on the following day; but a settlement was come to at the last moment and the eviction did not take place. The small local force was not sufficient to prevent the disorder during the night, but reinforcements were summoned and arrived next morning. Mr. Townsend, the resident magistrate, informs me that at Caledon petty sessions on the 10th instant his brother magistrates complained of the matter, whereupon he asked the police why they had allowed such an intolerable state of things to continue for twenty-four hours to the annoyance of the inhabitants. He said he thought they should have stopped it, but said nothing about batoning. Mr. Townsend's remarks appear to have been made in the interests of the peace and good order of his district, and do not call for official notice. The reason for the inaction of the police has already been stated. The fact that in this instance Orangemen and Nationalists were united in a common purpose does not afford any justification for disturbing the quiet inhabitants of the town for a whole night.

Wexford Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that for the last twenty-five years the Wexford Rural District Council have been in the habit of entering into agreements with the parties interested in the lands proposed to be acquired compulsorily for the purposes of the Labourers Acts; that under the improvement scheme they are at present about to carry out the council entered into a number of such agreements; that in cases where they failed to agree as to the price to be paid for the land they applied to the Local Government Board to appoint an arbitrator for that purpose; that on 8th May last the Board appointed an arbitrator to determine the purchase money to be paid so far as compensation for the same has been made the subject of agreement, and that the arbitrator did inquire into such cases; that on 18th June the Local Government Board wrote to the district council to the effect that in a case affecting the Newtownards Rural District Council the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice in Ireland had unanimously decided that it was not competent for any district council where the lands were proposed to be compulsorily acquired to enter into agreements with the parties interested, and that the compensation therefore should be arrived at by the arbitrator, and accordingly the cases in which agreements had been entered into by the Wexford District Council should be submitted to him; that the arbitrator, notwithstanding the limitation to his appointment, did sit and inquire into these agreement cases and spent a considerable time inspecting the said sites; and whether, having regard to the terms of Section 3 (1) of the Labourers Act of 1896 and Sections 4 and 7 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890, the Local Government Board propose to appeal against the judgment of the King's Bench so as to have the law on the subject well-established.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The facts are generally as stated in the Question. The Local Government Board do not propose to appeal against the decision of the King's Bench Division in the Newtownards case. An appeal, in fact, has been lodged by the prosecutors in that case, and the matter must therefore be regarded as being still *sub judice.*

Irish Intermediate Education Inspectors

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the rules made by the Intermediate Education Board with the approval of the Lord-Lieutenant under the authority of the Intermediate Education Act of 1900, contemplated the introduction, as part of the system of intermediate education in Ireland, of a scheme providing for the appointment of a staff of permanent inspectors; that the late Government in November, 1905, came to the conclusion that the time had arrived for a reconsideration of the reasons which were previously urged against the adoption of the scheme; that with a view to such reconsideration as well as to place the Government in possession of expert opinion on the question of affecting a much needed co-ordination of the systems of intermediate, primary, and technical education, so far as co-ordination is practicable within the limits of existing powers, a committee representative of the three educational systems was appointed, with instructions to make a Report to the Government on the matters mentioned; whether he will state the names of the representatives who formed this committee; what was the date of its Report; what were the committee's recommendations; whether any action has since been taken on its recommendations; and whether he will now consent to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the Report of the committee the appointment of which so strongly commended itself to the departments concerned.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The rules of the Intermediate Education Board made in 1902 prescribed bonuses for schools which on inspection should be reported as satisfactory or highly satisfactory. In November, 1905, the Government suggested that the question of the appointment of a staff of permanent inspectors might be usefully reconsidered in the light of, and in conjunction with, the suggestions for co-ordination of the systems of primary and intermediate education made by Messrs. Dale and Stephens in their then recently published Report on Intermediate Education. As a result the matter was considered by a committee consisting of the Right Reverend Dr. Archdall, Bishop of Killaloe and Dr. Starkie, nominated by the Board of National Education, Mr. Justice Madden and the Reverend T. A. Finlay, nominated by the Intermediate Education Board, and Mr. Gill and Mr. Fletcher, nominated by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. The Report of the Committee, which is marked private and confidential, is dated January, 1906. Its principal recommendation is the appointment of permanent inspectors under the Intermediate Education Board. My predecessor informed the right hon. Gentleman in 1906 that he could not undertake to present the Report in question to Parliament, and I am not prepared to depart from his ruling. I may say, however, that the Government are at present considering a scheme for the appointment of permanent inspectors, and I have reason to hope that a settlement may be arrived at in the near future.

Queen's County Evicted Tenants.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what were the number of claims which the Estates Commissioners received from evicted tenants in Queen's County since the passing of the Act of 1903; how many of those tenants were restored or got equivalent farms under the Act of 1903; and how many claims were settled under the Act of last session, and how many remain to be dealt with.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that since the passing of the Irish Land Act, 1903, they have received up to 30th June last 322 applications for re-instatement in Queen's County. Of these applications 129 have been rejected; in fifteen cases the applicants have been restored by the landlords with the assistance of the Commissioners; thirty-six have been provided by the Commissioners with holdings on lands purchased by them; and seventy-six applicants have been noted as suitable to be provided with holdings in the event of the Commissioners acquiring untenanted land in the neighbourhood of the former holdings; sixty-six of the applications, which were received since 1st May, 1907, have not yet been considered by the Commissioners. Up to the present, no persons have been provided with holdings in Queen's County under the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907.

Lord Listowel's Estate.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the holdings purchased by the tenants on Lord Listowel's estate in North Kerry will be vested in the tenants so as to reduce the interest on the purchase money from 3½ to 3¼ per cent.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The holdings on this estate, with the exception of a few outstanding cases, were vested in the purchasing tenants on the 16th instant.

Mr. H. Franks' North Kerry Estate.

MR. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say if the estate of Mr. H. Franks, in North Kerry, has been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners, and, if so, when; has the estate been inspected and reported upon, and, if so, when; what price has the landlord asked, and what price, if any, have the Estates Commissioners offered for the estate; and at what probable date may the sale be completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the estate of Mr. H. Franks in County Kerry has been offered to them under Section 6. An offer has been made to the owner, but he has not, up to the present, agreed to accept it. The Commissioners cannot, therefore, say when the sale will be completed. It would be contrary to the Commissioners' practice to make any statement as to the details of pending negotiations.

Intermediate Education Rules.

MR. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Examination Rules and programme for 1909, which was presented on 23rd June, 1908 and ordered to be printed on 7th July, 1908, will be printed for the use of Members of the House of Commons.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) This Paper was circulated yesterday.

Blacker Douglas Estate, North Kerry.

MR. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the land known as the Jeffcott farm, on the Blacker Douglas estate, situate near Ballylongford, North Kerry, has been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners, with the view of enlarging uneconomic holdings and giving plots of land to labourers in the district; whether the farm has been inspected and reported upon; and, if so, will the Estates Commissioners secure this farm so as to relieve congestion in a very poor district.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they will not be in a position to give the required information until they have received the report of the inspector to whom all the papers in connection with the estate in question have been referred.

Deaths from Disease in India.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can state the number of deaths from plague, cholera, and small-pox, respectively, in any quinquennial period prior to the establishment of British supremacy in India, in the territories corresponding with, or approximating to, the presidencies of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, including East Bengal, the United Provinces, and the Punjab; also the amount spent on famine relief, and the amount of remissions or suspensions of land revenue in each of the provinces named during the like period on account of the total or partial failure of crops; and whether he can give the same information in respect of any other administration in Asia, whether or not under direct or indirect European control.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) No, we have no means of obtaining the information asked for by the hon. Member.

Madras Deputy Collector's Appeals.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether Mr. Kothandaramayya, formerly deputy collector and magistrate in the Madras presidency, petitioned the Secretary of State for a copy of the proceedings on his appeal against his dismissal from the service; whether such petition has been refused; if so, for what reason, and will the Secretary of State agree to lay the Papers dealing with the matter upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The appellant did petition the Secretary of State for a copy of the orders passed in disposing of his case. On inquiry, it was ascertained that the substance of the orders had been duly communicated to the memorialist. The Secretary of State knew no reason why passages in the orders passed, not dealing with the merits of the case but containing instructions to the Madras Government, should be communicated to the memorialist; nor does he see any advantage in laying the Papers upon the Table of the House.

MR. O'GRADY: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that Mr. Kothandaramayya, formerly deputy-collector and magistrate in the Madras Presidency, appealed to the Secretary of State for India against the order of the Madras Government removing him from service, and that the Secretary of State, as a result of inquiry, characterised the procedure as arbitrary and unjudicial; and whether, in consequence of the view so taken, any relief or reparation was granted Mr. Kothandaramayya.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan*). The Secretary of State did not use the language mentioned in the Question. He desired, in April, 1904, that the memorialist might be informed that he saw no sufficient reason for disturbing the order passed by the Madras Government in his case, in dismissing him from the service of the Government. The present Secretary of State in July, 1907, on a full consideration of a renewed appeal by the memorialist, refused to re-open the question.

State of Jasdan.

MR. E. H. LAMB (Rochester): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India, if he will state what amount of compensation has been paid to the sons and grandsons of the late Krachar Shri Ala Chela, Chief of the third-class State of Jasdan in Kathiawar, since they were disinherited by order of His Majesty's Government; and whether States, even smaller than that held by the above chief, have in recent years been divided among the heirs, according to the traditional custom which was overruled in the case of Jasdan.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan*). I have no information as to the allowances allotted to the sons and grandsons of the late Chief of Jasdan, but it was a condition of the succession of the present Chief that he should make suitable grants to them in maintenance and should act on any advice that might be given to him by Government as to these grants of "giras." As regards the smaller States in which since the Jasdan decision succession may have taken place in accordance with the custom of division, I would point out that in cases where the application of the principle of division has resulted in States losing internal sovereignty and coming under British control and the Thana system, the reasons of policy that governed the Jasdan decision, viz., the maintenance of an estate large enough to support internal sovereignty, do not apply.

Importation of Spirits into Nigeria.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state the nature of the tribunal to whom the investigation of the importation of spirits into Nigeria is to be referred; what is its constitution; and what are the terms of reference thereto.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely*). The Colonial Office is in communication with the Native Races and the Liquor Traffic United Committee as to the best manner of conducting the investigation. It is probable that some time will elapse before the details can be settled, but my right hon. friend may rest assured that there shall be no avoidable delay.

Exchequer and Audit Department.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will explain why members of the Exchequer and Audit Department serving in the Crown Colonies and Protectorates are not allowed their travelling expenses to and from the ports of embarkation.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely*). I can only assure my hon. friend that officers of the Exchequer and Audit Department are treated precisely in the same way as all civil officers of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates who receive free passages. It is an old-established practice that free passages should not carry also the right to free railway journeys, etc., between the port of embarkation and the home of the officers.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse*). This is the general rule in force throughout the Colonial service, and accordingly the Colonial Office thought it desirable to adopt it in the cases referred to in the Question.

Jamaica Relief Fund.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that the committee under the chairmanship of the Governor of Jamaica, appointed to distribute the money voted by Parliament and subscribed by the English public towards the relief of the sufferers from the Kingston earthquake, has caused grants to be made to certain sufferers on the condition that such funds were to be expended only in litigation for the prosecution of insurance claims; and, seeing that this money was intended to be applied to relief, whether he has sanctioned this diversion from its original object; and, if not, whether he will signify his disapproval to the Governor of Jamaica.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely*). In the Report of the Assistance Committee for the period ended 31st March last the following passage occurs:—"It appeared to the Committee that one of the most effective and practical means of giving assistance would be to help those persons who had lost property and stock by fire and whose insurance claims were contested, with the result that they were unable to rebuild or to resume business, to obtain at any rate a legal decision upon their claims. The Committee having ascertained that the majority of the persons so affected had combined to support legal action on their common behalf, and that the plaintiffs in two test cases had been successful in actions in the Supreme Court and on appeal, and were in pressing need of funds to defend an appeal against these judgments before the Privy Council, the Committee decided to allot to each of such persons so interested who had applied to them for assistance and whose case on investigation they had decided to be one which they were entitled to aid under the law, a special grant to assist him or her to defray his share of the legal expenses of prosecuting the last-mentioned appeals. In all cases, therefore, in which they had decided to give a building grant or a trade grant to an insured person so situated they further allotted an amount equal to 2 per cent. on the amount for which such person had been insured and had been refused allotment by an insurance company, on the condition that if he should be successful in his claim the amount of such allotment should be returned into the Assistance Fund. The grants made in this manner amounted to £2,263 3s. 3d. As has already been stated, in cases in which a building grant was made on a building destroyed by fire it was stipulated that if fire insurance was recovered a proportion of the amount received should be repaid into the Assistance Fund according to the scale on which the grant had been made." The Secretary of State sees no reason to question the action of the Committee in making grants to enable persons who had lost property and stock by the fire, and whose insurance claims were contested, to obtain a legal decision on their claims.

Imports of Continental Hops.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether Continental hops are now being offered on forward contract to be delivered in London in October next at 28s. 6d. per cwt.; and whether such hops can be dealt with in England without being subject to the provisions of the Hop (Prevention of Frauds) Act, 1866.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) It is possible that Continental hops of old stock or of the lowest grade of 1908 crop may have been offered at the price stated. I am informed, however, that current quotations range from 30s. to 70s. per cwt. without business. I understand that the Select Committee on the Hop Industry were of opinion that it would be impracticable to apply the general provisions of the Act of 1866 to foreign hops without further legislation.

Hop Harvest in the United States.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, if he will state at what period of the year the hop crop is picked in the United States of America; and whether he is aware that so-called 1908 American hops have been advertised for sale in London during the present month of July.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I am informed that American hops are not picked until August. I have no information as to the latter part of the Question.

Hop Acreage in England and America.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, what was the acreage of hops cultivated in the Western States of America and in England in each of the last twenty-five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The following statement gives the information desired by the hon. Member so far as it is available. Acreage under hops in: (1) England and Wales; and (2) the Western Division of the United States of America—

Years.	England and Wales.	Western Division of the United States of America.*
	Acres.	Acres.
1880 - - - - - - -	66,698	1,957
1881 - - - - - - -	64,943	,,
1882 - - - - - - -	65,619	,,
1883 - - - - - - -	68,016	,,
1884 - - - - - - -	69,258	,,
1885 - - - - - - -	71,327	,,
1886 - - - - - - -	70,127	,,
1887 - - - - - - -	63,706	,,
1888 - - - - - - -	58,494	,,
1889 - - - - - - -	57,749	,,
1890 - - - - - - -	53,961	12,239
1891 - - - - - - -	56,145	,,
1892 - - - - - - -	56,259	,,
1893 - - - - - - -	57,564	,,
1894 - - - - - - -	59,535	,,
1895 - - - - - - -	58,940	,,
1896 - - - - - - -	54,217	,,
1897 - - - - - - -	50,863	,,
1898 - - - - - - -	49,735	,,
1899 - - - - - - -	51,843	,,
1900 - - - - - - -	51,308	27,683
1901 - - - - - - -	51,127	,,
1902 - - - - - - -	48,031	,,
1903 - - - - - - -	47,938	,,
1904 - - - - - - -	47,799	,,
1905 - - - - - - -	48,967	,,
1906 - - - - - - -	46,722	,,
1907 - - - - - - -	44,938	,,

* These particulars are only collected at the time of the Decennial Census.

The Western Division comprises the following States:—Montana, New Mexico, Washington, Idaho, Arizona, Oregon, Wyoming, Utah, California, Colorado, Nevada.

Consumptive Emigrants to Canada.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that under Canadian Law emigrants from this country who develop consumption within two years after arrival in Canada are required to return; and, seeing that the various steamship companies make no provision for the isolation of such passengers, will he consider the expediency of communicating with the companies on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I am aware of the provisions of the Canadian Immigration Acts on this subject, and I believe that the steamship companies are fully alive to their responsibilities under those Acts, and take precautions to prevent persons being embarked who are liable to be deported. I will consider whether any further action should be taken, but the powers of the Board of Trade are limited to securing that steerage passengers shall not be embarked who are likely to be a danger to themselves or to others during the voyage.

Scottish Crofters.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the abandonment of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, will he introduce legislation to extend the benefits of the Crofters Act to crofter tenants holding under lease.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I must refer my hon. friend to the terms of my Answer to his Question of yesterday in regard to the Amendment of the Crofters Act.

Price of Beef in Chicago and New York.

MR. COOPER: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, what have been the average prices of beef per 8 lbs. in Chicago and in New York from July, 1907, to June, 1908.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The following statement gives the particulars asked for so far as regards New York. I am endeavouring to obtain corresponding particulars as regards Chicago—

Wholesale market price of beef in New York, July, 1907, to June, 1908.

Month.	Mean price per 8 pounds.
1907.	s. d.
July - - - -	2 4
August - - - -	2 3
September - - -	2 4
October - - -	2 5
November - - -	2 5½
December - - -	2 6¼
1908.	
January - - -	2 6
February - - -	2 4¾
March - - - -	2 5¾
April - - - -	2 9
May - - - -	2 9½
June - - - -	2 9½*

* Based on quotation for 4th June only.

Note.—The figures are the mean of highest and lowest quotations of "family beef" for one day in each week of the month, and are taken from "Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance of the United States."

Imports of Foreign Hops.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade what were the imports of foreign hops in 1820 and each subsequent year.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The following statement gives the information asked for by the hon. Member—:

Table showing the quantity of hops imported into the United Kingdom in each year from 1820 to 1907, inclusive—

Years.	Quantity imported.	Years.	Quantity imported.
	Cwts.		Cwts.
1820	1	1846	3,283
1821	—	1847	1,471
1822	—	1848	385
1823	572	1849	5,265
1824	2,171	1850	6,479
1825	3,202	1851	462
1826	1,914	1852	309
1827	5	1853	42,344
1828	41	1854	119,040
1829	28	1855	24,662
1830	77	1856	15,987
1831	98	1857	18,711
1832	100	1858	13,000
1833	299	1859	2,220
1834	471	1860	68,918
1835	28	1861	149,176
1836	—	1862	133,791
1837	—	1863	147,281
1838	46	1864	98,656
1839	—	1865	82,479
1840	107	1866	85,687
1841	34	1867	296,117
1842	—	1868	231,720
1843	28	1869	322,515
1844	267	1870	127,853
1845	726	1871	218,664

Years.	Quantity imported.	Years.	Quantity imported.
	Cwts.		Cwts.
1872	135,965	1890	188,028
1873	122,729	1891	195,266
1874	145,994	1892	187,507
1875	256,444	1893	204,392
1876	167,366	1894	189,155
1877	250,039	1895	217,161
1878	168,834	1896	207,041
1879	262,765	1897	164,154
1880	195,987	1898	244,136
1881	147,559	1899	180,233
1882	319,620	1900	198,494
1883	129,900	1901	116,042
1884	256,777	1902	191,324
1885	266,952	1903	113,998
1886	153,759	1904	313,667
1887	145,122	1905	108,953
1888	216,606	1906	232,619
1889	199,384	1907	202,324

Tarbert Pier, Loch Fyne.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has yet got from the Scottish Office the desired information about Talbert Pier, Loch Fyne, and, if so, will he communicate it to the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The information with which my right hon. friend has furnished me as the result of his inquiries is to the following effect: The pier in question has been let for a considerable time past by the Campbells of Stonefield. The lease expired in May last, when the property was again advertised and the offer of the former lessee accepted. Owing, however, to a difficulty that arose between Mr. Campbell and his tenant, the former decided to make the pier free to the public and he is carrying out certain repairs. Doubts appear to have arisen in the locality as to who is really the owner of the pier, but no authentic information is at present forthcoming on this point.

Churches (Scotland) Commission.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Elgin Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether all the allocations by the Churches (Scotland) Commission were made months ago; and, if so, when the final distribution will take place.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) A comprehensive statement of the allocation of the entire funds and property of the churches was communicated to the Press on 17th February last, but these allocations are inoperative until given effect to in formal orders which are very numerous and involve detailed adjustments, the completion of which remains largely in the hands of the agents for the churches. It is believed that all the work entailed will be concluded during the extended period for which the Commission has been appointed.

Partial Exemption Scholars.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the additional attendances allowed under Article 43 (*c*) of the Day School Code in respect of partial exemption scholars are also counted in determining the accommodation of a school and the staff required.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Answer is in the negative.

Police Day of Rest.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the sitting of the Committee on the Police Day of Rest Bill, he will order a ballot to be taken of the constables of the Metropolitan Police Force on the subject; whether his attention has been called to the instructions of the Chief Commissioner of Police to the chief inspectors to ascertain from sergeants and constables their views on a number of questions dealing with weekly leave, loss of payment for such leave, a reduction of pension if such leave were granted, and other matters outside the terms of reference submitted to the Committee; and whether he sanctioned this action of the Chief Commissioner; and, whether, with a view to having a free and impartial return of the men, he will have the question of a day's rest in seven placed before them on ballot papers for them to express their votes for or against.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The hon. Member must have been misinformed. The Commissioner of Police informs me that he has not given instructions for any such inquiries as are mentioned in the Question. The matter is not one in which a ballot could be taken with any advantage, as the chief question involved is one of finance and of increased burden on the ratepayers.

English Industrial Schools.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many day industrial schools there are in England, and what is the number of scholars, male and female, in average attendance at them and whether any practical difficulties have been found in carrying out the system of religious instruction in those schools, and, if so, what are those difficulties.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) There are fifteen day industrial schools in England. The average attendance in 1707 was 1,257 boys and 694 girls. No difficulties have been experienced in carrying out the system of religious instruction.

English Hop Acreage.

Mr. COURTHOPE: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what was the English acreage of hops in the years 1820, 1835, 1845, 1855, 1865, 1875, 1885, 1895, and 1907.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The existing system of collecting returns of the acreage under hops in England only commenced in 1866. The figures for 1875 and other years specified are as follows:—

Year.	Acreage.
1875	69,171
1885	71,327
1895	58,940
1907	44,938

Cattle Disease.

Sir W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what arrangements exist for securing the prompt international notification of the existence of contagious diseases of sheep and cattle in different countries; whether the presence of any contagious diseases of cattle, *e.g.*, foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, or pleuro-pneumonia, has been reported during the present year in Canada or the United States; and how many cases have been reported.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) With reference to the first part of the Question perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to refer him to my reply on 28th May to a similar Question by my hon. friend the Member for Bermondsey. The reply to the latter part of the Question is, so far as we are aware, in the negative.

Unemployment in the Building Trade.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether, in view of the amount of unemployment in the building trade, he will put in hand all new Government buildings, and alterations, additions, and repairs to existing buildings for which money has been voted by Parliament, with the object of relieving to some extent the distress now existing in this industry.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I said on 13th July, in answer to the hon. Member for West Ham, that I am as much interested as anybody in pressing on this work, and no time is being lost in doing so.

Greenwich Park Night Watchmen.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether it was by his authority that an order was issued in March last by which the night watchmen's hours in Greenwich Park were increased from eight to thirteen per night, making ninety-one hours per week without extra pay; and whether, in consequence of objecting to this increase on the ground of its unreasonableness, a watchman of ten years standing has been punished by removal from his position as watchman to that of labourer and debarred from sharing in Sunday duty and overtime; what is the reason for the increase in the working hours; and whether he will make inquiries into the matter with a view to another arrangement being made and the reinstatement of the workman in question.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The arrangement was made in order to bring the duties of the watchman at Greenwich Park into line with the practice in other parks. Before March last there was no watchman on duty at Greenwich during the earlier night hours after closing time. The hours will vary according to the time of the year. The late watchman was given the option of retaining the post, but declined, preferring to revert to ordinary work at 4s. 6d. a day, which was his pay as a watchman, only that he earned it for seven days a week instead of six days as at present. He is not debarred from overtime or Sunday duty, with extra pay, when it may be required. I see no ground for further action in the matter.

Strangers Lobby Mosaics.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the four panels in the Strangers Lobby, two of which are now filled with mosaics, were originally intended to be all filled in with mosaic decoration; are there any cartoons or working drawings in existence intended to provide for the two vacant panels; is it intended in the near future to complete the four; and are the patron saints of Ireland and Scotland to form the motifs for the remaining designs.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I think it most desirable that the two remaining panels should be finished in mosaic, as was always intended; but I fear that the condition of the public finances will not warrant the Government at present in spending money in works of supererogation, however decorative. I may, however, suggest that these panels are very suitable for private generosity on the part of those who are addicted to the missing saints, and I shall be glad to receive any communications in this direction.

Weir Hospital Grant.

SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): To ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether the Charity Commissioners will extend the time allowed for objections and suggestions to the draft scheme in the matter of the Weir Hospital grant by the inhabitants of the parish of Streatham until 14th October next, the date to which they have extended the time to the Wandsworth borough council.

(*Answered by Mr. Trevelyan.*) The Charity Commissioners will extend the time as desired.

Aberdeen Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, in connection with the inquiry which has been asked for, and the consideration by the Admiralty Volunteer Committee into the creation of a new division of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve at Aberdeen, if he will consider the advisability of holding a public inquiry there, with due notice, so that a local committee might be formed amongst those most likely to be of help in the matter; and if he will keep in view the advantages which would accrue from the retention of H.M.S. "Clyde" as a drill-hall and head-quarters of the proposed new division of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) As was stated on the 13th instant, the matter referred to by my hon. friend is receiving consideration in case any extension of the existing numbers of the Naval Volunteers should be required. The matter has not yet reached a stage at which a public inquiry at Aberdeen would be of advantage. The old system of training the Royal Naval Reserve on Board stationary drill-ships is being terminated, and in consequence H.M.S. "Clyde" will be paid off on or before 31st March, 1911.

Burning of Bonar Bridge, Crofters' House.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord-Advocate whether he is aware that on Saturday, 18th July last, the sheriff officer forcibly entered the house of John Murray, a crofter residing alone on a croft at Laidbreack, Bonar Bridge, inherited from his grandfather twenty years since, and, during the crofters' absence from home, removed his goods and burnt the house to the ground; and will he state why this official adopted such extreme measures, and whether steps will be taken to arrest this method of carrying out evictions.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) I have perused a Report from the chief constable on this subject with certain depositions and documents. While it appears from these that John Murray is not a crofter as alleged, and has never been tenant of the subjects at Laidbreack, and neither worked the land nor had stock thereon, I have thought it right to remit the question to the Crown Office, and I have directed that a special Report from the procurator fiscal should be made upon the eviction proceedings referred to. These proceedings were presumably taken on the responsibility of the proprietor.

Beer Brewing Statistics.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what were the numbers of standard barrels of beer brewed in Great Britain in the years 1820, 1835, 1845, 1855, 1865, 1875, 1885, 1895, and 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Barrels of Beer brewed in Great Britain

Year ended		Barrels.
5th July, 1821	Strong Beer	- 5,699,329
	Table Beer	- 1,646,141
	Total	- 7,345,470

Duty repealed 1830. No returns available for the years 1835, 1845, and 1855, the duty being levied on malt.

Year ended	Barrels.
31st March, 1866 -	- 23,853,391 (estimated)
30th September, 1875	- 28,988,767 (estimated)
31st March, 1866 -	- 25,045,275 (estimated)
31st March, 1896 -	- 31,023,360
31st March, 1908 -	- 30,931,227

Old-Age Pensions and Workhouse Pensioners.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if pensioners in workhouses, the cost of whose maintenance is deducted from pension, are debarred from the benefit of the Old-age Pensions Bill by Clause 3.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The question is one of some difficulty; but, at at present advised, I am disposed to think that the Answer is in the affirmative.

West Africa Nickel Coinage.

MR. ESSEX: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will exhibit during the autumn session in the Library or Tea-Room, or some other easily accessible part of the House, an example of each of the nickel coins issued last year to certain Colonies on the West Coast of Africa, and together therewith examples of the bronze coins of similar values now in current use in the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have given instructions for my hon. friend's suggestion to be carried out.

Inland Revenue Chemical Officers.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is now in a position to reply to the petition of the chemical officers of Inland Revenue, forwarded to the Board of Inland Revenue in July, 1907, asking for the grant of an allowance similar to that paid to testing officers of Customs at the outposts.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The matter is still under consideration.

Captain Bryce Wilson.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, after making an adverse confidential report with reference to Captain Bryce Wilson, his commanding officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Graham, recommended him for promotion to a majority in a cavalry regiment serving, or about to serve, in India.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether, on 2nd December, 1907, the War Office officially stated that there was nothing against the character or efficiency of Captain Wilson; and whether, in view of that fact and the desirability of establishing public confidence in the decisions of the military authorities, he will state why Captain Wilson was dismissed or retired from the service in view of such official declarations.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that Captain Bryce Wilson, late of the 5th Lancers, was dealt with upon the basis of a confidential report made by Lieutenant-Colonel Graham, which it was alleged was wholly untrue and at variance with the previous Reports made by the said commanding officer; and whether, in the interest of the service and the public, he will direct an investigation to be made into the circumstances and truth of such Report.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that in October, 1907, Captain Wilson was placed on half-pay and subsequently gazetted out of the 5th Lancers, notwithstanding the fact that on 25th November, 1907, his late commanding officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Graham, admitted his fitness to remain in the service, while objecting to his continuance (for private and personal reasons) in the 5th Lancers; and whether he will insist upon a full explanation being given why two inconsistent and contradictory Reports were allowed to be given by and received from the same officer with regard to the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) In replying to these four Questions together, I take the opportunity of stating the facts as to what took place. On receiving from Lieutenant-Colonel Graham a Report that Captain Bryce Wilson had not a good influence in his regiment, the Army Council called upon General Sir John French, Commanding-in-Chief at Aldershot, for his views. He reported that in his opinion Captain Wilson should not be permitted to rejoin the 5th Lancers, on account of the bad influence he exercised over the junior officers of the regiment. These

Reports are regarded as fully justifying the action taken by the Army Council in placing Captain Bryce Wilson on half-pay. It subsequently came to the knowledge of the War Office that the removal to half-pay of five officers of the regiment, of whom Captain Wilson was one, had given rise to rumours which reflected upon the character of these officers. Having regard to the fact that other officers, besides Captain Bryce Wilson, had been placed on half-pay, it was decided to make a general announcement to the effect that the action taken was not taken on grounds detrimental to their characters. At the same time Captain Wilson's retention in the regiment was considered to be undesirable for the reasons given by Sir John French to which I have already alluded. It is true that, after reporting adversely upon Captain Wilson, Lieutenant-Colonel Graham recommended him for promotion into a cavalry regiment serving or about to serve in India, but the Army Council did not agree with the recommendation. In expressing the opinion that this officer was not unfit to remain in the service Lieutenant-Colonel Graham intended to imply that in extra-regimental employment, the special reasons which rendered Captain Wilson's retention in the 5th Lancers so undesirable would not operate at all events to anything like the same extent. The whole circumstances have been considered by me personally as well as in consultation, and in my opinion, and that of my military advisers, it would not be in the interests of the Army or the public to restore Captain Bryce Wilson to his former position.

Shoebury Fishery Rights.

Mr. WHITEHEAD: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any several and private rights of fishery now exist over any, and what, part of the foreshore belonging to the War Office in the parishes of Foulness, Shoebury, Great Wakering, or Southchurch; and whether any such rights have by conveyance become vested in the Crown, and, if so, over what part of the said foreshore.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am not in a position to answer the hon. Member's Question without some investigation, and I will let him have a written reply in due course.

Irish Territorial Force Officers and Jury Service.

Colonel McCALMONT (Antrim, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether officers belonging to the Territorial Force or to the Militia in Ireland are exempt from serving on ordinary or special juries.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the Answer which I gave last Monday to a similar Question by the hon. and gallant Member for East Down. Ireland is no exception in this matter.

Director of Army Finance.

Colonel R. WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War in what respects he has reconstituted the office of Director of Army Finance; whether the minute or other document defining the duties and responsibilities of the reconstituted office has the approval of the Treasury and will be laid upon the Table of the House; and if he can assure the House that its financial control is in no way weakened by the change.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The details of the changes involved have not yet been settled; but the hon. and gallant Member may rest assured that in any modifications that may be made the principles laid down in the second Report of the Public Accounts Committee of this year will be carefully and exactly observed, and the financial control of the House will be in no way weakened. I shall be prepared when the time comes to lay upon the Table a document defining the responsibilities and duties of the Assistant Financial Secretary, who will be the Accounting Officer of the War Department.

Printing of Government Bills.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Prime Minister whether he will consider the advisability of establishing, as a general practice, in the printing of Government Bills and Acts of Parliament to which schedules are attached, that there should be inserted opposite each schedule as a marginal note a reference to the section or sections which contain references to that schedule.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I will consider this question. There is no doubt that the practice could be followed as regards Acts. The only difficulty as regards Bills is the practical difficulty of keeping the references correct when Bills have to be reprinted without delay after their various stages in Parliament.

Rosyth.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): To ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the low price of raw material, the increased numbers of the unemployed on the North-East Coast, and the imminence of wasteful local relief works, he will consider the expediency of expediting those naval works at Rosyth, which are necessary to the Fleet and which would offer a large field for labour.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) As has already been stated by my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, the contract will be placed as soon as possible, and it is proposed to make provision in its terms for a premium to be paid to the contractor for completion of the work before the contract time.

Fisheries Investigation Report.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): To ask the Prime Minister when the Report of the Treasury Committee on Scientific and Statical Fisheries Investigation will be printed and circulated; and whether the Government will adopt the recommendations.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The Report of the Committee will be laid upon the Table forthwith, but I am not in a position to state what conclusions may be arrived at with regard to the Committee's recommendations.

Customs Warehouses Stock-taking.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the system of periodical stock-taking in warehouses under the Inland Revenue Department and under the Customs Board; is he aware that in connection with a certain warehouse handed over from the Customs to the Inland Revenue in 1903 a balance was struck showing stock representing a duty of £1,200 when there was not a single package in the warehouse; will he cause inquiry to be made into this matter and into the methods of stock-taking adopted in the Customs, and an investigation to ascertain whether the stock shown in the books of the Board agree with the stock actually in the warehouse; and whether there has been a fraudulent removal of stock from any of the other warehouses under that Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Treasury have had the matter referred to in this question under their consideration quite recently, and it will be further considered in connection with the proposed amalgamation of the two Revenue Boards. The Board of Customs are unable to trace the transfer in 1903 of the bonded warehouse mentioned.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Submarine Dangers.

MR. MACPHERSON (Preston): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what means, if any, animal or mechanical, existed on board Submarine No 9 for the detection of the escape of petrol gas; and whether he will state what methods the Admiralty propose taking to prevent the recurrence of such mishaps as that which took place on Submarine No. 9 off Folkestone on Tuesday 9th July.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): In the case of the recent accident in Submarine A. 9 owing to a mechanical defect, a large quantity of exhaust gases escaped into the boat. The effect was sudden; and the occurence of defects of this kind, though happily rare, are almost impossible to guard against. Engines have so much improved since submarine boats were first built, that such an escape of petrol gas as white mice would serve to register, is no longer to be feared. There is no remedy for such an accident as occurred in A. 9, the effect of carbon monoxide on the men being so rapid.

Report on the Naval Manœuvres.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will state when the customary report as to the recent naval manœuvres will be issued.

MR. McKENNA: The recent manœuvres, like those of October 1907, were in the nature of confidential fleet exercises, and no report on them will be issued.

Royal Naval Reserve.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Government will consider the advisability and propriety of granting to officers and men of the Royal Naval Reserve a long-service and good-conduct medal; and whether he will consider the advisability of granting to trained men of the Royal Naval Reserve a higher rank than that at present given of A.B. or stoker.

MR. McKENNA: The grant of a decoration to the officers of the Royal Naval Reserve and of a medal to the men is still under consideration, but it is hoped to make an announcement on the subject at an early date. Under the regulations for the new system of training, a limited number of seamen and stokers, Royal Naval Reserve, not exceeding two per cent. of each class, are eligible for advancement to the ratings of leading seamen and leading stokers, Royal Naval Reserve, subject to the conditions for promotion laid down in the Royal Naval Reserve regulations.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: May I assume that the matter is under favourable consideration?

MR. McKENNA: I hope to make at an early date an announcement which I trust will satisfy the hon. Member.

Trial Trips of New Vessels.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that several of His Majesty's vessels have gone out on trial-trip from the yard of Messrs. Hawthorn, Leslie, and Company, Government contractors, inefficiently and under-manned; that H.M.S. Torpedo-boat No. 21, with machinery by Messrs. Hawthorn, Leslie, and Company, has had a number of unsuccessful trial-trips during the last five months; that the engine-room and boiler-room staff at the trials of this vessel, which uses oil as fuel, was composed of apprentices to the extent of about 75 per cent; and whether he will make representations to the firm in question on the matter.

MR. McKENNA: Two vessels for which Messrs. Hawthorn, Leslie, and Company are the contractors, have made trials, but they were not considered to be inefficiently manned or under-manned. Torpedo-boat No. 21—one of the above two vessels—has made a number of trials during the last five months. These were unsuccessful solely because the contract speed had not been realised. Although the complement of No. 21 Torpedo-boat has throughout these trials been known to be largely composed of apprentices, it is not considered that the failure to attain the contract speed was attributable to any inefficiency in the engine-room staff. No representation to the firm is necessary on this matter, as no condition of their contract with the Admiralty has been infringed.

MR. CURRAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman investigate why the contract speeds were not realised?

MR. McKENNA: A contract would not be concluded till the contract speed was realised.

Messrs. G. Corderoy & Co. and the Admiralty.

MR. GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty on what works Messrs. G. Corderoy and Co. have been employed during the last five years by the Admiralty as quantity surveyors; on what basis payments have been made to this and other firms; and whether the Admiralty have considered the question of employing their own staff to carry out this work.

MR. McKENNA: List of works undertaken by Messrs. G. Corderoy and Co., during the five years ending 31st March, 1908:—Malta, Docks and Breakwater; Gibraltar Dockyard, Harbour, Commercial Mole, Dockyard Extension and Coaling Facilities; Dover, Harbour; Hong Kong, Dockyard Extension and Coaling Facilities; Cape of Good Hope, Dockyard Extension; Chatham, New Dock, Naval Barracks, Hospital, Slaughter-house, Commander-in-Chief's Residence, New River Wall; Pembroke, Jetty; Sheerness, Depot for Torpedo Boat Destroyers and Drainage; West India Docks, New Offices; Deptford, Seamen's Clothing Store; Greenwich, Laboratories; Deal, Additions to Sergeant's Mess; Horsea Island, Torpedo Range; Haulbowline, Coaling Jetty; Dartmouth, Royal Naval College; Devonport, Dockyard Extension, Naval Barracks, Electrical Generating Station, &c., Gunnery School, Magazines, Coaling; Plymouth, Hospital, Wards for Lunatics. The basis on which payments have been made to this and other firms is a percentage on the cost of the work for which quantities have been prepared or measurements made. The Board have only just received for consideration a full report on the question of employing the Admiralty Works Department staff to do this work.

Naval Discussions.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether any communications have been received at the Admiralty from the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet with reference to a serious collision having been imminent between H.M.S. "Good Hope" and H.M.S. "Argyll," owing to an order given by the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet.

MR. MCKENNA: The Board have had reported to them and have examined the positions of the Fleet at the moment the signal referred to was made, and they are satisfied that the manœuvre was not dangerous. At the same time the Rear Admiral, as he thought there was risk in carrying out the order, was justified in turning the other way; and the Commander-in-Chief so informed him by signal at the time.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): Will my right hon. friend convey that answer to the editors of those papers which erroneously accused Lord Charles Beresford of having endangered the lives of 1,600 men?

MR. MCKENNA: I think it is always desirable to avoid communications with the Press.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is now speaking for the whole of his colleagues?

MR. MCKENNA: I do not think I should be called upon to answer that Question.

Naval Ordnance Department and Petitions from the Employees.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that an executive officer of the Naval Ordnance Department has refused to forward a petition from the storehouse clerks to the Admiralty, and, if so, can he say whether this officer was acting upon his own authority, and what action he intends to take in the matter.

MR. MCKENNA: A petition put forward by the storehouse clerks to amend the position of their own class at Woolwich in January last, was objected to by the acting naval ordnance officer on the ground that it was signed by several men who were not storehouse clerks. They were directed to amend the petition by excluding such names, but they preferred to withdraw it. Since that time no new petition has been received. This action, which was correct, was taken by the acting naval ordnance officer on his own authority. If a properly signed petition is put forward it will be duly considered.

Overtime in Deptford Victualling Yard.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how much overtime has been worked by the employees at Deptford Victualling Yard since 31st March, 1908, and how many men have been discharged from the same place since the same date.

MR. MCKENNA: The amount of overtime worked in 100 days since 31st March is computed at fifteen minutes per day per man. Fifteen workpeople have been discharged and six entered, making a net discharge of nine persons.

Deptford Victualling Yard Storehouse Staff.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can say when the storehouse staff at Deptford Victualling Yard are likely to receive the increase of wages promised them two years ago.

MR. McKENNA: The pay, etc. of the storehouse staff at all the victualling yards is now receiving consideration, and a decision will be promulgated within the next few weeks.

Naval Courts Martial.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether in the Channel and Home (Nore Division) Fleets there has been an abnormal number of courts martial held upon men for breaches of discipline during the past twelve months; and whether this state of things is largely due to the week-end leave which prevails, or has prevailed, during that period.

MR. McKENNA: I am sending the hon. Member copies of the quarterly returns for last year. There is no reason to suppose that there has been an abnormal number of courts martial in the fleets named during the past twelve months.

MR. NIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what is the especial difficulty or what the disproportionate amount of labour involved which prevents him from informing the House what is the total of the men of all ratings in the various fleets or squadrons, and the number of courts martial held in respect of charges of insubordination or breach of discipline during the past twelve months; and whether those figures being given the department is not competent to give the percentages asked for.

MR. McKENNA: I have already sent the hon. Member the most recent return showing the number of men tried by court martial in the various fleets. The difficulty in ascertaining the percentages arises from the doubt as to what exactly the hon. Member means when he speaks of the Home Fleet, Channel Fleet, &c., and to the variation during the year in the composition of the fleets and the numbers of men borne.

Contracts for Destroyers.

MR. DU CROS (Hastings): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the contracts for the five destroyers of the 1907 programme have yet been awarded, and, if so, when; and what is the earliest date upon which these vessels can be completed, in view of the fact that some of the twelve German destroyers of the same year are already completed, while at least one of them has done her steam trials.

MR. McKENNA: The "Crusader" and "Nubian" were ordered in January, and the "Maori," "Viking," "Zulu," in February of this year. They are all expected to be completed by October, 1909.

Naval Officers and the Press.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Frist Lord of the Admiralty whether he proposes to take steps to ascertain the name of the officer who, in defiance of regulations, recently communicated to a newspaper an account of an alleged incident in the Channel Fleet; and whether, in the event of the name of the officer being discovered, he will be tried by court martial.

MR. McKENNA: I am not aware what grounds the noble Lord has for imputing a breach of honour to any naval officer. If he will state them or communicate them to me privately, I will investigate them. They are quite unknown to me.

EARL WINTERTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I make no allegation of breach of honour, but rather of breach of regulations? I desire to give notice that, in view of the answer given, I shall raise the matter on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill.

MR. McKENNA: The noble Lord's Question asks whether we propose to take steps to ascertain the name of the officer who, in defiance of regulations, recently communicated to a newspaper an account of an alleged incident in the Channel Fleet. In my judgment it would be a breach of honour for an officer to communicate such a matter to the Press.

EARL WINTERTON: Does not the right hon. Gentleman think that that is entirely a matter of opinion? My Question was directed to the matter of fact.

MR. BELLAIRS: Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to hold any inquiry to ascertain how this information leaked out to the papers?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

Progress in India.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the speedy recovery of the Indian peasantry as soon as periods of abnormally high prices are at an end has been one of the marked features of modern Indian administration; and whether there is a general consensus of opinion that there has been in recent years a progressive improvement in the condition of the inhabitants of the Indian Empire.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that Question, may I ask whether it is not the fact that in recent years there has been a more rapid succession of famines and a corresponding increase in mortality?

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): I do not think there have been more lamentable famines in recent years. I think that if one compares the ravages of famine in recent years with those of fifty or 100 years ago, one would find that the ravages then were much greater than they are now. As to the Question on the Paper, the view expressed in the first Question is in accordance with the conclusions of recent Famine Commissions and of the local governments. With regard to the second Question, the hon. Member must judge for himself as to the existence of unanimity on the point. I at any rate agree with him, as he will have gathered from the remarks I made on the Indian Budget.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give figures indicating the average income of the population ten years ago and now?

MR. BUCHANAN: No, I have not any such figures; but I think that on the whole there has been a development in the prosperity of the poorest of the population in India.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, E): These happy people are thriving on 1½d. per day!

Afforestation in India.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that the object of the forest policy of the Government of India is the utilisation of forests for the benefit of the cultivating classes and not for the increase of the revenue by the sale of timber, further measures have been taken for the afforestation of waste lands; and, if the answer be in the affirmative, whether the result of such measures can be stated to the House.

MR. BUCHANAN: The afforestation of waste lands for the benefit of the cultivating classes is one of the main duties of the Forest Department. The chapter on Forests in the Moral and Material Progress Statement for the decennial period ending 1901–2 deals fully with the progress made during that period, and more recent information is given in the Annual Statements for succeeding years. The Statement for 1906–7 was presented in May last.

Indian Administrative Reforms.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the reforms in the administration of India which are now under consideration will necessitate legislation by this House; and whether, in view of the situation in India, he will consent to circulate the draft reform proposals to Members of Parliament before the House reassembles for the autumn session, in order to enable the House to deal effectively with the legislation which will be introduced.

MR. BUCHANAN: At the present stage it is not certain whether the improvements now under consideration will, or will not, demand legislation in Parliament. It would be a departure from settled usage to circulate draft proposals, before formal submission of definite conclusions on the responsibility of the Government.

MR. SMEATON: Will some share of effective control over taxation be given to native statesmen?

MR. BUCHANAN: I gave as full a statement as possible on that subject last Wednesday week.

Mr. Tilak's Conviction.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if Mr. Tilak, at his recent trial in Bombay, was convicted by seven English jurymen and acquitted by two native jurymen; and, if so, in view of the fact that the jury were disagreed and of the feeling caused by the sentence of six years imprisonment in the Bombay Presidency, whether the Secretary of State will cause the sentence to be remitted.

MR. BUCHANAN: With regard to my hon. friend's Question I have nothing to add to the full statement that I made on Tuesday in reply to the hon. Member for Brentford.

MR. LUPTON: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is satisfied that the articles, for writing which Mr. Tilak was tried, were properly translated for the benefit of the English jury who had to try him for articles written in another language?

MR. BUCHANAN: I do not think that that is quite a fair presentation of the case. I have no reason for believing that the translation of the articles was otherwise than fair.

MR. O'GRADY: Is it not the fact that the main line of the defence was that the articles were not accurately translated?

MR. BUCHANAN: I am not aware of that. I am perfectly certain that, if that were one of the allegations brought forward by Mr. Tilak, it was fairly considered by both the Judge and the jury.

MR. LUPTON: Would it not be in accordance with proper justice to try such a man before a jury of his own countrymen?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mr. Tilak objected to the special jury on account of the large majority of Europeans it would contain, and desired to be tried by a jury of his own countrymen?

MR. BUCHANAN: I think I said the other day that Mr. Tilak challenged a considerable number of the special jurymen, while, on the other hand, the prosecuting counsel only challenged two.

MR. LUPTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman say how the panel is summoned? They all seem to be Europeans.

*MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members should put these Questions on the Paper.

St. Lucia Property Tax Bill.

SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the St. Lucia Property Tax Bill, which, in the opinion of the majority of the inhabitants of the Colony, will cause a serious set-back to the agricultural improvement lately started, has received the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and in view of the riots in the island last year and the probability of a renewal of the disorders if the Bill is forced through the Council, and the effect such a tax had in the Island of Dominica, and which caused riots there and necessitated the sending out of a Commission which recommended the abolition of the law, whether his Majesty's Government would request the Administrator of the Colony of St. Lucia to withdraw the Bill which is before the Council; whether seeing that the Colony has a balance of £25,000 to its credit lying idle in the hands of the Crown Agents, he will explain the necessity for further taxation; and whether he will give a Return of the value of the products of the Colony for the past year and the amount of revenue collected by the Government during that period.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): I understand that the riots of last year did not arise from the Property Tax Bill. The St. Lucia Property Tax Bill of 1907 was postponed early in this year, and the Secretary of State agreed to the appointment of a committee to consider the repeal of the Road Tax and the substitution of taxes on property and on incomes derived from other sources than land. We have not yet received from the Governor a report on the result of the Committee's labours, nor any further Bill. I cannot well discuss the necessity for a readjustment of taxation in reply to a Question, but I may point out that the existence of a reserve surplus balance (which is earning interest and not lying idle) does not relieve the Government from the duty of securing equilibrium in the revenue and expenditure. The annual report containing the statistics desired in the last paragraph of the hon. Baronet's Question has not yet been received from St. Lucia, but will be laid on the Table when received in the usual manner.

Dinizulu's Salary.

MR. BYLES, (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the arrears of salary due to Dinizulu have been actually paid from the Imperial Treasury; and, if so, what steps will be taken to recover the money from the Natal Government.

COLONEL SEELY: No money has yet been paid. I cannot at present add anything to the statement which I made on Tuesday.

MR. BYLES: How much longer is he to be kept out of his money?

COLONEL SEELY: He is not being kept out of it.

Transvaal Public Service.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will lay upon the Table the Return showing the names of individuals retrenched from the public service of the Transvaal from 1st April, 1908, to 15th June, 1908, which was laid upon the Table of the Legislative Assembly of Pretoria on the 1st July, 1908.

COLONEL SEELY: I see that a Return of the nature referred to has been laid, but it has not yet been received. There is not likely to be any reason why it should not be laid here, unless it is very bulky and expensive to print, but in accordance with custom I cannot promise a Paper which has not been received.

British Indian Traders in the Transvaal.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the arrest and imprisonment in the Transvaal of some thirteen British-Indian traders for trading without licences; whether these traders tendered the licence money, which was refused with the above consequences because they declined to comply with the formalities of the registration law; whether these men were residents before the war, already holding certificates of identification and possessed of a clean record; and whether the Secretary of State will make friendly representations to the Government of the Transvaal with a view to their speedy liberation.

COLONEL SEELY: According to a telegram from the Governor of the Transvaal the Asiatics lately prosecuted have been proceeded against for contravention of the licensing laws and not of the Asiatic registration legislation. The men were found by the licensing officers to be trading without licences, and the prosecutions were undertaken at the instance of the municipal authorities. Further inquiry will be made into this matter.

White Labour on the Rand.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can give particulars of any case in which work which was being done on the Rand and mines by Chinese coolies, since repatriated, is now being performed by white labour; and, if no such particulars are available at the Colonial Office, will he make inquiries from the Transvaal Government if there are any such cases.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir, but inquiry shall be made of the Transvaal Government.

The Gilbert Islands.

Mr. SMEATON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he is aware that grave charges have been made against the Resident Commissioner in the Gilbert group of islands in the Western Pacific, notably in compelling the natives to labour without wages on public works and on the phosphate concession held by a private company, of which Lord Stanmore is chairman, in inflicting flogging for disobedience or dilatoriness, in collecting taxes from the natives in copra or cocoanut kernel, which is their staple food, notwithstanding that the phosphate company are said to be making from £80,000 to £100,000 a year clear profit from the guano which the natives collect for them; that these and other statements are sworn to by a late resident in the Gilbert Islands, and confirmed by missionaries and by three influential natives, who have presented a petition of complaint since the submission of his Report by Sir J. M. Thurm, the High Commission, in 1906; and whether, in view of these allegations, the Secretary of State for the Colonies will cause an independent inquiry to be made on the spot by some person or persons unconnected with the administration of the Western Pacific Islands.

Colonel SEELY: Certain charges of of the nature indicated by my honourable friend have been made by a former official of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate, but the Secretary of State has not at present received any confirmation of these charges by missionaries and natives of the Protectorate. The High Commissioner will be asked to send home any petition which he may have received from the Natives on the subject, and the Secretary of State also hopes to have the opportunity of conferring with him personally when he comes home in the autumn.

Egyptian Schools and English Teachers.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Egyptian Ministry of Public Instruction has called upon its English teachers of mathematics and science to qualify themselves either to teach those subjects in Arabic, or to teach history or geography, which latter subjects are still to be taught in English; and, if so, whether he will advise the British Consul-General in Egypt to represent to the Egyptian Government that the teachiny of history and geography in Arabic in the Egyptian schools is also advisable.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): I have no information as to whether the Egyptian Ministry of Public Instruction has made a demand of the nature indicated on its English teachers of mathematics and science, but I will address an inquiry on the subject to His Majesty's Acting Agent and Consul-General at Cairo. As regards the present position of Arabic as a medium of instruction in mathematics and geography, I beg to refer the hon. Member to Sir Eldon Gorst's Report for 1907 (Egypt No. 1, 1908) page 32, paragraph 2, and page 35, paragraph 2, in which it appears that the number of subjects in which instruction in Arabic is being given is being increased.

Mr. ASHLEY (Blackpool): Is not this instruction given in Arabic at the present time?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I cannot say without reference to the Report. I know one or two subjects have been added.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is it likely that properly qualified teachers in mathematics and science can be obtained if Arabic is insisted upon?

Sir EDWARD GREY: The question is a very difficult one to deal with, but I think teaching in Arabic should be encouraged as far as possible.

Brigandage in Turkey.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether an official circular has recently been issued to British subjects residing in Turkey informing them that, in the event of their capture by brigands, under no circumstances will His Majesty's Government advance any funds whatever for their release; whether any similar circular has been issued by other Governments to their subjects; and is he aware that this circular will have the effect of preventing the employment of engineers, foremen, and others of

British nationality in the provinces of Turkey.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is that the attention of British subjects residing in Turkey has been drawn to a circular issued by the late Lord Granville in 1881 in the sense stated by the hon. Member. With regard to the second part, I have no information as to what action, if any, may have been taken by other Governments. I have no reason to suppose that the circular had any prejudicial effect before or that its repetition now will have the effect mentioned by the hon Member in the third part of his Question.

German Arrest of the Trawler "General."

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has placed before the German Government the case of the illegal arrest of the steam trawler "General" by the German gunboat "Zeeder" on 9th May last; whether he is aware that the vessel was boarded by a German crew and taken to Cuxhaven, that the captain was imprisoned and the cargo of fish destroyed, and that when tried by the court they proved their innocence and the ship and crew were released; and whether he can state what compensation the German Government intend to award the fishermen and vessel owners for the loss they have sustained.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am aware of the case referred to by the hon. Member. No claim has yet been presented to the German Government, as I am still awaiting the receipt of the official account of the trial and other material, but the matter is receiving careful consideration.

EARL WINTERTON: Is it not the fact that in these cases foreign Governments acquaint our Government with the trial and its sequel?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Where it is a matter of importance we instruct our Consuls to watch the case and report to us.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY: Have you had any report in this case?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am expecting a full report in a week or so.

German Arrest of the Trawler "Taurus."

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what compensation (if any) the German Government propose to award to the captain and crew and the owners of the steam trawler "Taurus," which was illegally arrested by a German torpedo boat while fishing off the German coast on 14th May last; and whether he can state what steps His Majesty's Government propose to take to protect British fishermen while discharging these duties in these waters, and also to prevent these infringements of international Law by German naval officers.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The trial of the master of the "Taurus" has not yet taken place. Until it has, and I have been informed of the result, it is impossible for me to make any statement on the subject. The trial was originally fixed for 15th June last, but as the master did not appear on that day it has been postponed to 24th August.

Imprisonment of Mr. Tchaikovsky in St. Petersburg.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Mr. Tchaikovsky, who has for the past eight months been a prisoner in the fortress of St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Petersburg; whether he can say if any charge has been preferred against the accused or when he is likely to be brought to trial; and whether, as Mr. Tchaikovsky has been for thirty years a resident in Great Britain, where his family still reside and practice their professions, and where Mr. Tchaikovsky has not only borne an excellent character but earned a high reputation in the world of letters, he will make such representations as will ensure that Mr. Tchaikovsky may either be brought to trial or be released from confinement and allowed to return to his home in London.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Mr. Tchaikovsky is not a British subject, and the matter is therefore not one in which official action could be taken.

Persian Imports of Arms—Proposed Russian Loan.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a large quantity of arms has recently entered Persia via the Caspian for the use of Colonel Liakhoff and the Royalist Party in the suppression of the reform movement in Persia; can he state whether a loan to the Shah by Russia is under negotiation; and, if so, whether, in the view of His Majesty's Government, such separate action on the part of one of the signatories of the Anglo-Russian Convention would be in consonance with the spirit of that Convention.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As regards the first part of the hon. Member's Question, I have no information to this effect. The reply to the second part is in the negative, and there is therefore no occasion to comment upon it.

Colonel Liakhoff's Action in Teheran.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has yet received information as to the part played by Colonel Liakhoff in the suppression of the Persian Parliament; is it a fact that last December the representatives in the Persian capital of Great Britain and Russia pressed upon the Shah the advice to remain faithful to his promise solemnly made to the popular assembly, that he would observe the constitution, one of the articles of which provides that the royal orders will be sanctioned only when they have received the signature of a responsible minister; were the orders issued to Colonel Liakhoff, which resulted in the sack of the Parliament House, countersigned in this manner; and on what grounds does the Russian Government justify the suppression by a Russian officer of the popular assembly, to which Russia and Great Britain had urged the Shah to remain faithful.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no more information now than I had when the hon. Member last asked Questions on these points; nor do I see how I can usefully add to the general explanation and expression of opinion which I gave on Monday.

MR. LYNCH: Seeing these events occurred more than five weeks ago, will the right hon. Gentleman endeavour to get the information before Parliament rises?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Even if I had the information I am not at all sure I should be able to add to the statement I made last Monday, when the hon. Member had a full opportunity of stating his views, and I replied on the general circumstances of the case.

Increase in Lunacy.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, seeing that the Report of the Lunacy Commissioners for 1907 states on page 5 that the rate of increase in certified lunatics was equivalent to 237·2 per cent. over the figures for 1859, and that the general population increase for the same period was at the rate of 77·5 per cent., he can see his way to cause inquiries to be made as to the causes of this continued and large percentage of increase of certified lunatics.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. As pointed out on pages 8 and 9 of the Report of the Commissioners, there are many considerations to be borne in mind in interpreting the figures as to lunacy; and I would also call attention to the special Report of the Commissioners on the alleged increase of insanity issued in 1897. The whole question is receiving careful consideration, and the Government will no doubt receive assistance from the Report of the Royal Commission on the Feeble-Minded, which will be issued in a few days.

Provincial Homes Investment Company.

MR. WALSH (Lancashire, Ince): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to a case reported on 16th June, in which the evidence showed that a policeman named Wilkinson, acting as agent for a company entitled the Provincial Homes Investment Company, had induced a woman named Poynton to subscribe sums amounting to £37 10s. to the said company; whether he is aware that Judge Parry stated that the company was really and essentially a fraudulent concern; whether it is in accordance with police office regulations for constables to act as agents of societies; and, if not, will he take steps to prevent similar action by police officers in future.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am making inquiry in the matter, and in the meantime I am not in a position to express any opinion as to the part taken by Wilkinson in the case.

Motor 'Bus Breakdowns.

MR. S. COLLINS (Lambeth, Kennington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will give a Return showing the number of motor 'buses that broke down within the area of the county of London during the last twelve months.

MR. GLADSTONE: I regret that I am unable to give the information desired. No official figures as to breakdowns are compiled, and it would be very difficult to define breakdowns so as to distinguish them from temporary stoppages, due to the need of adjusting brakes, replenishing the supply of water in the radiator, etc.

Illicit Hawking of Beer.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the sentence of a fine of £50 or three months imprisonment recently passed by the Brentford bench of magistrates upon a man named Swallow for supplying a bottle of beer to a customer whose name had not been entered in his employer's books; whether the man is now undergoing such term of imprisonment; and, if so, whether having regard to the technical character of the offence and to the fact that no previous charge had been made against the man, he will consider the justice of advising a reduction of the sentence.

MR. GLADSTONE: This was a case of illicit hawking of beer, which cannot be regarded as a merely technical offence. On the contrary, it is in my opinion a serious offence, which is difficult to detect, and when detected, calls for an exemplary penalty. On the information before me, I see no grounds for advising interference with the sentence which the Court in its discretion imposed.

Metropolitan Police.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it has been usual for the Metropolitan Police Force, when they have been called upon for extremely exceptional duties, to be granted two or three days extra leave; and whether this course was adopted on each occasion of the Royal Jubilee of 1887 and 1897, and at the time of the visit of the Shah of Persia.

MR. GLADSTONE: Extra leave was given for the Royal Jubilee of 1887, the visit of the Shah in 1889, and on some other occasions; but the grant of this extra leave involved such dislocation of duty that in recent years, with the exception of the Coronation, when both extra pay and extra leave were given, any recognition of extraordinary duties has taken the form of a grant of pay and not a grant of leave.

Arlesey Asylum Brewery.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, having regard to the fact that the quantity of beer annually brewed in the private brewery attached to the Three Counties Asylum, at Arlesey, has been reduced during the last two years from 32,800 gallons to 17,600 gallons, he will say if he has any official reports showing what the effect has been upon the health of the patients or the staff of this reduction in the consumption of liquor; and, if so, whether he will state their purport to the House.

MR. GLADSTONE: There is no official report showing what the effect of the reduction in the consumption of beer has been on the health of the patients or the staff at the Three Counties Asylum, but the Commissioners in Lunacy have made inquiry of the Medical Superintendent, who replies that there has been no apparent effect on health.

International Securities Corporation, Limited.

MR. WALSH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the remarks of Mr. Justice Swinfen

Eady in the case of the International Securities Corporation, Limited, on 23rd July, wherein he described the company as carrying on a business of a peculiarly mischievous character by illegal and fraudulent means, and tempting poor people to part with sums of money by means of seductive and attractive advertisements, and expressed the opinion that the company ought to be wound up at once; and what steps, if any, the Board proposes to take in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): An order has been made by the Court for the compulsory winding-up of the International Securities Corporation, Limited, and a full investigation is in course of being made by the Official Receiver.

Shunting Fatality at Leeds.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the death of W. Harris, an under shunter in the employ of the Midland Railway Company at Leeds; whether such death was caused through what is known as gravitation shunting, the men employed having to run to the wagons, and put down hand brakes, when the wagons have reached the level, and are travelling at the rate of 20 miles an hour; and whether, in view of the dangerous practice and the loss of life that must ensue, especially during the winter months of fog and darkness, he will take steps to obviate such danger by reducing the height of the bank down which the wagons have to run, and thus minimise the speed, by insisting on hand brakes to be fixed each side of the wagons, by the ballast between the sidings being improved, and the staff of brakesmen at the danger point being augmented.

MR. CHURCHILL: The accident referred to has been reported to the Board of Trade by the railway company, and I have directed that an inquiry shall be held.

Fraudulent Building Societies.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the business done by the Provincial Homes and other building societies, and the charges implied by Judge Parry against them, he can give any assurance of immediate action to protect the public against alleged fraud.

MR. CHURCHILL: I must refer my hon. friend to the reply given on the 27th July to my hon. friend the Member for the Prestwich Division. I have directed that a careful examination of the subject be made in order to see whether further legislation is necessary.

Unemployment Statistics.

EARL WINTERTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the admitted impossibility of making any accurate comparison between the statistics relating to unemployment in Great Britain and Germany, respectively, given in the Board of Trade *Labour Gazette*, he will cause the printing of such statistics to be discontinued in the next issue of the journal in question.

MR. CHURCHILL: Though the official statistics of unemployment in the two countries are not comparable, each series of figures possesses a value as indicating changes of the state of the labour market. I think, therefore, that the figures ought to continue to be published, together with a warning against their misuse.

Unemployment in Manchester.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received statements from Manchester showing the increase in the number of unemployed persons in that district and the concern for the difficulties to be faced later in the year; and whether he can undertake to assist the efforts of the local authorities by grants of money to meet their requirements.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I do not find that I have received any recent statement to the effect referred to in the Question. I shall certainly do all I can to administer to the best advantage the sum voted by Parliament in aid of the expenses incurred by the distress committees, so far as it falls to my Department to disburse it.

Distress at Erith.

MR. ROWLANDS: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the exceptional distress at Erith and the stopping of the works undertaken by the urban district council, he will take steps to urge upon the council the desirability of re-opening the works at an early date.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am in communication on this subject with the urban district council, who will, I have no doubt, take into consideration all the circumstances of the case.

MR. ROWLANDS: Will the right hon. Gentleman remind the council that they have a balance over from the unemployed fund last year?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes, Sir.

Police Traps for Motorists.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that motorists who are in the habit of exceeding the speed limit frequently complain of the traps set by the police for the detection of such breaches of the law; and whether, in view of these complaints, he will suggest to the local authorities that a preferable method of enforcing the law would be to employ cars provided with an accurate speedometer so that the driver may know when the car is being driven at the precise maximum speed permitted by the law, each such car to carry a police officer in plain clothes with instructions to arrest any car that passes him when he is travelling at the maximum speed and to prosecute the owner or driver for exceeding the speed-limit.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The somewhat expensive method of checking breaches of the speed-limit which my hon. friend suggests does not commend itself to me, and I do not think it is one that I could recommend to police authorities for their adoption.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Will the right hon. Gentleman take into consideration the simple suggestion made by a noble Lord in another place?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will take them all into consideration.

Refusal of a Charter to Eastbourne.

MR. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that, after the town of Eastbourne had applied under the Local Government Act, 1888, to be created a county borough, the town authorities at the request of the Local Government Board took a special census of the inhabitants, which showed a population of over 50,000; and, if so, what were the special reasons why the consideration of Eastbourne's application has been either refused or deferred.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am aware of the facts stated in the Question. The informal census taken by the town council showed a population of 50,696 only, and having regard to the small margin of population above 50,000 thus shown, it appeared to the Local Government Board that the consideration of the application that Eastbourne should be made a county borough should be deferred until after the next ordinary census, when the precise population would be more accurately ascertained.

MR. BEAUMONT: Why did the Local Government Board insist on putting Eastbourne to the expense of a special census and then decline to abide by the result? Will the right hon. Gentlemen order a special census to be taken by the Registrar-General?

MR. JOHN BURNS: The Local Government Board asked Eastbourne to take a special census believing they would do so accurately, but it was not taken under circumstances which ensured its reliability to the extent which was necessary to justify us in conferring on Eastbourne that which Eastbourne was demanding.

MR. BEAUMONT: Will the right hon. Gentlemen direct the Registrar-General to take a census which can be relied upon?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will consider that.

Oldham Postmen's Wages.

MR. CLYNES: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that postmen in Oldham are paid about 4s. per week less than Manchester, whilst the Board of Trade Returns and other particulars show the cost of living to be slightly higher in the former town; and whether he can consider the case of the Oldham postal servants, on the basis of the memorial they have recently presented, with a view to raising their scale of pay.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Oldham and Manchester have been classed in accordance with the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee as explained in the Parliamentary Paper, "Post Office (Changes in Wages, etc.)," pages 54 *et seq.* The classification is based on the volume of work subject to modification where the cost of living is especially high or low. The number of units of work representing the volume of work at Oldham is 409, which places it naturally in Class III., the units of which range from 240 to 800. The cost of living in Oldham is just under normal, so that it remains in Class III. At Manchester there are no less than 9,612 units of work, and Class I. scales are therefore appropriate; while the cost of living is only slightly below the normal. Of course my hon. friend clearly understands that no existing established officers are adversely affected by an alteration in scale. They all go to their old maximum and enjoy all benefits that may be derived from the improved stripe system, Bank holidays, night work, etc.

MR. CLYNES: Has not the right hon. Gentleman promised to consider specially any cases in which it can be shown that the calculations were made on a wrong basis?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: If any such information is forwarded I will consider it.

MR. CLYNES: I understood that a memorial had been sent in.

Putney Telephone Exchange.

SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the Post Office telephone exchange at Putney is so obsolete or ineffective that it is impossible for the General Post Office to give to an ordinary table instrument an extension, as the National Telephone Company does in the same district; and whether he will say what action he is going to take in the matter.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The number of subscribers to the Post Office telephone exchange at Putney is increasing so rapidly that a new exchange is being provided for their accommodation, but I am glad to say that the exchange is neither obsolete or ineffective in any other respect. The hon. Member's question must, I think, be based on a misapprehension of the circumstances of some particular case. If he will give me particulars of the case I shall be glad to have it fully investigated.

Government Pensions.

MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that the recipients of old-age pensions will be paid weekly, he will consider the desirability of arranging that all other persons at present in receipt of Government pensions payable through the Post Office shall be paid weekly.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Post Office pensioners in receipt of pensions of less than £80 a year already have the option of weekly payment if they received weekly wages before superannuation. All other Post Office pensioners are paid monthly or quarterly, and I do not propose to alter this arrangement. Army and Navy pensioners are paid at Post Offices by means of Money Orders issued monthly or quarterly by the War Office and the Admiralty. I am not, of course, responsible, in the case of these pensions, for anything beyond the cashing of the Orders, and have no control over the period of payment.

Royal London Friendly Society.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies is aware that an agreement has been arrived at between the supporters and opponents of the conversion of the Royal London Friendly Society into a mutual insurance company; whether he can state the terms of that agreement; whether the Chief Registrar has yet confirmed the conversion; and, if not, whether he can state when he is likely to do so.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): I understand that a meeting took place on the 22nd instant between the representatives of the Society of the National Union of Insurance Agents and of certain collectors, at which terms of agreement favourable to the dissentient collectors were offered by the Society and provisionally accepted, but I have not been informed how far these terms have been ratified. The main point conceded was that collectors should be guaranteed the market price for their books if they received notice to leave for any cause except "wilful dishonesty." I must, however, refer the hon. Member to the Society if he wishes to have a copy of the terms themselves. The Chief Registrar proposes to register the Resolutions to morrow.

MR. CLOUGH: Has all idea of testing the legality of the poll been abandoned?

MR. HOBHOUSE: That is a matter which does not concern the Treasury. It rests entirely with the members of the Society.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) asked if those who voted for the conversion had their costs paid out of the funds of the society while the opponents paid their own expenses.

MR. HOBHOUSE: No, Sir. I have inquired and find that the society's funds were not used for that purpose.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, having regard to the recent conversion of the Royal London Friendly Society, he will consider the possibility of presenting a Bill amending the Friendly Societies Act, 1896, section 54 of which confers the absolute right upon wealthier societies to convert themselves into companies and so destroy the benefits in the Act specially designed for the use of the industrial community.

MR. HOBHOUSE: No, Sir. His Majesty's Government has no intention of amending the Friendly Societies Act further than is provided in the Bill which has recently been read a third time in this House and is now under consideration in the House of Lords.

MR. O'GRADY: Was not the effect of this conversion a considerable fall in the value of shares?

MR. HOBHOUSE: That does not affect the Treasury, which has no power over that at all.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that an application was presented to the Registrar of Friendly Societies on the 18th day of June last asking the Registrar to appoint inspectors to inquire into the matters connected with the attempt to convert the Royal London Society into a mutual company, and that, as yet, no such inquiry has been ordered or directed; and whether steps will be taken at once to institute such inquiry.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies informs me that he has refused this application on the ground that the applicants did not shew sufficient cause for an inspection as is required by subsection 2 of Section 76 of the Act.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that provision has been made in the new constitution of the Royal London Mutual Insurance Society, Limited, to take 30 per cent. of the premium income of the society (exclusive of commission paid to collectors) for management expenses, and that the total premium income is £1,000,000; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the affairs connected with such conversion, with a view of amending the Friendly Societies Act to prevent such conversion of friendly societies by laying down a draft code of rules and incorporating them in an amended Act.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The first part of this Question concerns the Board of Trade. I have already replied to the second part of the Question.

Reorganisation of the Customs.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in the coming amalgamation of the Customs and Excise, all officers of Customs, clerical or practical, who have reached the age of sixty-two, will be called upon to retire, as is done in the Excise service at the present time; and whether facilities for retirement on advantageous terms will be given to officers who desire to take up their superannuation rather than accept service in the new department.

I beg also to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a position or positions under the combined Board of Excise and Customs have been offered, directly or indirectly, to highly placed Excise officials; whether he is aware that there is a belief in the Excise and Customs services that an effort is being made, by the offer of desirable positions to highly placed Excise officials, to buy off the opposition to the amalgamation; and whether he will consider the desirability of abandoning a scheme which has to be carried through by such methods.

MR. HOBHOUSE: In reply to this Question and to the Question on the same subject which the hon. Member has addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I beg to inform him that I am not in a position to anticipate the decision hereafter to be reached on the details of the forthcoming amalgamation of the Customs and Excise services.

Ballinorley (Sligo) Teacher's Residence.

MR. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a loan was obtained from the Board of Works, Ireland, through the Commissioners of National Education, for the erection of a teacher's residence at Ballinorley, county Sligo; what amount remains outstanding, and whether payments for principal and interest on the loan have still twelve years to run; is he aware that the Commissioners of National Education have struck the Ballinorley school off the roll; and, as the residence will now become vacant if the school is closed, will he state how he proposes to collect the amount outstanding for principal and interest.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The Commissioners of Public Works inform me that a loan was obtained from them for the erection of a teacher's residence at Ballinorley, county Sligo, of which the amount outstanding is £39 1s. 9d., the payment in respect of principal and interest having still twelve years to run. It is the case that the Commissioners of National Education have struck Ballinorley school off the roll, but the residence in connection with the school will not become vacant. It has been let by the manager for nearly four years to a person other than the teacher, and the manager pays the Board's rent-charge. In any case a former manager and two sureties (or their personal representatives) who entered with him, in the year 1885, into a bond to secure the repayments, are liable.

Miltown Evicted Tenants.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received and considered applications for reinstatement, as evicted tenants, from John Bacon, evicted from the lands of Milltown, on the Castle Archdale estate, and John Cassidy, evicted from the lands of Aughnagaffert, on the Aileen estate; and will these men be reinstated or supplied with new holdings.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners have received and considered the applications referred to. In the case of John Bacon, the Commissioner considered the applicant to be unsuitable to manage a farm, and moreover the evicted holding is in the occupation of a tenant purchaser. John Cassidy is already in temporary possession of the holding from which he was evicted, and the Commissioners will further consider his case when the estate on which the holding is situate comes before them.

Clovelly Evicted Tenants.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have acquired any land in county Fermanagh upon which they can allot a holding to John Graham, of Barmagh, Clovelly, country Fermanagh, an evicted tenant already considered by the Commissioners as a suitable person to have a holding allotted to him.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have not yet acquired any untenanted lands upon which they could provide a holding for John Graham, but they are in negotiation for the purchase of certain land in the county, and, if they should acquire this land, Graham's claim will be considered in connection with it.

Ballinorley National School.

MR. McHUGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education for Ireland have struck off the roll the Protestant national school of Ballinorley, County Sligo, of which the manager is the Rev. John Roche Ardill, LL.D., canon, Protestant rector of Calry parish; is he aware that this school has been established for more than a century, and that it has been on the roll of the Board for thirty years; that this school is three miles distant from the nearest Protestant school; and that if it is closed Protestant children living in Ballinorley will be obliged to walk a distance of four miles on the average to the nearest school under Protestant management and a like distance returning home from school; is he aware that the Board's rule 179 (c) provides for the closing of a school under Protestant management only when it is within two miles distance of one or more schools under the management of any Protestant denomination; whether, seeing that the Compulsory Education Act of 1892 assumes that in all cases where it applies there is a school in which both secular and religious instruction are given within two miles measured by the nearest road from the residence of the child, and provided that the school grant should be paid to schools having an average attendance of ten or more pupils, and that the average in Ballinorley school for last year was thirteen, the Commissioners are empowered to make rules and orders overriding an Act of Parliament; and will he make representations to the Commissioners with a view to having the case of Ballinorley school reconsidered.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the school in question was struck off the roll of national schools on 26th April last, because it was not required in the locality and the average attendance for the years 1906 and 1907 was only thirteen. The school has been under the National Board since 1876. There is a national school under Protestant management two and a half miles away, and there is also one under Roman Catholic management about half a mile away. Rule 179 (c), which applies to Protestant and Catholic schools alike, deals with the appointment of new teachers in schools with an average daily attendance of less than twenty-five. The rule under which the Commissioners acted in this case was Rule 189, which provides that, as a general rule, a national school, in order to continue to be recognised by the Commissioners, must have an annual average daily attendance of at least twenty pupils. The Irish Education Act of 1892 contains no provision which requires payment of the school grant to be made to any elementary school that does not fulfil the require- of the Commissioners' rules and regulations, and in any event the Act is not in force in the district in question. The whole question as to small schools, distinguishing between those which may be suppressed without any real injury, and those which cannot be so suppressed, will, I hope, immediately engage the attention of the National Board.

MR. ASHLEY: Where are these thirteen children to be educated?

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of course proceed on the assumption that they can go to another school. There is a Protestant school two and a half miles away and also a Roman Catholic school, and it is assumed the children can attend either of those schools.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S): Is it not the fact that the National Commissioners of Education in Ireland accepted the grant of £114,000 because the result of a refusal would have been the closing of 225 small schools? Seeing that this school has been in existence over 100 years and it is fully three miles to the nearest Protestant school, will not the right hon. Gentleman get the case reconsidered?

MR. BIRRELL: It is no use interrogating me, I am not a member of the Board. As to the grant of £114,000, it must not be lost sight of that the money has been allotted altogether irrespective of the size of the schools. I have no control over the Commissioners; the whole matter rests with them.

Mr. SLOAN: Is it not the fact the National Board have twice refused to agree to the closing down of the 225 Protestant schools?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am not sure of it.

Mr. SLOAN: Well, it is.

Mr. BIRRELL: At any rate the National Board will have an opportunity of stating its views.

Mr. McHUGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman ask the Commissioners to reconsider their decision?

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) put a similar Question.

Mr. BIRRELL: I will do the best I can, but I have no control whatever over the Board.

Mr. ASHLEY: But surely the right hon. Gentleman can make representations? I am a Sligo man, and very much interested in this question.

Mr. BIRRELL: If the facts are as stated I have great sympathy with any school which has to be closed, with the result that a number of children are left unprovided with the kind of denominational education they desire. I do not think it is desirable in the present state of public affairs that the children should be required to go to a Roman Catholic school. At the same time, the multiplication of small schools should be avoided.

Mr. McHUGH: There would not be a multiplication.

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not say there would; but there are a large number of schools in Ireland which might be usefully amalgamated.

Mr. McHUGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the teacher of Ballinorley national school, County Sligo, applied to the Commissioners of National Education on the 2nd of the present month for a quarter's salary, amounting to £11, due on the 30th June ultimo; whether the Board had written on the 19th May informing the manager that the teacher would be paid up to the 26th April, but not stating that the salary would be discontinued after the latter date; whether on the 26th May the teacher supplied to the Board, at the Board's request and at her expense, a medical certificate to qualify her for the pension fund as if she were still under salary; whether at the end of June the Board called upon her to furnish the quarterly returns up to the last day of that month; whether the first intimation the manager received that the salary was withdrawn was conveyed in a letter from the Commissioners to the manager, dated 6th July instant; and will the salary due to the 30th June be paid without further delay.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the teacher referred to is not a permanent principal teacher, and could not be recognised as such seeing that she has not been trained. She was recognised by the Commissioners, under rule 79, as *locum tenens* at the school in question for the maximum period of three months, pending the appointment of a permanent teacher, and the manager was so informed. The three months expired on the 26th April last, and salary was paid to that date. Under the rules no further salary can be paid. All teachers have to furnish a medical certificate of health when first recognised.

Fair Rent Notices.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of originating notices to fix fair rents received by the Irish Land Commission for the years 1890 to 1896, inclusive, and also the numbers of said notices similarly received for the years 1897 to 1903, with the approximate cost of the Commissioners and staff employed during the above two respective periods; and will he state the present costs of the Commissioners and staff annually employed in the rent-fixing department.

Mr. BIRRELL: The number of originating notices to fix fair rents lodged with the Land Commission between 22nd August, 1890, and 1st March, 1896, was 15,061, and the number lodged between the latter date and 31st March, 1903, was 93,924. The Land Commission inform me that it would not be possible, without considerable labour, to state even approximately the expenditure on the fair rent side of their business for the thirteen years in question. Moreover, a comparison as regards cost between the two periods referred to could not fairly be made, seeing that the system of fixing fair rents underwent considerable change by the Act of 1896. The Commissioners cannot make a close estimate of the present cost of the fair rent staff, but they think it may be stated at approximately £45,000 per annum, exclusive of the salaries of Judicial Commissioners, which are charged on the Consolidated Fund.

The All-Red Route.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the pledges given by the late Prime Minister and to the imminence of the adjournment, he can now give any assurance to the House that the Government will not commit the House to any subsidies in support of what is called the all-red route before Parliament has had the opportunity of discussing the subject.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I can only repeat the assurance of the late Prime Minister that if, on examination, any such scheme was found to be feasible, no arrangement would be binding until approved by the House of Commons.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.

MR. SMEATON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to revive the defunct Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, or to introduce a measure to effect the same objects, but on different lines.

MR. ASQUITH: No further legislation on this subject can be attempted during the present session, and it would be premature at this moment to anticipate the future.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Lord Chancellor has declared this Bill to be defunct?

MR. ASQUITH: If so, he was stating an obvious fact.

MR. SMEATON: Will the new Bill resemble the defunct measure?

[No Answer was returned.]

NEW BILLS.

WHITE PHOSPHORUS MATCHES PROHIBITION BILL.

"To prohibit the manufacture, sale and importation of matches made with white phosphorus, and for other purposes in connection therewith," presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; supported by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 351.]

TRAWLING IN PROHIBITED AREAS PREVENTION BILL.

"To prohibit the landing and selling in the United Kingdom of fish caught in prohibited areas of the sea adjoining Scotland," presented by Mr. Sinclair; supported by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland; to be read a second time upon Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 352.]

CROFTERS' COMMONS GRAZINGS REGULATION BILL.

"To extend the powers of the Crofters' Commission in regard to the regulation of common grazings," presented by Mr. Sinclair; supported by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland; to be read a second time upon Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 353.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to county government, and to roads and bridges and the use of locomotives thereon, in Scotland," presented by Mr. Sinclair; supported by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland; to be read a second time upon Monday 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 354.]

TRANSFER OF GOODS BILL.

"To amend the law relating to the transfer of goods," presented by Mr. Dundas White; supported by Sir George

M'Crae, Mr. Younger, Mr. Phipson Beale, Mr. M'Callum, and Mr. Smeaton; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 14th October, and to be printed. [Bill 356.]

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 355.]

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 358.]

WHALE FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords Amendment to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 361.]

TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 360.]

BEE PEST (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 359].

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Joint Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 350.]

COMMONS BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 357.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PRIVATE BUSINESS.)

Motion made, and Question proposed—"That the Proceedings on any Private Business set down for consideration at 8.15 this evening by direction of the Chairman of Ways may be entered upon at any hour, and be not interrupted under any Standing Order regulating the sittings of the House."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he understood that notice was rendered necessary by Standing Order 8. It was a Motion which might be put to very questionable uses. The Standing Order was rather new, and it might be serious to suspend it so soon after it was made. He thought it would be justified if not to help these Bills forward would be to inflict any loss on the parties concerned, but it must be remembered that they were going to have an Autumn Session, and this was a case of a Provisional Order Bill in which the expense was incurred on the local inquiries, and it was not likely to be increased by delay at this stage. What he said applied to four Bills, and he was a total stranger to all of them, and in respect to three of them which had come from the other House he was not given to understand that there was any object to their being put forward; but as regards the fourth, information reached him which he thought required to be answered to the effect that it had gone forward with such rapidity that the Report Stage was taken on 27th July, consideration on 28th July , and that it stood for Third Reading on 29th July—yesterday, without the opponents to the Bill, who were substantial and important, having an opportunity of making themselves acquainted with the Amendments made. He understood that the Amendments had not been printed and circulated, and it was quite possible that substantial injustice might be done by this exceptional measure of putting forward the Bill. He thought some reason should be shown for this special procedure, and that they ought not to have a Motion made without some explanation being given.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said it was refreshing for him to find himself in thorough accord with the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, and he thought the Premier himself should treat the House more fairly in this respect. The Prime Minister, in asking the House that there should be only a limited time for the discussion of the action of certain Government spending departments and executive departments like the Home Office, said that the House would have full opportunity of discussing the matters on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, which was the only time when a private Member, with possibly a fad of his own, could make himself heard, and now what happened? Here were these Bills, private Bills, introduced under an order the like of which he never remembered. It seemed that the Chairman of Committees could intervene at any time and say that private business might begin and go on as long as they liked. That was not a proper or a right way to deal with private Members, but there was something more. What was the necessity for the Motion? They were to have an Autumn Session. These Bills were set down for Second Reading, and therefore they would not come to a completion one minute before the proper and ordinary time. The Motion was only a contrivance to take a very considerable slice of the miserable portion of time allotted to private Members; while at the same time that portion of time was promised to be generously and even excessively given if hon. Members would submit, as they did on the previous night, to allow the Home Office and other Votes to be discussed in two hours and ten minutes. It was in the belief that they would have ample time to edge in a word that day that the House permitted that, and now, on private Members' day, the opportunity was taken from them. If he had even one person only to tell with him, he would divide on the Question.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I quite agree that this is an exceptional Motion, and that it ought to be justified by exceptional reasons, but I think the reasons which induced the Government to put it down and to move it ought to commend themselves to the House. The three Bills which are appointed for consideration at 8.15 p.m. by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means are all Electricity Supply Bills connected with the Metropolis. These three Bills are absolutely cognate in their subject matter, and to a very large extent the same considerations apply to the discussion of their merits on the Second Reading with regard to any one of the three. They were put down for Monday, but we thought it undesirable to interfere with the allotted days for the discussion of Supply, and it was for that reason that they were postponed until to-night. I am told that they stand or fall upon very much the same arguments, and that it will be a waste of time to take them separately, and it was for that reason that we propose to suspend the operation of the new rule, which would prevent any one of these Bills being entered upon for discussion after 9.30 p.m. A further reason for the Motion I have put down is that the suspension of the eleven o'clock rule only applies to Government business, and therefore it was necessary, in the event of the discussions on these Bills continuing after eleven o'clock, that special provision should be made. It was suggested by the hon. Gentleman who spoke last that the Bills might be postponed till the Autumn Session, but I am told that that would be a source of great inconvenience to all the parties concerned. If the Bills are now read a second time they will in the beginning of the Autumn Session be sent upstairs and considered by a Committtee, and having regard to the magnitude of the interests involved, the long delay that has already taken place, and the importance of the thorough discussion of all the details, I believe it is the universal opinion of all the parties interested that we should get the decision of the House on the merits of the Bills before we rise for the holidays. The other point raised was with regard to a Bill which stands on a different footing, the Potteries Provisional Orders Bill. The only reason, I am told by my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board, why this Bill is put down and included in the scope of my Motion, is that it is a convenience that we should get a clean print of the measure now, so that between now and October the amended Bill can be printed. However, if it is objected to, the Third Reading can be taken in October. The main point is in regard to the three Electrical Bills, and I hope, as far as they are concerned, the House will agree to the Motion.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said that it was not in regard to the merits of these Bills that they took objection to the procedure which the Government proposed to adopt. It was practically impossible for the House to come to a just decision upon the merits of private Bills. They really depended, not upon speeches made or general cases advanced in the House, but upon the evidence given before the Committee, and one of the objects which his right hon.

friend had in view in moving the Standing Order governing the conduct of private Bills was to give the greatest possible incentive to what he would call the settlement out of Court of difficulties between contending parties on a private Bill. The step the Government were taking prejudiced to a certain degree the step which the Leader of the Opposition took, which had always been regarded as one of the greatest and most beneficial reforms in regard to the passing of private Bills. It was not at all difficult, if anybody desired to do so, to delay the progress of a Bill without doing anything improper. Once it became understood that a private Bill had only to be delayed in its progress in order to obtain advantages denied to the promoters of other Bills during the Session, then the House would realise that the change proposed was a very serious one in the system of private Bill procedure. The Prime Minister, the other day, in reply to the hon. and learned Member for Waterford said, in regard to the time which had been given for Supply, that the hon. and learned Member might rely upon it that no precedent was being created by the giving of less time for the discussion of the Irish Estimates. But the most powerful Prime Minister of recent years with a vast majority behind him could not possibly prevent a precedent being created if he took a step never taken before and the House sanctioned it. There were no special circumstances which justified this Motion, which, if pressed, would make a serious innovation in private Bill procedure which might be extended with disastrous results in future Sessions. The House had been told that there were three Electric Bills, but he himself was given to understand that there was considerable difference between them, and that the arguments used for and against the first need not necessarily apply to either of the others. The Prime Minister had stated that the first Bill might last until 9.30 p.m. and that the other Bills would not be taken, and that, therefore, there could not possibly be any objection to this Motion being accepted. But let the House mark one thing. There was always the indefeasible right of the House to debate any subject on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. Many questions which might give rise to considerable debate would be raised by hon. Members, and there was litle enough time for their discussion of the Second Reading if the Appropriation Bill was to be carried in one sitting. The right hon. Gentleman said the private Bill might go on till 9.30 p.m. That estimate might be correct, but if after that time they proceeded with Bills raising quite different debates, what time would be left for a discussion of the Government's general policy, which the House had a right to discuss, and which could only be discussed on this occasion? In his opinion a Motion of this kind ought only to have been moved after full notice had been given of it so that the whole House might know what they were doing. Not only should notice have been given by placing the Motion on the Paper some days previously, but distinct warning should have been given through the usual channels that a new procedure was to be adopted. In these circumstances he felt it was impossible that this Motion should pass without challenge, and he should certainly when the Question was put from the Chair, vote against it on the ground that it was a serious innovation in the procedure of the House, which had not been justified by any of the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. ASQUITH said he had listened with attention and he need not say with great respect, to what the right hon. Gentleman had said. He could only say that he had proposed the Motion in the belief that it was consonant with the general wish and opinion of the House. But the Government did not intend to use their majority to take away the liberty of private Members in the exercise of a right which they at present possessed. He had been of opinion that this was a question of the general convenience of hon. Members, but after the appeal made to him by the right hon. Gentleman he did not feel disposed to press the question. The result would be that the first Bill would come on that evening, but he hoped that the discussion would not be prolonged. Afterwards they would resume the debate on the Appropriation

Bill. He was very sorry that this should be so, because he was afraid that there would be a certain amount of delay in dealing with an urgent question. But on behalf of the Government he would try to make that delay as short as possible by putting the other two Bills down at the opening of the autumn sittings. He would, therefore, withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS).

Ordered, That Mr. Barlow be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): It is in accordance with the practice of the House on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill that we should take occasion to survey the work of the session and to deal with any of those questions for which opportunity for discussion has not been granted in the ordinary course of our procedure. There are some criticisms on the Government methods which I should like to make as to their conduct of business and the principles on which they said they meant to deal with it before coming into office. I cannot have a better starting point than the speech made by the Prime Minister to his constituency a few weeks before he took office. The right hon. Gentleman made that speech with a full knowledge of the Parliamentary situation. He had nothing to learn about the methods of conducting the business of the House and of the difficulties which lie in the way of conducting it, of the limitations that are inevitable on the liberty and privileges of debate, and upon all the complex questions which are now puzzling and perplexing every section of the House. The right hon. Gentleman laid down certain principles which I think I shall adequately present to the House by reading two extracts. The first of these relates to the closure of Supply under the Standing Order passed by the late Government, and which the right hon. Gentleman in the last few months, I believe, has declared to be one of the greatest reforms ever introduced in the procedure of the House of Commons. This was his opinion expressed earlier in the session, but it was not his opinion in October, 1905. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "The theory of the Constitution is that you, the electors, send us, your representatives, to the House of Commons in order that we may check and control the expenditure of public money. What is the practice? I will give you the figures of the last two years. In 1904, under the operation of the Supply closure, or guillotine, £31,000,000 was voted, and not one item had ever been discussed; and this year, 1905, that £31,000,000 had under the same conditions risen to no less than £50,000,000."

I will interrupt my quotation here to give the House the items of the last two years as compared with the £31,000,000 and the £50,000,000 of the late Government. They are £45,000,000 and £53,000,000, and these sums have been passed undiscussed by the House. I will now resume the quotation from the right hon. Gentleman's speech—

> "What is the use of pretending that we live under a constitutional system and that the House of Commons has a real control over the finances of the country? . . . . I say this, and I want to impress this view on the public mind, that this is a most serious state of things, for it amounts to nothing more nor less than a progressive paralysis of the Parliamentary organism."

Then a little later on he says—

> "Another result, and an equally serious one, is that the Executive Government of the day by the joint operation of the guillotine and the block becomes every year, both as to legislation and as to policy, more and more emancipated from the control of Parliament. That may be convenient for the holders of office for the time being, but in the long run it is bad for the Executive, it is degrading to Parliament, and it is injurious and even perilous to the Empire. In my opinion, therefore—and this is the conclusion to which I wish this narrative to lead—one of the primary duties of a Liberal Government and of a Liberal Party will be to supply a remedy, and to restore efficiency and dignity to our Legislature at Westminster."

How have a Liberal Administration and a Liberal Party supplied a remedy or restored efficiency and dignity to our Legislature at Westminster? As regards the voting of Supply under the closure Resolutions, more money has been voted without discussion than under the late Administration. As regards blocking notices, the right hon. Gentleman, I believe, has put down a Resolution which he thinks will do something to remedy that state of things. But he has not allowed us a night to discuss it; and I venture to say that if the primary duty of a Liberal Administration and a Liberal Parliament is to be discharged by putting down on the Paper Resolutions dealing with these important matters and not giving us time to discuss them, then the duty falls very lightly on the Gentlemen who have undertaken it. The right hon. Gentleman has done much worse. He complained three years ago that these blocking notices prevented the discussion on the adjournment of the House of important matters. But the right hon. Gentleman spends his life in bringing forward closure by compartment Motions under which nothing can be discussed except the particular Bill dealt with. Consider the situation of the House now in regard to these closure Resolutions. As the House is aware, while the late Government had closure by compartments three times in ten years the present Government have had closure by compartments ten times in three sessions. The figures are identical but they are differently placed; and I shall be very much gratified if under the right hon. Gentleman's leadership we get to the end of the autumn session without the ten being increased to eleven, twelve, or thirteen. The right hon. Gentleman, in addition to this absolute destruction of the legitimate discussion in Committee on the Bill, prevents by his procedure anything being done in the way of discussion upon Motions for adjournment. I believe that for the first time in our Parliamentary history we are going to meet on 12th October with our liberties already taken away from us, and without the smallest power of raising any question on the adjournment of the House, however important the topic, however great the interest, however urgent the necessity. What are blocking notices compared with disabilities of that kind? They sink into absolute insignificance; and the right hon. Gentleman, I am sure, if he surveys what has been done under his administration, must be aware that one of the primary duties of the Liberal Government and the Liberal House of Commons has been more grossly neglected, and the principles which they have laid down have been abandoned with less scruple and more violence than I think has ever happened in the history of this House. I confess I am amazed at the course the Government have pursued. In order to obtain some temporary cheers at meetings they laid down principles, with full knowledge of the facts, which they not only abandoned but reversed, the very moment power was put into their hands. There is one branch of this subject on which I desire to speak at length, and that is the way in which such discussions as could be allowed under the Supply rule have been curtailed by the present Administration. I have never myself attached much value to the figures which so pleased the right hon. Gentleman in 1905, of the money which is voted without being discussed. I have never believed that discussion in this House on questions in Supply really gives us control over the details of expenditure. In prehistoric times there might have been some control over the expenditure, but there certainly has not been in my Parliamentary experience. What it does do is to give an opportunity for criticising the Executive, and that power is not to be measured by the amount of money which goes undiscussed. It is to be measured, first, by the number of days which are devoted to criticism and discussion, and, in the second place, by the Votes put down by the Government of the day so as to give occasion for that discussion. Here I am bound to say the Opposition have great cause of complaint of the course which the right hon. Gentleman has pursued. He had it in his power to give twenty-three days to Supply; he had it in his power to curtail that period to twenty days. Sometimes the time has been curtailed with advantage. Can any human being say that that power of curtailment has been exercised with advantage this year, or that there is the least justification for the Government's having given us the smaller number of days? What was the justification given by the right hon. Gentleman when he gave us a sketch of business up to the beginning of August? His justification was that unless the House consented to give up these additional three days we should not be able to rise by 1st August, and that if we did not rise then general inconvenience would follow. I will accept the right hon. Gentleman's promise and will assume with him that the convenience of the House, which after all must be consulted, was such that it would have been an outrage to have asked us, seeing when we have to meet again, to sit into August. But why did the right hon. Gentleman give two days to the Licensing Bill which might have been given to Supply? He had got his closure Resolution on the Licensing Bill; it was absolutely certain it could not take more than twenty-five days. It now is only going to take twenty three days in the autumn session. It would have been no greater strain upon the House to have had the whole twenty-five days in the autumn session, and given us at least two days more for the discussion of Supply. Why the right hon. Gentleman did not take that course he has never explained to the House, and I have been unable to conjecture. The most plausible hypothesis was that it was absolutely necessary to convince a certain section of his supporters that the Government were really in earnest over the Licensing Bill, and that unless they got through the first clause before they separated for the holidays, nobody would put the smallest faith in the promises they had made. I do not know whether that is the reason, but what other reason can there be? The right hon. Gentleman may perhaps urge that we had such a full opportunity of discussion in Supply that more days were not required. If that was his view, he cannot have listened to the lamentation of the Home Secretary last night as to the exiguous portion of time which had been granted to him. I do not know whether the President of the Board of Trade laments that his Vote was not discussed. I rather conjecture that he does not. But there are two Estimates on which really it is little less than a scandal that we have not had some opportunity of criticising the administration. One of these is the Education Vote. I am not going to deal with that. The whole House will agree that at this time of all others it would have been desirable, and indeed necessary, to allow the House some liberty of debate upon the various methods by which the Government are attempting to solve by executive action problems which the House ought to deal with by legislation, and by legislation alone. There is an even graver question than education, and that is Ireland. Now what have the Government done about Ireland? In the first place, they have cut the customary three days down to two. In the second place, they have refused absolutely on either of these two days to allow the Chief Secretary's salary to be put down, so that the administration of Ireland could be properly discussed in this House. As I understand their excuse is this. They say that the business of the Government is to arrange Supply so as to meet the convenience of Members of the House, and the Members whose convenience is most to be consulted in the matter of Irish Supply are the party which contains a majority of the Irish Members—namely, the Nationalist Party; therefore they mean to arrange Supply so that the Nationalist Party shall discuss exactly what they like, and representatives of Ireland who differ profoundly from the Irish Party shall have no opportunity whatever of discussing Irish administration. I admit, of course, that Irish Members below the gangway take great interest in certain questions which they have a perfect right to discuss, such as Irish education and Irish local government, and the Government are bound to give such opportunities as they have given for the discussion of these matters. But when you come to the administration of the law in Ireland, hon. Gentlemen below the gangway will not accuse me of saying anything offensive when I say they are not the people to decide whether or not an opportunity should be given for discussion. They are not ardent upholders of law and order. They have never shown themselves anxiously critical of the Executive in the direction of seeing that the law was maintained from one end of the country to the other; and they will not pretend that that has ever been their principal *role* in this House. In truth, it is absurd for the Government to treat hon. Gentlemen below the gangway as if they belonged to a separate party and were in the nature of official critics of the Government. Hon. Gentlemen below the gangway are more and more, so far as I can see, coming into a kind of subordinate alliance with the Radical Party at large. [Cries of "No," and an HON. MEMBER: Who told you that ?] The observation is my own; it may not be correct; I offer it for what it is worth. What I have observed is this. The Gentlemen who represent the Home Rule constituencies in Ireland are anxious to say no more than they can help about Home Rule in order to keep their friends quiet on the other side of the Channel, while the Radical Party here and there, sometimes using a Cabinet Minister and sometimes not, is talking just as much about Home Rule in the constituencies as will quiet the Irish vote in those constituencies without frightening the English vote. That is a delicate and difficult position; but if I have rightly described it, and I think I have, it evidently prevents hon. Gentlemen below the gangway from taking up the position of independent criticism, such as that which Gentlemen sitting above the gangway naturally and properly occupy. We have had no opportunity of dealing with the administration of Ireland at all in Committee of Supply. Is that because there is nothing to criticise in the Irish administration ? Is that because there is no cause of disquiet at the present time with regard to the maintenance of law and order and of personal freedom in that country ? The facts which have been put into my hands, and which have been obtained by Question and Answer from the Chief Secretary in the course of the present session, are, in my opinion, of a most alarming character. May I just remind the House and the Chief Secretary of some of the leading features of the existing situation ? I notice, for example, that serious outrages in which firearms were used amounted in the first six months of 1906 to 12 cases; in the same period in 1907 to 34 cases; and in 1908 to 76 cases. I am bound to say that the growth from 12 to 76 cases of serious outrages in which firearms were used is a symptom the gravity of which nobody could afford to ignore; and I think it is made worse, not better, by the fact that, as I take it, the disturbed state of Ireland is not universal—that is, the worst features are not universal but are more or less concentrated in nine or ten counties. I go on to cattle-driving. I observe that the figures of cattle-driving in the first six months of this year exceed the number of cases of cattle-driving for the whole twelve months of last year. There were 381 in 1907. From January to June in 1908 there were 413 cases.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Did you get these figures from Lord Ashtown ?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order.

MR. CULLINAN: Order you. What do you know about it ?

*MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to behave himself.

MR. CULLINAN: They are calling order when there is no disorder.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then I come to boycotting, which is one of the most painful social symptoms in that disordered state of the community, and one of the most difficult to deal with, and I notice that according to the figures there were in February, 1907, 20 cases; in February, 1908, 98 cases; in March, 1907, 19 cases; in March, 1908, 90 cases; in April, 1907, 25 cases; and in April, 1908, 104 cases. Not only is the actual growth enormous, but if you compare the figures of 1908 with the previous figures, it is continuous, it goes on from month to month. March is worse than February; April is worse than March. I do not know whether the later figures are more satisfactory, but if they are I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give them to the House. As to intimidation, I observe that 47 persons were under continual police protection in May, 1907, and in May, 1908, that number had risen to 70. If this be the state of crime, what is the state of the machinery by which crime is to be dealt with ? How is the law working under the control of the right hon. Gentleman and the law officers of the Crown ? At the end of 1907—at the last winter assizes—85 persons were put on their trial for agrarian offences, and not one single conviction of any sort or kind was obtained. In 1907 prosecutions before juries took place in respect of 381 persons charged with cattle-driving, and there was only one conviction. The Government, not unnaturally, finding that prosecutions for cattle-driving had utterly broken down in 380 cases out of 381, have abandoned even that ineffectual method of trying to deal with disorder or to protect property, and I understand—I hope I am not misrepresenting the right hon. Gentleman—that they have absolutely abandoned any attempt to deal with these malefactors by the ordinary course of law. What they do now is to bind them over to give sureties for good behaviour. That, as anybody could foresee, is a most futile way of dealing with the situation. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman himself will tell us it is an effective way. I am told that recognisances have been required in case after case; they have only been estreated in one case, although the person bound over has absolutely refused to carry out the undertaking. Cattle-driving, naturally and inevitably under this process of ineffectual law—threatening but never acting—is increasing steadily, with all the evils to industry, to society, and to law which are inevitable in such circumstances. If I have sketched this very dark picture as it seems to me—there may be higher lights on it somewhere; I have not come across them—if to this very dark picture we add the final touch that the right hon. Gentleman has been obliged to increase the number of police and that the cost to the counties for extra police has been growing by leaps and bounds, I think it will become apparent that the right hon. Gentleman is fully conscious of the gravity of the position with which he has got to deal, although he absolutely refuses to make use of the plainly indicated method by which that disorder may best be met. In 1907 the amount charged to local rates in respect of extra police amounted roughly to a little over £1,000. In 1908 it amounted to over £12,000. These additional charges upon the local authorities for extra police are growing before our eyes. The number of police that the right hon. Gentleman is obliged to use in order to maintain law is also growing, simply because he refuses to use the powers of the law which the Legislature of this country has put in his hand. While the cost of police and the number of police are both rising, crime is simultaneously increasing and the impunity of the offender is becoming more and more a notorious fact in every disturbed county in Ireland. May I ask what possible justification the Government can have for refusing us that additional day to discuss the Chief Secretary's Vote on which a topic so grave as this might have been dealt with, without the interruptions which cannot be avoided, of course, when the whole field of discussion is open to the House on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill? The House is thinning in numbers, losing its interest in public affairs, thinking much more of the seaside than of the state of Ireland.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): We are thinking of tariff reform.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I heartily condole with the hon. Gentleman if he is going to occupy August and September with thinking over tariff reform. Let him retire happily to the seaside, play golf, and clear his brain. I am quite certain the Chief Secretary is the last man to desire to evade debate. He is not only speaker of boundless resource, but a man of unlimited courage. I think he would have rejoiced to have an opportunity of explaining, and it may be of defending, the policy or impolicy which he is pursuing now. But he has not been given that opportunity by the Government. His colleagues have refused it to him and they have refused it, as I venture to point out to the House, for no assignable reason except the desire to have only twenty-three days in October and November devoted to the Licensing Bill, instead of the twenty-five which they would have had had we been properly treated in this matter of Supply. Everybody will feel that the House never separated with a greater feeling of general disquiet in the public mind than at the present time, considering that, so far as we know, the horizon is quite clear of clouds connected with foreign policy or international complication. I share this disquietude. We were told by the Prime Minister, I think it was a year ago, that the low price of Consols was to be expected when money was very dear and when trade was very good. Money is very cheap and trade is not very good, but Consols remain low. I know how easy it is to use perversely for some immediate controversy such considerations, and I am not going to assert that all this is due to the Government. Are we sure that it is not partly due to the anxiety and disquiet about our financial position, which is the inevitable result of the policy the Government have chosen to pursue during the present session? With or without reason, they have continued to alarm vast sections of the community—they may or may not have been justified, this is not the time now to discuss that, and my opinion is well known—but the fact remains. Do not let us delude ourselves into the belief that it matters very little whether the public mind is disquieted or not—it matters a great deal, even if we cannot estimate the loss in pounds, shillings, and pence—through the difficulties the Government must have met with in their finance. So far as they are responsible they have brought upon themselves and upon us the misfortunes inevitably incident to our financial position. I do not know whether the Government are happy about the state of efficiency of our national defences, our Army, and our Fleet. I do not know whether they think with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who apparently cannot make a speech upon peace without suggesting that the best way to attain peace is by lowering the scale of our defensive armaments. I do not know whether that is likely to reassure the public mind. For my own part, seeing what the financial position is to which the Bill now to be read a second time has brought us; seeing the impression our debates on the various financial measures of the Government have made on the public mind; seeing the commitments they have made; seeing how contradictory have been statements made by members of the Government on the fundamental question of national armaments, I do not think that the public uneasiness is without justification. I earnestly hope—if not during the remainder of the session, that is too much to hope—that, at all events, next session the Government will do two things. First, that they will carry out what the right hon. Gentleman declared in a speech before he entered office to be the primary duty of a Liberal Government—to restore to the House some of its ancient privileges and traditions; and in the second place, that they will redeem, fully redeem, all the pledges they have made through the mouth of the Prime Minister in regard to the maintenance, in all circumstances, at whatever sacrifice, of the national armaments with which our security is intimately bound up.

*Mr. ASQUITH: The right hon. Gentleman in the gloomy exordium and pessimistic peroration to which we have just listened has told us that never had he known the House to separate with greater feeling of disquiet.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I said when there were no foreign complications.

*Mr. ASQUITH: Looking round these benches, looking at the benches behind the right hon. Gentleman, my eyes fail to discern any signs of sympathy with these gloomy forebodings. If the apprehensions the right hon. Gentleman expresses, and I have no doubt sincerely entertains, were shared—I will not say by the general public—I will say by his own party, should we not have something more than this listless, apathetic audience to listen to the right hon. Gentleman's sombre vaticinations? What is it that alarms the right hon. Gentleman? He mentioned the price of Consols, but they have been higher in price this year than last. For my part, I have always declined to take the price of Consols as a measure of national credit—many factors combine to affect that result; but if the right hon. Gentleman chooses to make this suggestion, may I remind him that the German Government recently proposed to float a 4 per cent. loan at 98½ and have not got it?

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London): It was a 3½ per cent. conversion, not a 4 per cent. loan.

*Mr. ASQUITH: A 4 per cent. interest, I understand, is a 4 per cent. loan. Now the question I would like to put to the right hon. Gentleman or the hon. Baronet is, would he change places in regard to national credit with any other Government in the world; would he, after three years of Liberal administration, change with any Government you like to mention, with France, Germany, the United States, or any other country? The people of this country are not in that state of anxiety and disquietude which the imagination of the right hon. Gentleman attributes to them, for the reason that they live under a system of free trade and sound finance and the position of the country is solid and substantial.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): With much destitution.

*MR. ASQUITH: Measure it by any test you like, my proposition will command general assent. The right hon. Gentleman said something about our national defence. There has been much criticism, and there has been ample opportunity afforded for it, upon the scheme for the reorganisation of our military forces by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War, and both inside and outside the House those criticisms have been met. Does the right hon. Gentleman mean to suggest, speaking with the authority that attaches to the position of Leader of the Opposition, that our Navy is not in a position of unquestioned supremacy when compared with all the Navies in the world? Does he mean to suggest that we have allowed it to fall below that standard of efficiency which, by the consent of all parties, we ought to maintain, and the necessity for which no one has asserted on behalf of the Government more strongly than myself during the session? General vague insinuations are calculated to spread disquietude which cannot but produce evil impressions, false impressions, in foreign countries, and there is absolutely no foundation for saying that our Navy is not in a condition of first-rate efficiency, thoroughly adequate for the duties the interest of the Empire may require. Now I go back to the earlier part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. He has quoted some language I used in addressing my constituents, and I do not in the least repent of what I then said—that one of the duties of the Liberal Party would be to restore the dignity and efficiency of the House of Commons. I think we have performed that duty. ["Hear, hear," and "Oh, oh."] I do not say this in any spirit of vaingloriousness or self-complacency, and I ask any fair-minded man to look at what we have done and what we have left undone during the three sessions the Government have been in existence, and to compare these with any other three preceding years, and then judge by the comparison. The specific points raised by the right hon. Gentleman resolve themselves really into two. The first is, as he says, that we have not remedied the abuse to which I called attention in the speech from which he has quoted, the abuse of blocking motions which may prevent the discussion of matters of importance. Well, we have done much more than the right hon. Gentleman did; we appointed a Committee for the purpose of inquiring into the practice, and I had the honour to preside over it. We discussed the subject exhaustively, and dealt with it in a unanimous Report which, subsequently, I embodied in a notice of Motion which has been before the House during the whole of the session. I never had any kind of assurance from the right hon. Gentleman opposite that this Motion would meet with general acquiescence or certainly by this time it would have been a Standing Order of the House. I cannot, therefore, charge myself or the Government with any laxity in this matter; I am most anxious to see that reform speedily and with general consent introduced into our proceedings. And now I come to what, after all, is the *gravamen* of the charge against the Government as a whole, as distinguished from the administration of Ireland in particular—the manner in which we have dealt with Supply. I confess I listened with some astonishment to the right hon. Gentleman's figures by which he sought to draw a comparison between the amount of Supply undiscussed during his term of office and during our term. The figures do not in the least accord with those I have here recorded, I think, in authentic form from the journals of the House. I take the four years from

1904. In 1904 the total amount of the Votes discussed was £68,000,000; in 1905, the last year of office of the late Government, £60,000,000; in 1906 it was £111,000,000, and in 1907 the amount was £77,000,000. That there were very considerable items of Supply undiscussed I agree, but on the comparison the record is most favourable to us in the last years as compared with the preceding years. I do not suppose anyone—I do not suppose the right hon. Gentleman himself—will say that we can possibly under modern conditions have the old condition of things under which every item could be discussed without regard to relative importance. We never can return to that system, and the real test to apply to the conduct of the business of Supply by any particular Government is to ask whether they have within the number of days allotted by the rule as far as possible, submitted to the House, with the opportunity for discussion, items of the largest general interest, and subject to the most adverse criticism. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the Education Vote. We should have been perfectly prepared to submit that Vote for discussion if from the Opposition, from the Irish Party, or from any considerable section of the House there had come a desire for discussion. That the desire was not expressed was the sole reason why the Vote passed undiscussed. The main charge of the right hon. Gentleman was in regard to Ireland. As I pointed out the other day, although two days were allotted, yet in one way and another Irish administration has been discussed in Committee of Supply for four and a half nights during the session. The speech of the right hon Gentleman has shown that it is competent for hon. Gentlemen to discuss it again to-day. I am not going to enter into the specific points which the right hon. Gentleman has raised, though they are serious points, and very worthy of consideration, but I cannot allow to pass the suggestion that hon. Gentlemen who sit below the gangway on the other side come to the House as subordinate members of the Liberal Party. They have a very odd way of showing their subordination, and I think that the halcyon time in which, I shall not say, co-operation, but co-ordination, in political efforts and aims, shall be established between them and us, is still rather a dream of the future than a realisation of the present. As a matter of fact, no one knows better than the Chief Secretary that every administrative act in Ireland is the subject of scrutiny from two precisely opposite points of view, and it is only when it is possible with the aid of the Treasury to provide a measure which satisfies with a pecuniary solatium some Irish need, that there are smiles of approval both below and above the gangway. I have said that I believe that we have done everything in our power to restore dignity to the House of Commons. It is not in order to discuss legislation to-day, but it must be remembered when reviewing these matters that this House is not only the critic of administration, but also an organ of legislation. I do not think it is irrelevant even to-day when you are considering whether the time of the House has been usefully and fruitfully spent, to say that by the time the House adjourns, we shall have passed through the House in all their stages, no less than thirty-three Government Bills, as well as fifteen Bills introduced by private Members. Let me say at once that I acknowledge to the full in regard to a considerable number of those Government Bills which were of a non-contentious character, the thoroughly reasonable spirit in which we have been met, particularly at night under conditions which possibly are rather provoking, by many hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. It would not have been possible to have so large a legislative harvest unless there had been loyal co-operation on both sides of the House in the attempt to carry through measures which tended to excite party passion. I acknowledge that in the fullest fashion, and I think that the House may look back on five months of as really fruitful and effective legislative work as any that has been carried in the annals of Parliament.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) called attention to the action of the Board of Education with regard to the administration of the building grant made last year under the Appropriation Act. He did not think anyone would contend that it was competent for the Board of Education to make regulations to override the provisions of an Act of Parliament previously passed by that House. He reminded the House of Mr. Justice Channell's judgment that the Board of Education decision could only be final as to conditions not directly imposed by Act of Parliament. That showed very plainly that the Board was not empowered to make regulations which were contrary to a clause in a previous Act of Parliament. But in order to make quite sure that that was not going to be done he asked the then Minister of Education, now the First Lord of the Admiralty, a question on the subject, and on 6th February this year he replied in the following terms—

> "It is proposed to make grants for building schools, but the Board will take care that the section which the hon. Member quotes (18 (1) (c) of Act, 1902) is not contravened."

Section 18 of the Act of 1902, he said, provided that a county council should charge such portion as they thought fit, not being less than half or more than three-fourths, of any expense incurred by them in respect of capital expenditure in the parish or parishes which in the opinion of the council were served by a new school. It was perfectly clear from that that there was no choice for a county council but to charge something between a half and three-quarters in the parish; but there were cases in which this had not been carried out. He could quote cases in which not only the Act, but the specific undertaking of the Minister of Education, had not been carried out. At Pontfadog in Denbighshire there was a school which had received a grant which covered the whole cost of the new building. There were other schools, too, in which the grant had been given in such a manner as to relieve the local ratepayers of any charge. In Glamorganshire the county council agreed to pay their share and that the whole of the parish share should be taken out of the grant given by the Treasury. He contended that that was absolutely illegal. The building grant was paid to the local authority and the local authority had no choice but to charge from one-half to three-fourths on the parish concerned. In this particular case it happened to be the parish in which the Welsh Secretary to the Board of Education himself resided, and, therefore, the circumstances must have come to his notice, both officially and privately. Another point of which he complained was that the inquiries made when objections had been lodged had been one-sided and perfunctory. He could quote many cases, but he would only mention that of the school at Llandaff. About two and a half years before this grant was made there had been a proposal there to build two new schools, but suddenly without giving any fresh notice, although previous notice had been given of these schools, the Board of Education decided to build another school in a different place for a different class of people, but they gave no notice under the section of the Act of 1902, which required that they should do so in order that ratepayers opposed to the proposal should have an opportunity of objecting. Now a grant had been made of £1,000 to that school, although none of the formalities under the Act had been followed out. There were other cases in which the Board of Education had not held inquiries and heard, or attempted to hear, what was to be said on the other side. He hoped that in the distribution of the £40,000 building grant for this year the Education Acts would not be over-ridden by the Board of Education, and that both sides would be fairly heard.

Another complaint he had to make was against the composition of the Departmental Committee on half timers at school. This was a question which intimately concerned the agricultural interest—and affected that interest perhaps more than any other. But there was no adequate representation of agriculture on the Committee. He had been told in answer to a question that Lord Clifford of Chudleigh was put on to represent agriculture.

But that was not enough. He had no doubt that the noble Lord would be an admirable member of that Committee; but, however excellent he might be he was bound to say that his Lordship was a representative of the Roman Catholics rather than of agriculture. He observed that on reading his life that he was a Count of the Holy Roman Empire and, therefore, he was on the Committee as representative of the Roman Catholic schools. What he wanted to impress on the right hon. Gentleman was that this was a question of the most vital importance to people interested in agriculture. An enormous number of schools were affected by this question of half-time and it was perfectly absurd to appoint a Committee on which one noble Lord could be said to be the only person to represent agriculture. He looked at the composition of the Committee and found that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education was to be Chairman, but he represented London and Glasgow. Lord Stanley of Alderley represented the view of the old work done on the London School Board. Then came the hon. Member for Scarborough; Mr. Lindsell, the Secretary to the Board of Education, who was bound to be on it; Mr. Bellhouse, Factory Inspector; Mr. Cross, Secretary to the Weavers' Amalgamation in the Northern Counties; Mr. T. Garnett, of Manchester; Mr. Allen Gee, Huddersfield, Secretary of Union of Weavers; Mr. Oldroyd, of Dewsbury, who was, no doubt, very well known to the right hon. Gentleman, and Mr. Sykes of the Board of Education, Secretary. If this had been a Committee to inquire into the position of the children of operatives who were weavers in Lancashire and Yorkshire, or of the condition of children of people living in London it might have been a very fair Committee, but he contended that it was a most narrow, partial, and one-sided Committee to consider this great question. Three counties only were represented, and Lord Clifford of Chudleigh had to represent the rest of England. The hon. Member for West Cambridgeshire the other day also took the view that the Committee was thoroughly bad and partial; and he agreed that the reference to the Committee was most unsatisfactory. That hon. Member asked a question as to whether it was possible, owing to the terms of reference, to take evidence on the advisability of extending the exemption as well as curtailing it, but the right hon. Gentleman without much consideration said no. Now, it seemed to him that the terms of the reference were quite incompatible with the answer the right hon. Gentleman gave. Here was the second paragraph of the reference—

> "To consider the practical effects of legislation providing for the abolition or restriction of half-time employment upon industries and wage-earning and upon educational organisation and expenditure."

And the third paragraph said—

> "To report whether, and to what extent, in view of these considerations, it is desirable to amend the law by raising the age at which partial exemption from attendance at public elementary schools is to be permitted, or by raising the minimum age for total exemption concurrently with affording facilities for partial exemption."

The reference was purely one-sided. It allowed evidence to be taken as to the desirability of still further raising the age at which half-time or whole-time exemption was permissible, but it excluded evidence on the other side. Speaking for an agricultural constituency and resenting very much the way in which agriculture was treated in the matter of education and its special representation on the Committee, he maintained that it was most important to consider this whole question—not only from the point of view of raising the age limit, but also of lowering it. If it was desired to do something in the least satisfactory for education in the agricultural districts the proper course was to be more free with regard to exemption in day schools and put the age still lower, the continuation of study in evening schools being relied on to make good the deficiency at a later age. The boy would thus be able to keep in his head what he had learnt and would be induced to take an interest for himself in learning. He firmly believed that that was the proper way of solving the difficulty in the agricultural districts. But if this Committee was going to be guided in its decisions by hon. Gentlemen none of whom knew anything about the conditions of agriculture, he thought there was a danger of the interests of agriculture being neglected altogether. He hoped that it was not too late to urge upon the right hon. Gentleman that he should alter the composition of the Committee and also the terms of reference so as to give the highest interests of agriculture a chance of being considered.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said he only desired to intervene for a moment between his right hon. friend the Minister for Education and the hon. Member for Oswestry in order to offer a few observations on one of the subjects referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. No one would be surprised that the right hon. Gentleman had availed himself of the opportunity which the Second Reading of this Bill gave him if he had anything to say about Ireland and the Government of Ireland. So far as he was personally concerned, he would have been very glad if a third day had been allotted to Irish Supply. The present occasion did not, he admitted, afford the opportunity of discussion which the gravity of the subject deserved. He was glad the Leader of the Opposition in his criticism that day had not referred to a matter which he or, at all events, the hon. Members behind him had referred to previously. He meant the suggestion that he regarded the present state of Ireland as other than very grave in many of its aspects. He had been accused of flippancy and levity and other qualities which, if he really showed them, he deeply regretted, for he could honestly say that the burden of his office pressed always very heavily upon him. Naturally he resented the language often employed giving the impression that the whole of Ireland was in a terrible state—language used by speakers, some of whom ought to know better, and some whose only excuse was their ignorance. It was his bounden duty to try to preserve the perspective in this case, and prevent anybody from being led to a wrong conclusion. Therefore he might have sometimes used language which, to people who had their attention concentrated on one part of the country, might have seemed a little strange. Moreover, he was not always correctly reported. He had been reported, for instance, as saying that Ireland was a cheerful land, when what he said was that Ireland was inhabited by a cheerful people. So far as he followed them the figures given by the right hon. Gentleman appeared to be perfectly accurate. He did not deny that during the last twelve months there had been a lamentable increase in certain kinds of crime and of offences in certain parts of Ireland. He did not endeavour to withhold information as to the real facts of the case. No doubt there had been a very reprehensible increase in a kind of crime in Ireland, but in some respects the crime and outrage were connected with circumstances which were not entirely agrarian in the ordinary sense of the word. They arose out of lamentable disputes between the occupants of land who were dissatisfied with the allotments made to them by the Estates Commissioners. That was a very terrible thing; there were sometimes incidents of great violence, and one case, he regretted to say, resulted in actual murder. These incidents could not be altogether avoided, and he was happy to say that the ordinary law was quite sufficient to deal with them. They arose from the passion for the land. They arose from the fact that these poor people had very little to think of except the land; they exaggerated its importance enormously; and if one person obtained a rather better piece than his neighbour it often led to lamentable disputes. The Government were able to say, almost for the first time in the history of the agrarian question in Ireland, that they were able to trace to its source this recrudescence of unlawful acts. Were it not for the passion of the people in Galway and Roscommon and other counties to get possession of the grasslands, Ireland would be extraordinarily free at the present time from anything that could be called agrarian outrage. The intimidation which took place—the firing into houses, a most detestable and cowardly form of intimidation—was almost always traceable to the question of the grasslands. It was in order to exercise intimidation upon graziers and other persons in possession of these lands, or persons who worked for the graziers, that these lamentable and cowardly acts were resorted to. It was surely a circumstance worthy of the consideration of the House at any time that they had traced to its source the origin of the increased disturbances in Ireland. It was owing to this desire to get the grasslands. For some time the policy of including grasslands within the purview of any purchase Bill was much disputed. But he could not overlook the fact that the Royal Commission presided over by Lord Dudley, and having among its members Sir Antony MacDonnell, now Lord MacDonnell, Sir Francis Mowatt, Sir John Colomb, a relative of a predecessor of his, and two others, one of whom was a Member of Parliament, and all of whom were well acquainted with the question, had held inquiries all over Ireland, particularly in the West. They had put something like 60,000 questions to witnesses from all parts of the country, and a great part of their inquiry had been directed to the very question, aye or no, in the interests of these people in the West of Ireland, was it or was it not desirable that these lands should be immediately taken up and distributed for the relief of congestion amongst the people who so anxiously needed them. That was a question on which the attention of Ireland had been fixed for the last eighteen months or two years, and all this evidence had been reported *verbatim* in the Irish newspapers, and read with the utmost eagerness in every market in Ireland. He had been called upon to listen over and over again to the reading of the evidence of some of the witnesses. All of it had apparently been committed to heart, and it seemed almost the dearest possession of the people. The excitement and interest occasioned by that Commission all over Ireland could not be exaggerated. What had happened? The Commission had reported in favour of this very thing, namely, the handing over of the grass-lands to the people. They would say to him: "Are you, as an honest man and a lawyer, attempting for a single moment to justify lawless and improper acts simply because the Commission, after giving all its attention to the subject, has come to the conclusion that these poor people were right, not in their method but in their desires?" Of course he answered, "Nothing of the kind." One regarded with horror every act of violence; but still let them be honest in the matter, and have regard to the whole past history of Irish land legislation. They had by their Irish land legislation inevitably done a great deal to demoralise these very people. They could not deny it. It was most painful to witness going on, month after month, and year after year, this undoubted demoralisation in the minds of the people, simply and solely because they had got the idea ingrained in their minds that this House and country stood behind them with the determination to divide the land of Ireland, agricultural and pastoral, in those parts where congestion existed, amongst the people who desired it, in order that they and their families might not have to drift away to America or elsewhere, but that they might live, thrive, and work in the country to which they were so deeply attached. That demoralisation showed itself very clearly in two ways which he deeply deplored. The people of every district disregarded now the desire to relieve their poorer brethren in the congested districts, and looked upon this grazing land, when it was divided, as peculiarly their own, as something which was to be theirs, and they showed no disposition whatever to allow poor people from a distance to have economic holdings cut out of the land. He deplored that demoralisation, and, though he did not know much about the Irish people, he knew a little about the English and Scottish people, and all he could say was that in both England and Scotland, under the same conditions, in his opinion, the demoralisation would have been much greater than it was in Ireland at the present moment. They said, and he might assume that it was true, "This increase of crime, of acts of violence, and acts of intimidation which you so eloquently deplore, assuming that it is true that in the main they are attributable to the desire of the people to get the grass lands, does that in any way acquit you from the obligation of seeing to it that by every means in your power you suppress and punish these acts of illegality?" He quite agreed that it was the duty of the Executive Government to do the best that it could to maintain the law, but he claimed the right to consider whether or not in the long run he was not best serving the interests of law and order by the exercise of the ordinary law to put down crime, and so enlisting on his side the forces and sympathies of public opinion, rather than by resorting to methods which would undoubtedly excite pain and indignation in Ireland and might very likely lead to far worse results. The whole argument of the Opposition was that they wished to pin him down to the Crimes Act, and they said: "Unless you put that Act into force you are guilty of cowardice"; but he did not agree with that, and he was not at all dissatisfied with the results of his administration so far as that went. Cattle-driving, as an indictable offence, in association with acts of violence and unlawful assemblies, had largely ceased to exist. Cattle-drives had been very frequent; they were diminishing in number now. Last week there were only seven, the week before, and the week before that, thirteen. Of course, it might be said by hon. Gentlemen opposite that this was what might be expected in these particular months, when they might look to see cattle-driving decreasing in numbers. There might be something in that, but he knew that the fact was that it was decreasing at the present moment. He had said that for some time cattle-driving had not been associated with acts of violence or unlawful assemblies, but it had become an offence extraordinarily difficult to deal with, because it was done at night, and no trace could be discovered by the police, with all their ingenuity, of the persons who committed these offences. Though cattle-driving had ceased to be anything so large as it was, it had become exceedingly difficult to trace. He was always being asked questions about cattle-drives and what arrests had been made. He had been compelled to answer that there had been cattle raids, and that no arrests had been made, and the reason was that they did not know whom to arrest, and neither the provisions of the Crimes Act nor any other method of legislation would enable them to bring people to justice unless they could catch them. For the most part the cattle-drives which were now being made were being conducted in conditions of secrecy at night, and were not easily discovered. Therefore, it was not altogether fair to say that if he were to avail himself of the benefits of the permanent legislation of the other side, and suspended trial by jury, and placed the administration of these things in the hands of two resident magistrates he would thereby secure a larger number of convictions. A good deal of ridicule had been poured on the system of arresting those persons who had been identified, bringing them up before the magistrates, and binding them over to keep the peace. He did not agree at all with the view that that was a useless proceeding; on the contrary, he had the authority of several inspectors of police that very good results had followed from it. He did not believe there were half-a-dozen instances of persons who had entered into these recognisances and taken part in subsequent cattle-drives. It was an entire mistake to suppose that these cattle-drivers were reprobate and idle persons; for the most part, he regretted to say, they were the sons of respectable farmers, stalwart, young men, only too well able to look after themselves.

MR LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): How is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the cattle-drivers are of the class he describes? A minute or two ago the right hon. Gentleman told us that they were not known.

MR. BIRRELL said that hundreds of them were bound over to keep the peace, and with those he was acquainted. An enormous number of cattle-drives were reported, and entered in the annals and statistics of indictable offences, and a great many persons who had taken part in them were not known. Therefore he only based his argument on those he did know, and they were a class of persons who for the most part kept their word. Therefore he would continue the use of his present weapon which, though perhaps rusty, was possibly the most effective for putting down the offence without doing that which might lead to far more serious consequences if they resorted to legislation outside of the ordinary law. Although the weapon might not be considered the most effective, it was not by any means ineffectual, and it had done a great deal of good. He was glad to notice that cattle-driving had declined in the past few weeks, although he knew that this was not the time when it occurred most frequently. Still, he was not without hope that when the winter time came the method they had adopted—though he admitted it had tried their patience to the utmost—might prove to have more permanent results in securing the peace of the neighbourhood than if they had suspended the ordinary law and handed over the liberty of hundreds of people to two resident magistrates. At all events that was the view that he took of the case. He could not admit, even on the figures, that the increase of offences was of an alarming character, though he quite agreed that it was profoundly to be deplored. The figures were not of a kind to lead anyone to abandon hope as to the course they were endeavouring to pursue. Complaint was made of the increase of the police. That was, he confessed, the most melancholy feature of the case. He had been obliged to increase enormously the number of the police in consequence of the necessity of watching great areas of sparsely populated country. Half the loss fell on the Treasury, and the other half on the county, and certainly nothing had pained him more than the fact that, while he was struggling to get money for the higher education of Ireland, struggling for a few thousands of pounds for the annual endowment of a college, he should have been obliged, simply in consequence of this stupid, as well as wrong, policy, to cast on the taxpayers of this country, as well as of Irish counties, themselves already heavily overburdened, a further burden amounting to many thousands a year. It was a lamentable feature of the situation that he should have been compelled to impose this heavy burden on the English, Welsh, Scottish, and Irish taxpayers. He lamented it from the bottom of his heart, but he still said, in spite of the shortcomings of his policy, in spite of the figures which the right hon. Gentleman had quoted, he believed that at the present moment he stood in a better position for the future maintenance of law and order in Ireland than if, adopting the policy of the Party opposite, he had made war on the people of Ireland, in spite of the protestations of the Liberal Party that they would do all that they could for as long as they could to govern them according to the ordinary law. He believed that he had been right in the policy he had adopted. If he had followed any other policy he was convinced that instead of being better, the situation would have become worse. The temper and the disposition of the Irish people, even in those disturbed portions of the country, would have been worse to-day than he had reason to believe they now were. He was, at any rate, not going to abandon hope, and he certainly thought that he was entitled to make an appeal to the Irish people and to the Irish leaders to exercise such influence as they could on the population, for whom everyone must have profound sympathy, properly to guide and control their action. He hoped each would exercise such influence as he had, to whatever party in the State he might belong, to see to it that these people were told what their duties were both to God and to their neighbours, that they should not have to lament the excellent land legislation which he hoped to see carried through by others, if not by himself, and that there should be no cause to regret that they had introduced that policy because of the demoralisation in some few parts of the country.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): No one will accuse the right hon. Gentleman of trifling with the position of affairs in Ireland, but when he asks us to realise that he treats it gravely and seriously, and tells us that suggestions to the contrary vex him, he must, I think, remember that there has been no small provocation for the adoption of a view like that. He cannot forget that more than once he himself has poured ridicule and contempt upon Members on this side of the House for doing that which he had been obliged to refer to to-day, viz., bringing before Parliament facts and figures the accuracy of which he has never been able to dispute. I do not wonder that the right hon. Gentleman claims in the first place his right as Chief Secretary to decide for himself what is the Government policy. Nobody disputes his right, but he cannot dispute our right to judge of his policy, not by his own statements, not by his own expressions of hope, not by his own opinions, but by the actual results which have followed from that policy. The Chief Secretary told us in his closing and most eloquent sentences that he believed the condition of Ireland would be worse to-day than it is in those parts of Ireland to which I have referred, if he had adopted a different policy; but what justification has the Chief Secretary for that view? He will find no justification in the previous history of the country or in the previous administration of his predecessors He himself, and his immediate predecessor, when they came to Dublin Castle, said they found Ireland in a condition of peace which had not been equalled for many years. That state of affairs had been brought about by an administration of the law which was absolutely equal as between man and man. The Chief Secretary says he is not altogether dissatisfied with the results of his policy, but, if that be so, he must be satisfied with very small results indeed. My right hon. friend called attention to the increase in the number of offences, especially the use of firearms, the gravest and surest indication of serious unrest in those parts of the country where the particular crime is committed. My right hon. friend also called attention to the increase of police, and although the Chief Secretary started with a condition of things so satisfactory that he and his predecessor constantly alluded to it in their speeches, he is bound to admit here to-day that he has had to increase the number of police in the counties because of the condition of unrest in which he finds them. Can it be urged that it is unjust or unfair of us to arraign him and his administration when facts of that kind are put before Parliament and the country? The Chief Secretary went on to trace this condition of things to the passion for land in Ireland. But that has been the fact in Ireland ever since the country existed. The passion for the land is the oldest, and in some respects perhaps the saddest, story in Ireland, and does the Chief Secretary or anybody believe that, if the people in Ireland believe, as they will believe, if his policy continues, that all they have got to do is to support their desire for land by crime and misconduct and that their desires will be met by Parliament—does he believe that the consequences to Ireland will not be of the gravest possible description? Is anybody so foolish as to believe that they can curb the desires of the various classes in Ireland? Hon. Gentlemen opposite surely know that even now there are signs in Ireland of a desire to share in the benefits hitherto conferred solely upon the farmers. Are you going to teach them, because they have a hunger for something, that if they want to get it they are to follow the example of those who are breaking the law now because, as the Chief Secretary says, they not altogether unnaturally desire to get the land for themselves? The Chief Secretary told us that he was urged by hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House and by the Unionist Party in Ireland to suspend the ordinary law and to put the extraordinary law into force. The remarkable part of that extraordinary law is that when it was passed by my right hon. friend, some parts of it were made to depend upon proclamations by the Government, but some parts were made a part of the ordinary statute law requiring no proclamation of any kind whatever; and what we have urged on the Chief Secretary is not that he should proclaim districts, or use those parts of the Act which must be preceded by proclamation, but that he should make full use of the general law; until he has done that, he cannot claim that he has done everything in his power to put down lawlessness and disorder. He told us that cattle-driving was not so very grave an offence as some people believed it to be. He said it was abominable and objectionable, but he pointed out that cattle-driving is indulged in by men among whom were small farmers and people of some substance, that in many cases it was not accompanied by brutal treatment either of human beings or of the animals themselves, and that therefore in many cases it was not so brutal as it was represented to be on this side of the House. The question of the degree of brutality has nothing to do with the commission of this particular offence. At first we were told that this cattle-driving was directed against tenants who occupied grazing land only, and that, at the beginning of the outbreak of cattle-driving, it was only the graziers that were attacked; but it did not take long before the lesson taught in the beginning was learnt and applied in other cases, and it has long ceased to be the case that cattle-driving is applied only to graziers. Many "drives" now take place on the farms of tenant farmers, not men of wealth, and it is inevitable, if it is allowed in the one case, that it will follow in the other, and as it goes on, it will become more and more difficult to put down. The Chief Secretary told us it is dying down already, but it was only in the debates raised at the beginning of this session in February that we were told exactly the same story. Many of us who know something of the cattle trade in Ireland, believe that the reasons which led to the reduction in the number of cases then had nothing on earth to do with the application of the law, but had solely to do with the conditions of the trade itself. I believe that is the reason now, but at all events, we know that the same hopes were indulged in in February, and dashed to the ground in April and May, and the same hopes being indulged in in July will, unless the law be enforced, be dashed to the ground in November and December. We must, said the Chief Secretary, legislate in order to remove this congestion. By all means. I have never concealed my view that if there be a grievance which legislation will remove, by all means take every chance to pass your legislation, and do justice to the country; but at the same time that you are carrying remedial legislation, you must first of all enforce the law without any fear or favour as between man and man. The Chief Secretary told us pathetically that he knew too little of the land question in Ireland, and that during his tenure of office he had been unable to do more than study it in parts. I am sure he will find that any Act of Parliament, based even upon the remarkable recommendations of the Congestion Commission—and when he quoted Lord Dudley and Lord MacDonnell, the late Under-Secretary for Ireland, surely he forgets that those gentlemen have all got recommendations of their own, and that the Report of that Commission is not one united Report.

MR. BIRRELL. It is united as to the grass lands.

MR. WALTER LONG: Only on one point. But the Chief Secretary forgets that he is dealing with congestion where it creates a desire for land. He must know that in proportion to the people whom you have demanding grass land, and who are now dissatisfied, the amount of grass land available, even if you took the whole of it, would not serve to go round more than one-tenth of them. Legislation dealing with congestion does not meet the case, because you cannot by legislation make land. You can take it away from those who have it and give it to others, but you cannot make fresh land. That is beyond even the power of a Radical Government, and if you let it be thought for a moment that the desire for land and the miseries which arise from congestion justify in any degree the commission of these offences, and that you will proceed to treat them rather by reforms than by punishment, you will go on getting this kind of thing steadily increasing as it has done during the last three years. Do the Chief Secretary and the Irish Government believe that under the Evicted Tenants Act they are going to remove all the difficulties which have arisen in connection with the evicted tenants question? Whereas it is only possible to find accommodation for a few hundreds, applications have been made on the part of thousands. While you can only hope to deal with a limited number as the Chief Secretary has tried to do, you have an enormous number of those people still clamouring to be treated in this way, still demanding land and demanding to be put back on their farms, and none of these demands can be met. It is impossible by legislation ever to deal with unrest in Ireland. Unless you make it clearly understood that you are whole-hearted and determined in your enforcement of the law, agitation will go on and increase as it has been doing during recent months. The Chief Secretary told us that he was entitled not only to decide as between the two courses open to him, but that he was entitled to be judged fairly by his critics. Of course he is. But, on the other hand, we are entitled to ask whether the law has been enforced in such a way as is likely to make the people believe you are in earnest. But you have prosecuted the followers and left out the leader. What would be the effect produced here in England if, in the case of riots led by people who were well known, and by their position were entitled to lead their fellows, the prosecution was directed against those who followed and those who led were left out altogether? The same effect would be produced as is produced in Ireland, and until you make up your mind without fear or favour to prosecute and punish, so far as you can, those who are responsible, not only as followers, but as leaders, in the commission of these offences, you will have, whatever may be your intentions—and nobody denies that they are good—the same sorry tale to tell that you have had to tell to-day, viz., to admit that every one of these statements is correct, that the increase in crime is as stated, that you have had to add to your proclamations more counties, and that you are obliged to appeal to friends and opponents to help you in a task which you have found greater than you are able to accomplish. The Chief Secretary went on to make an appeal to all parties in Ireland. I venture to say, and I am speaking with some knowledge of what I am talking about, that in that portion of Ulster from which the majority of the Unionist representatives come, and who generally side with us on this side of the House, there has been, especially during the last year or two, a steadfast and an honest attempt to do that which would tend to the general peace and quiet of the country, to support the Government in their efforts to maintain peace on those difficult occasions when there is risk of collision between Orangemen and Nationalists, an honest attempt to prevent disorder and bloodshed. I can promise the Chief Secretary that so far as those for whom I am entitled to speak are concerned, there will be every assistance given to him and his Government in any effort they make to maintain the law. The Chief Secretary urged just now that he ought not to be charged with treating with levity the great question of the government of Ireland. There are many men in Ireland, not politicians, but honest citizens, farmers, landowners, and tradesmen, who believe that by hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, whatever may be the position of the Chief Secretary, the claims we make on behalf of Ireland are treated, if not with levity, at all events with contempt. We contend that every statement we have made has been admitted to be correct by the Chief Secretary. He admits that his record is unsatisfactory, but he says it will be worse if he does other things. We say that that is not the opinion of Ireland. We say that when you have fairly administered the law between all classes of the people without fear or favour the result has always been a diminution in crime and an increase in the prosperity of the people and those very results, peace and happiness, which the Chief Secretary and his predecessors found in Ireland when they succeeded a Unionist Chief Secretary and a Unionist Administration. It is impossible to carry on a debate of this kind on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. It is quite obvious that there are many Members of the House who want to talk about other questions and the time at our disposal is very limited. I accept the statement of the Chief Secretary that he would have been glad to be allowed to have his Vote discussed, but I think it is little short of a public scandal that questions of this magnitude, affecting the happiness of a considerable section of His Majesty's subjects, should be so inadequately and so insufficiently discussed. We have raised the discussion not because we want to delay the business of the House, but because this is the only occasion on which we can put before the House what we believe to be the true situation in Ireland, and upon which we can voice our conviction that those who are responsible for Irish Government have lamentably failed in the discharge of their primary duty.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said that obviously he could not let the speech to which they had just listened pass without a word of reply from the point of view represented by his hon. friends and himself. He would have been glad if there had been more time to take some notice of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. With great fairness the right hon. Gentleman, before he came to describe the atrocities of his successors in the employment of the guillotine, made a confession of the atrocities of himself and his own Government. He said that in the session of 1904 there were £31,000,000 of money voted without discussion, and in 1905 £50,000,000. He could have shown to his heart's content that his successors had voted even much larger sums under the guillotine without advancing his cause. The right hon. Gentleman was distinguished from those who had succeeded him by the fact that he had no remedy for the present state of things, and that the present Government had a remedy. Was there a man in the House who did not know that the process of closure, reaching its ultimate form of violence in the guillotine, was going to go on from year to year, augmented by every successive Government, until in the end they might come to the time when practically free discussion, in the old sense of the word, would have entirely disappeared? What was the real root of all this? Was it the wickedness of one Government or of another? Was it because the Tories were wicked and the Liberals more wicked still? When either a Liberal or a Conservative used that language in Opposition he had his tongue in his cheek. When the Opposition became the Government they would employ the guillotine, and when the Government became the Opposition they would denounce it. The real root of the whole thing was that the Imperial Parliament was trying to do not merely the great work of the nation and the Empire at large, but work which ought to be left to local bodies in England, Wales, and Scotland, as well as Ireland. It was something like irony that the Leader of the Opposition, himself a Scotsman, should use the same figures as to Supply voted under the guillotine as an argument in favour of the *status quo* that he (Mr. O'Connor) used to prove that Parliament had broken down in its work of Imperial control of its finances and as an argument for transferring to a Scottish Assembly the adequate, wise discussions of purely Scottish affairs. He had heard with alarm the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that in his opinion this Parliament had lost real control over the expenditure of the country. According to his theory the only reason the House now discussed the Estimates was that the discussion of Estimates gave them an opportunity for the discussion of policy. Of course, that was one of the great purposes and functions of discussions in Supply. But he was sure the people of this country would be alarmed and astounded if they could realise the meaning of the words of the man who for fifteen years was the leader, almost the dictator, of their great representative assembly, when he said that under the present system the House of Commons had practically lost all control over the expenditure of the country. Those were general questions, and he had no right to stand between the House and other hon. Members who wished to address it. With regard to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, he stated that he was in favour of legislation for the purpose of dealing with the problem of congestion in Ireland and he was glad to hear that pledge.

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not pledge himself to anything. What he said was that he was in favour and always had been of removing any grievance in Ireland.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said that congestion happened to be the serious question at the present moment, and he inferred that the right hon. Gentleman had that in mind. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman would not take anything like a factious opinion in dealing with grievances which were admitted by all parties in this House. The theory of the right hon. Gentleman was that if there was disorder and crime in Ireland there was only one way of dealing with it, and that was by putting into operation certain portions of what the right hon. Gentleman would call the Crimes Act, but what he preferred to call the Coercion Act. He objected to the employment of the word "crime" in this connection. The right hon. Gentleman had committed himself to the statement that there was not a single statement of fact with regard to Ireland brought forward by himself and his friends which had not been fully confirmed. That was an astonishing phrase. He had claimed that a general case had been made out, but what was that general case? He did not mean during the session of Parliament, but during the recess which preceded that session. Was there a single hon. Member who did not read in scores of speeches and leading articles that the only analogy to the condition of Ireland was in Macedonia or Armenia. That appeared almost in every speech of the members of the Tory party and in articles in the Tory Press. There were 10,000 murders in four years in Macedonia, whereas in twelve months of Irish history with which the comparison was made there was not a single agrarian murder. Therefore Irishmen had a right to complain when their national character was villified with such gross and wicked exaggeration by gentlemen who would resent being told that their object was to sow dissension between the people of England and Ireland. What were the facts with regard to crime in Ireland? Would any man say that it was fair to speak of cattle-driving in the same terms as one would apply to the scores of murders which had defaced the annals of history. What was the case? Was there a single Assize Court in this country where a Judge in the last twelve months had been presented with white gloves? There was not one that he knew of. As a matter of fact there had been more trials and offences tried at one country Assize Court in England than in the whole of Ireland in the period named. In Limerick and in two or three other cities of Ireland the County Court Judge had been presented with white gloves because there were no offences to try, and all over the country Judges had been congratulating the population. In the face of this universal testimony to the crimelessness of Ireland, it was a little too bad that not only hon. Members above the gangway but responsible men like the Leader of the Opposition should endeavour to picture Ireland as one mass of bloodshed and violence like Macedonia. As to disorder, how was that to be removed? The policy of the Leader of the Opposition was to revive the Coercion Act. In debating Coercion Acts for the last thirty years he never knew one which did not aggravate the evils which it sought to remedy, and he believed that if to-day Ireland was free from crime, although not free from disquiet and disorder, it was because the Chief Secretary had had the courage to resist the enormous and gigantic pressure of true and false statements which had been used to induce him to apply coercion. The administration of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin was dead and gone, and he could therefore speak of it without any party feeling or acrimony. He would venture to tell the right hon. Gentleman that it was the opinion of every sane man in Ireland who took a wholly impartial view of politics and administration in Ireland, that another year of such administration as he was giving to Ireland would have led to an outburst of crime which would have made his task impossible and would have defaced the annals of Ireland, creating bitterness and bad feeling more than ever existed before. If the present Chief Secretary had followed the policy of his predecessor and applied coercion, what would have been the effect? The whole of the Liberal Party were pledged to the hilt against coercion and had voted session after session for the repeal of the Coercion Act. If the Liberal Party had applied coercion, what would have been the position? If a policy was right in his opinion it should be applied whether it led to the success or failure of any political party here or there. What he was concerned with was that the application of coercion to Ireland by a Liberal Government would have meant the swallowing of all the pledges which the Liberal Party had made, and it would have destroyed the moral character and repute of that party, besides digging another deep gulf of mistrust between the people of England and Ireland. To the Government it would also have meant the bankruptcy of democracy in this country. What was the real cure for the present state of Ireland? What was the cause of disturbance? The Chief Secretary had stated that it was not merely that there was a grievance in Ireland, but that there was a grievance which was admitted by all parties in this country and in Ireland, viz., that side by side with the congested districts in which the people had herded together so long, were vast tracts of splendid and fertile land, miles of which were not broken by a single human being. An influential Royal Commission had reported in favour of the solution of that problem by increasing the size of small holdings, and adding to them portions of this untenanted land. Would the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin deny that this was a wise way of meeting the question? It was something that would make one almost weep for the tragedy and irony of Irish life, that this solution of the question had been waiting now for generations, and had not yet come. Why was there disorder in Ireland? Because they had been waiting for this remedy, not for decades, but for generations, and even for centuries. Had they not suffered enough and lost enough? At the present moment in England they were discussing the problem of how to get the people back to the land. In this country they were all alarmed and moved by the tragedy of village life, because the villages were becoming empty, and their best sons and daughters were crowding into the congested streets of the great cities. In Ireland the problem was exactly the opposite. They did not want the people to come back to the land, they wanted them to remain on it, and that was a policy which every hon. Member ought to support. They ought not to be asked to wait any longer. During his own time Ireland had lost a third of the population it had at the time when he was born there, sixty years ago. Every year there was still this tremendous hemorrhage going on. To the extent of 20,000, 30,000 and 40,000 a year Ireland's sons and daughters were leaving her shores. No more touching sight than the partings amid tears and prayers of the Irish emigrants from their native soil could be witnessed. He asked that they should be allowed to remain within the shores of their own land. Let the right hon. Gentleman restrain his own followers from such violent, exaggerated, and malicious language as to the real condition of Ireland. Let him help to give to the right hon. Gentleman promptly such legislation as would satisfy the proper demands and the patriotic aspirations of the masses of the people.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said he would endeavour as shortly as possible to deal with the speech of the right hon. Member for South Dublin. He had no complaint to make of the tone of the right hon. Gentleman's speech; he thought indeed that the Chief Secretary and he had cause to be well satisfied with the way in which the right hon. Gentleman had referred to them personally. He had made no attempt, like some of his followers and many newspaper writers, to insinuate and suggest that the Chief Secretary had not been actuated with the desire to suppress crime and disorder as much as he possibly could. The right hon. Gentleman he thought would admit that, whether right or wrong in its methods, the Irish Administration desired quiet and order in Ireland.

MR. WALTER LONG: Certainly.

MR. CHERRY said that being so, it was only a question of methods. The right hon. Gentleman had severely criticised them, first, because they had not put the Crimes Act in force, and secondly, because they had not prosecuted the leaders, but had attempted to prosecute the followers. He thought he would be able to convince the right hon. Gentleman that the two charges resolved themselves into one. As regards the Crimes Act, he did not know if the right hon. Gentleman was in agreement with the nobleman who was Lord-Lieutenant when he was in office, but they remembered the eloquent speech made by Lord Dudley early in the session, in another place, when he expressed himself as opposed to the use of any portion of the Crimes Act. In the House of Commons the senior Member for Dublin University, when asked if he was of opinion that the Crimes Act should be put in force, declined to answer the question. He cited these two leading statesmen for the purpose of showing the House that those who had been connected with the administration of Ireland, on either side of politics, recognised how serious a step it was to put the Crimes Act in force, and how desirous everyone was to avoid making use of it. It appeared to him that the objections to making use of the part of the Act which did not require the proclamation by the Lord-Lieutenant were as great as to the rest of the Act. Section 2 enabled a person charged with unlawful assembly to be tried before a special Court composed of two resident magistrates. That special Court was composed by the Lord-Lieutenant, acting on the advice of the Attorney-General, who selected two resident magistrates, not judicial persons, it must be remembered, but ordinary Civil servants liable to dismissal. Then the Attorney General sent some representative to appear before these gentlemen. He made no charge against the resident magistrates, and he assumed that the Attorney-General would not prosecute unless he was satisfied there was a strong case for conviction, but let the House look at the effect on the public. The public saw a tribunal appointed by what was called the Castle, and a prosecutor coming down from the Castle, and they said the accused had no chance. He was of opinion that if they put this clause in the Crimes Act into force in Ireland, farewell to the idea of persuading people that the administration of the law was fair and just. They could not do it, and it was for this reason that they had sought to avoid, and would still seek to avoid, putting this particular law into force. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the fact that the followers were prosecuted and that the leaders were allowed to go scot free. In saying that he had repeated a charge which had been made again and again during the past year. That charge was made against them because one particular individual was not prosecuted, namely, the Member for North West Meath. They all knew that during last autumn and winter the hon. Member carried on a campaign in favour of cattle-driving. There were clamorous cries in the Press and from hon. Gentlemen opposite to prosecute him, and the Government were charged with cowardice for not doing so, and were accused of sympathising with his words and acts. What was the reason for the course they took? They believed, and still believed, that by prosecuting that gentleman they would have increased his influence instead of diminishing it. He did not think that at the present day he was capable of carrying out a cattle-drive of the smallest possible dimensions. [AN HON. MEMBER: Thanks to Judge Ross.] He said it was thanks to the action of the Government, which persisted in ignoring him instead of making a martyr of him. If they had prosecuted him they would have done so according to the ordinary law, and what possible chance would there have been in the temper Ireland was in last autumn and winter of securing a conviction under the ordinary law. They must clear their minds of cant. He did not want to deny obvious facts, and everyone knew that a prosecution before a jury at that time would have been absolutely futile. Did the right hon. Gentleman suggest that they ought to have brought such a prosecution? It was for that reason that he said that the two points came into one. If they had wanted to prosecute the hon. Member in any other way for trying to encourage a campaign of cattle-driving they would have been compelled to put the Crimes Act in force. Did the right hon. Gentleman think the occasion required an interference with the ordinary law which would destroy any possible chance of getting the mass of the people or the country to believe that the law was fairly administered? They had heard a great deal about the amount of intimidation in Ireland. There was a great deal of intimidation in certain counties, but there was this feature which they must recognise as certainly a very favourable one, namely, that this intimidation was not accompanied or followed by serious crime. There were many cases of shooting in the air, or booing on the road opposite a man's house, and a great deal of unpopularity was occasioned to people who took grazing land, but they had had no case of agrarian murder, and they had had practically no serious crime. There was only one serious case in Galway. There had been no period in the last forty years when there had been less serious crime. Intimidation was a serious thing, and the Government would take every possible means of putting an end to it. They viewed it with horror. They wanted the House to distinguish between disorder and crime. There had been a great deal of disorder, but very little crime. Disorder was steadily decreasing. Reports from Galway and Roscommon were most favourable, and the police in both these counties believed that the worst was past. They had every hope that before another year was out disorder would have disappeared.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY said that his hon. friend the Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool had drawn a comparison between the relative proportion of crime in Ireland and in this country. He was not inclined to sit silent when anyone contended that the Irish population was less disposed to crime than the English population. When such an imputation was made it became necessary to place on record the fact that twenty years ago the Report of the Prisons Commissioners for England and Wales showed that in the prisons of England and Wales the prisoners of Irish birth were 10 per cent. of the prison population, while persons of Irish birth in the ordinary population of England and Wales were only 2 per cent. He would be the very last person to make use of that significant fact as a basis for wounding criticism of the Irish race; for it must be patent to everyone that that test had to be considered along with the not less important fact that the Irish population which contributed to the crime of England and Wales lived under squalid circumstances in industrial centres through no fault of their own. Not only were the scenes under which they lived not those of their own beloved country, but the conditions under which they lived were more squalid and remote than those in which they would be living in their own land. He hoped that if comparisons were to be made again the very significant figures to which he had drawn attention would be borne in mind in order that these comparisons might not be made use of for the purpose of hurling recriminations backwards and forwards across the Irish Channel.

SIR HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said he wished to draw attention to a question of importance to all interested in Welsh education. Certain points of difficulty had recently arisen connected with the relations of the Central Welsh Board to the Welsh Department of the Board of Education. On Tuesday last, a deputation representing the Central Welsh Board waited upon the President of the Board of Education for the purpose of enabling representations to be made with regard to the points at issue. His right hon. friend in the course of his reply indicated his desire to meet, as far as possible, the views submitted to him. It appeared, however, that there was a certain amount of misunderstanding and misapprehension as to the purport of the reply of his right hon. friend, and in view of the importance of the question and the desirability of removing those misconceptions, he thought he was justified in taking this opportunity of calling attention to the facts, in order that his right hon. friend might be able to dissipate, as he would be able to do, the doubts and fears that had arisen. The conditions under which the Central Welsh Board worked, and its relations to the Board of Education, were questions which in the sphere of Welsh education went beyond mere departmental routine. The Central Board was regarded in Wales as the foundation of a large measure of educational autonomy. For many years it had been devotedly served by men who had unstintedly given their time, energy, and thought to the cause of education. Everybody in the House would agree that it was most important that nothing should be done to damp the ardour of those men who had played their part in a notable experiment with reference to education in Wales. Whilst admitting, therefore, to the full the necessity for the exercise of such supervision by the Board of Education as was rendered imperative by the payment of Parliamentary grants, all would recognise the importance of doing everything possible to secure cordial co-operation between the Central Welsh Board and the Board of Education. There was but one opinion as to the value of the work accomplished by the Central Board, and the President of the Board of Education in his reply to the deputation had, in the most generous terms, paid his tribute to the character of that work and its value to the cause of education, and the place of that body in Welsh life. There was only one opinion on that point, and he wished to express his appreciation of the admirable way in which the officials in London—the Secretary of the Welsh Education Department of the Board of Education and the Chief Inspector—had endeavoured to serve the educational interests and to promote the educational ideals of Wales. He would like to refer to one or two main points on which representations were made to the President of the Board of Education in connection with the difficulties which had arisen with regard to the exercise of their functions in relation to educational progress in Wales. The first point, he might mention, was the statutory powers of the Central Board. There had been, he believed, some idea in certain quarters that the Government were in some way desirous of interfering with the Central Board's statutory powers, but his right hon. friend had made it absolutely clear that so far from interfering with these statutory powers, he was personally anxious for a further extension of autonomous powers with regard to education in Wales. He might remind the House with reference to the attitude of the Government to this question, that it was this Government which proposed in the Bill of 1906 a scheme of complete educational autonomy for Wales, and to give it a national council of education, which provision was afterwards thrown out in another place. That ought to be sufficient to dissipate any doubt as to the real determination and desire of the Government. That was his first point; and he hoped there would be no further contention upon it after this debate. His second point related to the system of dual inspection owing to the existing conditions with regard to the administration of the Parliamentary grant. No one denied the inevitable inconveniences of such a system. The late President of the Board of Education made it perfectly clear a year ago that he fully recognised the inconveniences of the dual system, and the same view was held and had been expressed by the present President. However, they were face to face with the fact that while the conditions regulating the payment of the grants continued, the President of the Board of Education must exercise such supervision in inspection as would enable him to fulfil his obligations to Parliament. There had been a growing fear that the inspection of the Board of Education would, as time went on, become more exacting, and that the evils of the dual system would be accentuated. That point was pressed by the deputation, and the President of the Board of Education made a statement, the meaning and value of which he did not think was fully understood. The right hon. Gentleman expressed his desire to reduce to a minimum the inconveniences of the dual system, subject to the fulfilment of Parliamentary conditions. He firmly believed that there was much in that statement, and he hoped that in his reply the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give a somewhat fuller expression of his meaning and of the views he had put before the deputation, in order that all doubts on the point might disappear. Another point which the deputation emphasised was the desire of the Central Board to have, if possible, some recognition in the Welsh Code for secondary schools in Wales and Monmouthshire of the position of the Central Board in regard to intermediate education. Great weight was attached to this point, and he hoped that the President of the Board of Education would give just consideration to it, and see if something could not be done in the matter. Another point had arisen in connection with the new arrangements with reference to the methods of correspondence. According to the present requirements of the Board of Education, all correspondence had to be conducted directly between the Welsh Education Department and the schools concerned. A great deal of feeling had been aroused with reference to the difficulties which had arisen from this procedure. He ought to make it clear that he did not think any Welsh Member desired for a moment to press for the retention of any system which was educationally unsound, but they held the view very strongly that all matters connected with curriculum, forms, time-tables, etc., should be handled by the Central Welsh Board; and that all communications on such matters should be made, as heretofore, through that Board. The right hon. Gentleman had undertaken to give this matter his consideration. In conclusion, he had only to add that from the outset of those proceedings he had never had the slightest doubt as to the attitude of his right hon. friend towards the Central Welsh Board, and he felt assured that his right hon. friend was determined to do nothing which would in any way weaken its influence or authority. But, in view of the misconceptions which had arisen, and having regard to the importance of the question, and of every question relating to education in the minds of the people of Wales, he would press his right hon. friend to make a statement which would give to Wales and to those interested in Welsh educational autonomy, an added assurance as to the mind and intention of the Government on this admittedly important subject.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury) said the assurances which he had given to hon. Members representing Welsh constituencies were real assurances. No one in the United Kingdom who had been interested in secondary education for the last fifteen or twenty years could overlook the fact that the Central Welsh Board gave an impetus to secondary education in Wales long before the movement spread as it had done. He was not sure that the secondary school system of Wales had not been supported with even more enthusiasm in Wales than in Scotland, and no one who knew anything of intermediate education in Wales was likely to do anything to hamper the machinery that had done so much good. The history of secondary education in Wales was bound up not only with the Central Welsh Board, but with other institutions. The only funds in the old days at the disposal of those who conducted secondary education in Wales were the funds provided by way of a Treasury grant. Since those days Parliament had become more generous, and already the Parliamentary grant had become nearly three times that of the old Treasury grant. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had control of the national finance, and he hoped his right hon. friend would take note of the ominous fact, that whereas the Treasury grant had remained stationary all these years, the Parliamentary grant had gone up, and only this year they had increased the grant to Wales, so that all the Welsh schools were dealt with on identically the same basis as the English schools. Discrepancies had arisen last year which led to the unfortunate distribution of less among the Welsh schools than among the English schools. The whole of the grants, however, were now paid on the higher basis of £5 per child. The difficulty about the Parliamentary grant lay in the fact that the Minister who distributed it must be prepared to give an account to the House of Commons of the way in which it was spent, the standard at which the schools had been maintained, and how far the secondary school system had not been confused with the lower system. He had no tendency towards extravagance, and there would be no such tendency while he was at the Board of Education. He had no intention of sanctioning any method which would in any way restrict the funds available in Wales or in England. A Minister could only be answerable for what took place in the distribution of money under his control provided that those who represented him in the provinces and elsewhere were his immediate servants. He admitted that the whole system of dual inspection was to be deprecated, and that in so far as the Department could get rid of it, every effort would be made in that direction. He reminded the House that one effect of the change initiated by his predecessor and carried out by Mr. Owen Edwards resulted in diminishing dual inspection to an enormous extent in Wales. In Glamorgan, Cardigan, Carnarvon, and in the town of Cardiff, which represented about half the total population of Wales, there was under this arrangement no dual inspection whatever. That was the first step in the right direction, and he hoped it would be recognised that under their administration efforts had been made to get rid of this troublesome duplication. Next year there would be a further diminution of the inspections, and those inspections would be restricted to the bursars who were being taught in the secondary schools. He thought it quite conceivable that they might be able to extend elimination as the years went on, but he could not promise that they would be able to wipe out all the Board's inspectors in Wales. They intended, however, to make as much use as possible of the Central Welsh Board, rather than cover the ground twice over, although that might be necessary in some cases, and that nobody could object to. Mr. Owen Edwards not only understood what high educational ideals were, but he was a typical Welshman. His one desire was to raise the standard of the schools. The other points raised were not of such great importance. The question of the correspondence was a very trite matter, so far as the Central Welsh Board was concerned, and the only letters that could be cut out of the ordinary routine of headmasters were such letters as related to open-air work, epidemics, etc. Those letters could be better dealt with if they passed direct to the Board of Education rather than through the Welsh Central Board, and then on to the Department to be answered. The next point raised had reference to curriculum and time analysis forms, etc. The Government were of opinion at the time that these forms could pass to and from the Board and the schools. It did not really much matter one way or the other. If they passed through the Welsh Central Board it only meant that they would be reprinted and that would cause delay. He saw no reason in the world why the system which worked fairly well last year should not be continued. To that end he had given instructions that the next forms which were moved should be on the old basis, and not on the system adopted during the current session. The last point which had been raised was the insertion in the code of direct recognition of the Central Welsh Board. This was a matter which he could not go into until after consultation with those who were responsible for the financial relations of the House. He could not accept right off the suggestion which had been made because he had not had an opportunity of discussing it with his colleagues, and he hoped, therefore, he would be excused from giving an answer on that point at the moment. He hoped that the Welsh Department of the Board of Education and the Central Welsh Board would do everything in their power to diminish the amount of friction which must necessarily be associated with the educational system. His sole desire was to see that the scholars should have the benefit of the best system of education that they could organise and that local interest should be encouraged, because on the enthusiasm which was created depended the prosperity of the Welsh schools. Reference had been made to the Half-timers' Committee which was set up last week, complaint being made that there was upon it nobody strictly representing the agricultural interest. He did not shut his eyes to the fact that the half-timers' question did, of course, touch the agricultural districts as well as the manufacturing districts, and in so far as the reference to the Committee was concerned, if it did not touch agriculture, he would like to know what it did touch. He presumed that everything which could be discussed with regard to half-timers both in the agricultural and manufacturing districts would come within the purview of the Committee. That was his view, and he was sure that it would be carried out by his hon. friend.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN said that what he had stated was that the reference to the Committee prevented evidence being taken except in one direction.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he did not agree that it would prevent evidence being taken except in one direction. The whole question could be and would be thoroughly inquired into by his hon. friend and those associated with him. He did not believe in packing a Committee with partisans all on one side or the other. He believed in getting a good and impartial judgment, and that was what he had aimed at. In regard to any difference of view on the part of the hon. Member it was a difference not as to method, but as to the policy which lay behind—a policy to which the Government strongly adhered, namely, that they would not allow any district to be monopolised by denominational schools. That had been their object, and they intended as far as they could, if they could not do it by legislation to do it by grants of money both to England and Wales. The hon. Gentleman asked why so much more money had been spent in grants in Wales than in England. So much more money had been spent in Wales because the case in Wales was so much worse than in England.

MR. BRIDGEMAN said he had not complained in the least as to that point.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he was very glad the hon. Gentleman did not complain, for certainly they had relieved the tension in a good many Welsh schools by the expenditure of public money, opening them to the children of all denominations. The hon. Gentleman had also called attention to three schools at Pontfadog, but there, again, the hon. Gentleman complained that they had granted money which was to cover the whole cost of the schools. He joined issue with the hon. Member in regard to that complaint. No money was provided towards the cost of the site, and if they only granted money sufficient to provide for the cost of the building they were not covering the whole cost of the school, which must include both structure and site. They had paid nothing whatever towards sites, and he would be the last to allow Imperial money to be spent for a purpose of that kind. The hon. Member complained that they had not taken advantage of Section 18 of the Act of 1902, and had thrown the burden on the parish. He would point out that the beginning of the section provided that a part of the burden was to be put on the parish concerned, but that referred not to the grant which they asked from the Exchequer, or through the Board of Education, but to the expenses of the county council, who would have to carry out the provisions of Section 18. He presumed, therefore, that the cost of the site would be one of the items which would have to be allocated according to Section 18 of the Act of 1902. He believed he had replied to the whole of the points raised by the hon. Gentleman; if he had not, perhaps he would have an opportunity of doing so next session.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had mistaken altogether the point of the criticism of the administration of his Department. His hon. friend the Member for Oswestry had not made any attack on the policy of providing an undenominational school in a single school area where there was a demand for undenominational teaching. It would be utterly opposed to the general run of his opinions, and to the general run of the opinions of those who sat in that quarter of the House. The right hon. Gentleman was pleased to appear surprised at that statement. It was perfectly well known, as he had endeavoured to convey for the last three years, that their object was not to maintain a monopoly of any particular kind of religious thought, but to provide equal treatment for all. That had always been their object since he had had the honour of a seat in that House. He had said so over and over again, and several of his hon. friends had said the same. Their objection had not been in the least to these grants, and if the right hon. Gentleman turned to the pages of *Hansard* he would not find the slightest criticism of the policy of providing grants for the purpose of building schools where the religious feelings of the neighbourhood required an alternative school to be erected. But they said, and said as strongly as they could, that the method adopted by the Government in this Bill and in previous Appropriation Bills was a very unfortunate method to adopt, and it was one of the reasons why he was going, in Committee on the Bill, to bring the matter to a point. Another reason was that the result of it had been that all sorts of irregularities had cropped up in the administration of the grant. The right hon. Gentleman had wholly failed to meet the case under Section 18 of the Act of 1902. That section gave a specific direction to the county council to charge to the locality such portion as they thought fit, not being less than one half, of any expenses incurred by them.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Incurred by the county council?

LORD R. CECIL: Incurred by the county council in respect of capital expenditure. That was an absolute mandatory direction. The grant did not in any way interfere with the duty of the county council to provide schools under the Act of 1902. It could not interfere with that; it was the sole business of the county council, the local education authority; it alone had to provide schools. The Board of Education could not build the schools; they had not the power to do so. All they did was to say: "If you build the schools we will give you a grant towards the building. We cannot do anything else." Therefore, it was still the expenditure of the county council—an expenditure which was met to some extent, not altogether, by the grant to the county council. All that the Government could do was to pay the local education authority a grant in aid of their expenses, and a portion of the expense was thrown by the county council on the locality. And it was very evident why it should be so. It was right that the locality which had the benefit of these schools should be a very considerable contributor towards their erection. That was the policy of the Act of 1902. Very grave inconvenience arose from the course which the Government had adopted in this light-hearted way at the beginning of last session, apparently not in the least knowing of the section of the Act of 1870 which was in their way, and only realising it in the course of a debate after eleven o'clock one evening. That was exactly what happened last year.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Does the noble Lord suggest that money provided by us is an expense of the county council?

LORD R. CECIL: The school is an expense, and the money provided by you is a grant towards that expense. That is all it can be.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Does the noble Lord contend that the balance which is not provided by us is to be borne partly by the parish and partly by the county council? If that is so, that is what actually takes place.

LORD R. CECIL said he was contending that all the Department could do was to provide the amount which would be required by the county council. The county council were bound by statute to throw at least half the cost of the school on the locality. They might pay half the whole amount out of the Treasury but that was all they could do. He did not say that it was a reasonable result, far from it; it was a highly unreasonable result, but it was the result which the Government had chosen. If they had passed a short Act legalising the matter, they could have put in proper conditions to meet the difficulty, and they would not have been put in the position of being forced to commit rather more than an irregularity, merely for the purpose of getting rid of difficulties which they themselves had created. It appeared to him a very unfortunate precedent, particularly in the case of a Government which set up to be a Government of financial purity, to set to the House and the country.

***MR. WILLIAM JONES** (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) said they were all glad to hear the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education, for both in tone and substance it would allay some suspicion that had arisen in Wales as to unfriendliness on the part of the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman had emphasised two or three things which appeared in one of the latest Reports of his Board, which stated that although it was true the secondary schools of Wales had in recent years been receiving grants from the Board of Education and had, in consequence, come within the regular inspection of the Board's staff, yet

> "The unifying and standardising effects of the Central Welsh Board still continue and are of determinative importance."

He thought it would be a very easy matter to transfer some of that same kind of recognition into the Code. His right hon. friend had remarked upon the great interest shown in matters relating to education in Wales, and here were the words, not of a Welsh education st, but the Report of his own Department—

> "The needs and desires of the people most closely concerned have found expression and exerted influence on the schools, by means of the Central Welsh Board, from the outset and continuously, in a manner that has not obtained in any county in England."

They could not comp re anything in England or Scotland, in connection with this question, with the desire which existed in Wales for secondary education. So the only thing now was to realise the words of the right hon. Gentleman when he said he was not going to curtail any of the powers of the Welsh Central Board at all, and that nothing should be done which was not of a nature fully consonant with the dignity of the Central Welsh Board and the responsibilities of its position. Mr. O. M. Edwards, the Chief Inspector of the Welsh Department, was a distinguished Welsh Nationalist who understood the Welsh atmosphere and environment, and he hoped he would, under the right hon. Gentleman's behest, come into intimate touch and close relations with the officials of the Welsh Central Board, even in regard to methods of inspection and curricula, so that the dual inspection should be reduced to the irreducible minimum. Inspection did not mean close and detailed examination. It meant practically coming more into counsel with one another, and understanding each other's system. It was done in America and on the Continent of Europe, especially in Germany and Switzerland, where the State inspectors periodically met the superintendents of education and the teachers in friendly consultation and conference. He hoped the same method would be adopted between the Welsh Department of the Board of Education and the Central Welsh Board. The Central Welsh Board in all matters relating to secondary education should be the reflex of the national mind, until they were able to set up what was the universal desire of Wales—a National Council of Education to cover elementary, secondary, and technical, and likewise the training of teachers, so as to secure perfect autonomy over all these systems. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman for his speech. It would be thoroughly understood by the Welsh people, and the Welsh Department would be in close harmony with the administration of the Welsh Central Board.

*MR. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton) regretted that he was not yet satisfied with the right hon. Gentleman's assurances about the Departmental Committee on half-timers. He said almost with scorn that he refused to pack his Committtee and to represent the various interests which must be affected adversely or favourably by the employment of half-timers. That was all very well when he came to consider the schemes of agriculture, but he noticed that the woollen manufacturers were very well represented. In answer to a question put by him the right hon. Gentleman said on the previous day that it would be impossible under the terms of reference to consider evidence which would lead them to recommend the increase of half time for children. He had now informed the House that the Committee would consider this and all other evidence on the subject, and although it was too late to urge the appointment of some agricultural representatives, this was an improvement, for which he thanked the right hon. Gentleman, very much on his previous attitude. But although the right hon. Gentleman considered there was nothing very much more important in this world than education, there was, when they were considering the education of children in primary schools in rural districts, one more important question still, and that was that they and their brothers and sisters who did not go to the schools should be well fed and clothed. Among those who dwelt in towns there was often an opinion that children who were fortunate enough to spend their lives in the country were more fortunately placed. But nothing was more remarkable than the ease with which epidemics ran right through a village, the low power of resistance among country children to disease, and the prevalence of horrible, almost inexplicable ailments, such as consumption and cancer. This was often very largely due to lack of the good nourishment, which the parent, existing on low wages, was unable to afford. There was a very large amount of rural opinion directed to urging the Government to permit children to engage in healthy agricultural operations, and to attend school either in the evening or at the seasons of the year when they could not be employed in the open air, and it was contended that this possible sacrifice of education would be well atoned by the improved physique of the agricultural labourers. There was no doubt the real remedy for these evils was an increase in the wage of agricultural labourers, but so long as their wages were low they might be beginning at the wrong end by insisting upon education for children which was only obtained at the cost of their food. It would be a very serious matter if, now that the Committee was appointed, evidence of this important aspect of the case should be refused, and if his right hon. friend would only give them once more a complete assurance that all this evidence would be received by the Committee he would be more or less satisfied.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said there were two or three aspects of the Congo question which were almost entirely overlooked in the debate on the Foreign Office Vote. Although the Foreign Secretary spoke on the outlook as somewhat hopeful, he confessed that the information given them did not appear very reassuring. If they could elicit from the right hon. Gentleman some further information on what he based his views it would be reassuring to a great many who at present felt a great deal of uneasiness at the fact that they were about to separate without any more definite understanding than they had received. The real causes of uneasiness that existed were mainly two. The first was that the debates in the Belgian Parliament had really partaken of a retrograde rather than a progressive character, and the second was that the cruelties against which so much indignation and feeling had been expressed had not yet in any sense abated. His right hon. friend had spoken of the desirability of keeping the commercial and humanitarian aspects of the question separate, but there were strong reasons why they should not be kept separate. The government of the Congo Free State was entrusted to the Belgian King after his profession of an earnest desire to secure good and beneficent government for the inhabitants, and it was because his professions were implicitly trusted that the Powers agreed to the conditions to which they did agree. Had the humanitarian views upon which this agreement was based been carried out, they would have seen from the commercial point of view a very different condition of things from that which existed now. He had no doubt that they would have had a prosperous trading community in the Congo Free State if the conditions of settlement had been faithfully carried out, instead of having now to look upon this so called Free State as a devastated and almost worthless colony from the commercial point of view. In this case the commercial and humanitarian views of the question absolutely depended one upon the other, and were intertwined in a way which did not often happen in these colonial questions. The cruelties which had been connected with the administration of the Congo Free State were still going on, and he wanted to put it earnestly to his right hon. friend whether it was beyond their duty and their power to say that, while these discussions were going on in the Belgian Parliament, and the slow and devious processes of diplomacy were at work, the demons of cruelty and extortion should hold their hands. The statements which had been made inside and outside the House had been amply verified by the Government Papers, as well as by other reports that came to hand. These reports were still coming. They might be less terrible in the a counts they gave of mutilation and bodily injury, but they showed a long drawn-out series of privations, equal to anything they had heard of in the past—villages destroyed, people driven forth to live as wild beasts, because they could not bring in the tale of rubber, men compelled to work many miles away from their homes, because the forests round about had been devastated, and women and children held as hostages whilst the men were away endeavouring to accomplish their impossible task. It was proved beyond doubt that the labour tale which these men had to yield meant in some instances 300 days out of 365. This indictment was proved by what appeared in the last White-book that was issued, and it was still strengthened by what was going on in this sad and miserable land. Such treatment was not only against the laws of all civilised countries, but what was of more importance to the House and to his right hon. friend was that it was in direct opposition to the undertakings on which the Congo Free State was founded. They might well ask of what value treaties were when they were allowed to be broken year after year as this treaty had been broken. If the life of one of our own fellow countrymen had been at stake the reparation demanded would have been followed up with vigour, and they would have had redress long ago. Here was a case in which the lives of tens of thousands of people had been destroyed, and their happiness blackened and blotted out, and he believed that we had a certain measure of responsibility, and no small measure, for the sacrifices which had been made to meet the cupidity of the monarch in direct contravention of the conditions upon which he was allowed to take over the government of that country. He could assure his right hon. friend that he would be supported in endeavouring to assert the rights of this country in regard to treaty obligations into which we in common with others had entered. This was practically the last chance they would have for some months of discussing this question in the House, and he for one felt horrified at the idea of separating without some assurance, and without receiving from the Foreign Secretary some answer which would enable them to feel that he intended to take a firm and consistent attitude in regard to the matter. They had demanded that unless at the end of this session annexation was agreed to on suitable conditions consistent with our treaty we should proceed under our treaty rights to take action, and he hoped that action, if taken—and he believed it would be taken in conjunction with America—would be successful. He wanted to point out to his hon. friend that the promise which the House received so gladly from him on 26th February he had not yet been called upon to fulfil, because the session had not yet terminated. But what were the prospects of the condition of things coming into existence under which he would have to act? In the columns of the *Morning Post* of Monday last, there appeared a telegraphic message to this effect—

> "Debate on Colonial Bill reached dead-lock, and as discussion cannot be brought to a close it will be broken off on 15th August and referred to the session of October next when the Bill and the Treaty of annexation may be withdrawn by the Government."

There was also a further telegram to the following effect—

> "No annexation Vote this session, probably not this year. Object of King to prolong *statu quo* indefinitely believing we are not in earnest in our promise to interfere in administration of Congo Free State. Probably present Cabinet fall. Change of Government again bring delay by which King can engineer long delay before new Government."

All that was highly probable under the present condition of things, and notwithstanding the promise which they received with so much satisfaction on 26th February, he contended that something further must be done to meet this dilatory action on the part of the King and the Belgian Parliament. Just a few words in regard to the position of the Parliament itself. He confessed that those of them who had seen extracts or full reports of the debates in the Belgian Chamber had not been quite able to follow the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman when he said that a very different view was taken of the question of forced labour now from that which was taken a short time ago, and perhaps he would be able to tell them upon what that assurance was based. It seemed to him that the views expressed by many of those in the Belgian Parliament, and some of them in high authority, went directly adverse to the promises which had been made. M. Hymans, the Liberal Prime Minister of Belgium, said recently—

> "The whole Chamber is agreed that the Act of Berlin gives to no Power the right of interference in the Congo."

M. Renkin, the Minister for Justice in the present Belgian Government, said—

> "Property is a monopoly but it is not a monopoly of trade. Forced labour is necessary or civilisation is arrested."

M. de Smet de Naeyer said—

> "The native is entitled to nothing."

And the President of the Appeal Court of the Congo State said—

> "The native only respects the law of force and knows no other argument than terror."

Sir George White.

Those were samples of the expressions which had been used in the Belgian Parliament, and he failed to see that there was any change in the attitude of Belgium for the better in regard to this vexed question of forced labour. But the main point which he desired to urge upon the right hon. Gentleman was that which he had already mentioned, namely, the probability of further postponement, with all the unhappy conditions which now existed still going on. Even if annexation was agreed to by the Belgian Parliament it did not appear to him that the Ministry intended to act up to their treaty obligations. It was a very serious thing to contemplate that in the Colonial Bill they found that the leading officials on the Congo Executive at Brussels were to be in the new Belgian administration. A very small majority at the last election in Belgium had been returned in favour of the Government, and there would have been no majority at all in his opinion if the people of Belgium had known the whole history of this sad affair. He had never brought any indictment against the Belgian people. They had no sign whatever that the Belgian Government acknowledged that for which his right hon. friend had always firmly contended, namely, the rights of natives in the land, or that they were prepared to allow the natives to trade between each other and outside traders. Therefore they insisted on commercial as well as on moral grounds that this basic right must be conceded before any steps towards annexation could take place. Forced labour under those conditions was slavery of the worst kind. The assurances in the White-book No. 3 from the Belgian Government were weak and insufficient, and even those assurances found no place in the debates in the Belgian Parliament to which he had referred. Therefore he thought they ought at once to repudiate the assumption that the Belgian rights in the Congo Free State were equal to those of the other Powers in the Congo. His right hon. friend had done that already, but in reference to the assertions of the Prime Minister in the Belgian Parliament he felt that this repudiation should be more vigorous in character, so that the Belgian Government and the King might know that when we asserted this position we were determined to maintain it. What rights the Congo Free State possessed they obtained on specific obligations given not only to this country but to other Powers. They had defied those obligations and they now asserted that their rights were unlimited. He could give extracts one after another from speeches made in the Belgian Parliament asserting that those rights were unlimited and yet they took no exception to the despatch of the right hon. Gentleman which reminded them that after annexation the Congo State would remain subject to the provisions of the Berlin and Brussels Acts. They must not allow the Belgian Government to assume that the Congo administration had been properly carrying out the provisions of the treaty, because, in point of fact this administration had not only defied the international Powers who signed the treaty, but it had practically defied every provision of the treaty. One of the provisions was to help the natives to secure free trade and a variety of other things, and it would be quite germane to this debate to read the obligations which the King of Belgians took upon himself in connection with this matter in the first instance, but he would not do so as time would not permit. He was aware that in the government of native races we ourselves had not absolutely a clean slate. We had, however, always recognised that the land was the property of the people where there was a population to occupy it, whereas in this case all the land had been declared vacant land. They had some vague promises that grants might be made to the natives under certain conditions when annexation took place. As they were all aware, land was no use without labour, and labour under the conditions which existed in the Congo must be slavery. He hoped they would agree that no conditions in the form of annexation would be accepted which did not first of all admit the communal rights of the tribes where they existed. They should also insist that all those cruelties which were exciting in the minds of British people feelings of horror should be put an end to. There was one remedy which he hoped his right hon. friend would take in hand at once, and that was to appoint more Consuls in those districts in the Congo Free State. He felt that the presence of an active British Consul in one or other of these districts which were being devastated would have a very beneficial effect. He hoped this condition would be insisted upon, and that this country would withhold its recognition of annexation until such guarantees were given as would ensure the proper carrying on of the government of the country. It was now four years or more since these negotiations began, and many times in this Parliament they had discussed this very important question. It had also been discussed in great assemblies all over the country, and he thought the time had come when Belgium should be made to understand that no more dilatory process of dealing with this question would be allowed. He hoped that his right hon. friend would say that the time had come for some more definite action. This was in no wise a party question. It was a subject which had excited the indignation of a great many of our fellow citizens throughout the kingdom, and if ever there was a case in which the life-blood of a people called loudly for help this was a case, and he could not feel that they would call upon his right hon. friend in vain.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): Everyone knows that great anxiety and very deep interest are felt in this country with regard to the decision which the Belgian Parliament will, I presume, now take in a very short time. But I will ask those who do feel anxiety in regard to this question to remember also that, however much the decision may be a matter of anxiety to those who have treaty rights in regard to the existing Congo State, it must be a matter of very great anxiety at this moment to Belgium herself. The Belgian Parliament is on the eve of taking one of the most anxious and momentous decisions that have ever been before a State—the question of whether they should take over, with all its obligations and all the existing conditions now attached to it, this enormous territory of the Congo. It is really impossible for us to discuss with complete freedom, at a moment when the decision of the Belgian Parliament is in suspense, the whole question of the Congo. I do not think it is fair, and I think it would be resented there, if, while they are in the throes of a decision, they were to be harassed by constant declarations from a foreign Government on the subject of the Congo. What I thought the other day was necessary was that the position of the British Government and its view of its treaty rights should be made quite clear to the Belgian Government and published before the Belgian Parliament came to its decision. That has been done in the Papers already laid and published, and further Papers will be laid very soon. I should have been glad if they could have been laid this week, but it is only fair that they should be laid simultaneously here and in Belgium. I am now informed that they cannot be published before the beginning of next week, and the House will then have risen for what, after all, is to be a comparatively short holiday. I would ask hon. Members in advance to bear in mind that, although the Papers cannot be published for a week, yet, when the Papers do appear, further correspondence must take place, and before any final decision is come to which commits this country to any final view of the matter, the whole question will be seriously considered by His Majesty's Government. We shall also have to consider the view which the United States takes of the situation, and further Papers will be presented to the House before the country can be committed in any way to a final view by His Majesty's Government on this question. That covers one part of the question of my hon. friend. Another point which he pressed was—What will happen supposing the Belgian Parliament do not come to any decision to annex? I replied the other day to the hon. Member for Gravesend, and I take the same view of the situation which would then arise as I did when I then spoke. A very serious question would arise for us to consider. Supposing Belgium decided not to annex, and supposing we had, for an indefinite time, to deal with the existing state of affairs in the Congo, which we consider has been a violation of our treaty rights and of the obligations on which the Congo State was originally founded—if we have to revert to that situation—then a very serious question will have arisen. It cannot be a departmental decision on our part; it must receive the serious consideration of His Majesty's Government as a whole. All I can say now is that, if that situation does arise, it will receive the serious consideration of the Government as a whole, because we are not prepared to revert to the old condition of affairs under which for years our treaty rights have been violated. I trust that such a situation will not arise, but that the Belgian Parliament will soon come to its decision, and will not leave us in any doubt. But should the Belgian Parliament come to a decision not to annex, then, as I have said and I still hold, the situation is one which His Majesty's Government will have to consider very carefully, and whatever we do must be some new departure from the old policy.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) called attention to the prison treatment of the suffragists now undergoing terms of imprisonment for offences arising out of the "votes for women" movement. Whatever might be said of the merits of the claim, he maintained that the offences for which the women had been committed to prison were political offences. There were between twenty and thirty women in prison for offences connected with the movement, and until quite recently he had not the smallest notion that there was anything rigorous in their treatment. Political prisoners were treated as first class misdemeanants, they were allowed to do their own work, they had their own food supplied to them, and they were allowed to see their friends. In short, they were placed in the same position as Dr. Jameson when he was committed to prison in connection with the Transvaal Raid. But he found that the treatment to which these ladies were subjected was very much the reverse. They had behaved like heroines, for, to do them justice, they had made no complaint themselves. He had not the slightest idea that these ladies were placed in a position of humiliation, and that they were subjected to severe physical hardships, until casually he looked at a newspaper and saw a letter from an old friend, Mr. Logan, in which he described what his daughter had endured during six weeks imprisonment. The treatment meted out to that brave girl was not what anyone should be subjected to for a suffragist offence. Mr. Logan stated in his letter that his daughter, who had just been released, was confined during twenty-three hours per day in a solitary cell, and that the hour during which she was let out was divided between attendance at chapel and a round of exercise. The cell was unwholesome, and it rarely let in the light.

*Mr. SPEAKER: How does the hon. Member think this matter is relevant to the Appropriation Bill?

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: The salary of the Home Secretary is in the Appropriation Bill. My contention is that the Home Secretary should have removed these ladies from the second class division to the first class division.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That does not rest with the Home Secretary. It rests with the committing magistrates. That has been pointed out several times. It is entirely in the discretion of the magistrates.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Irrespective altogether of that discretion, the Home Secretary is the Minister who exercises the prerogative of mercy, and he can modify these sentences. The precedents are strong. There is the precedent of the Jameson case. There are the precedents of cases in which prisoners are sentenced to death and where the Crown commutes the sentence. Of course, if you think that I am in the slightest degree out of order, I will not pursue the subject now, but I will raise the question in another way. I am criticising the action of the Home Secretary in not advising the Crown to place those ladies, notwithstanding the magistrates' decision, in the position of first-class misdemeanants.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is a matter which the Home Secretary has not in his power. It rests with the hon. Member to show that he has the power. I have heard it several times denied from the box.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: This is the constitutional law of the case. The Home Secretary is the Minister responsible for the exercise of the prerogative which the Crown has, and which has never been taken from it, to modify a sentence. He is the person who has really the control in this matter. He is the Minister of justice. These matters—prison regulations and the moving of offenders from one class of misdemeanants to another—are actually vested in him, and would be vested in him no matter what any statute says, unless the prerogative of mercy, vested in the Crown, is abrogated by statute, and, not only abrogated by statute, but abrogated by the previous consent of the Crown.

*Mr. SPEAKER: These ladies were imprisoned by their own choice.

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down for consideration by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LONDON AND DISTRICT ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL [Lords] (By Order).

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this Bill be read a second time."

*Mr. CHAPLIN (Surrey, Wimbledon) said he did not rise to oppose the Bill on general grounds; nor was he concerned to take that course, but he found that the Borough of Wimbledon and the Urban District of Merton were both of them included in the area defined in Clause 48, and that their inclusion would be highly injurious to those parts of the constituency which he represented. Those were the grounds upon which, in the absence of Members who had notices on the Paper, he opposed the Second Reading of the Bill, and when he had stated his reasons for doing so, he believed the House would agree that he was right. His objections were founded on the facts contained in the petition from the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the Borough of Wimbledon against the Bill. That borough contained an area of 3,220 acres, a population of 50,000, a rateable value of £454,000, and the needs and requirements of that area, and the population, as to the supply of energy both for lighting and power purposes were amply met already by the petitioners themselves, who were the undertakers for this purpose in that particular locality, under various Electric Lighting Orders dating from 1897 to 1903. In the case of Wimbledon under the Electric Lighting Order, 1887, confirmed by the Electric Lighting Order, 1897, Confirmation (No. 2) Act, 1897, and in the case of Merton, under the Wimbledon Electric Lighting (Extension) Order, 1903, confirmed by the Electric Lighting Confirmation (No. 7) Act of 1893, the petitioners had erected a generating station and other works at a capital cost of no less than £182,394, and they were now supplying energy for the public lighting of their borough, and to consumers within their area of supply both for light and power. That being so, the petitioners very naturally complained that there was no justification whatever for this new company seeking to invade their territory and to compete with them in the supply of electric light or power. He submitted that in the case of an undertaking so recently established as 1893 it would be contrary to public policy, and would inflict a great and unmerited loss on the ratepayers of the district. In proof of this it was stated by the petitioners that the Bill had been so drawn that if passed in its present form it would enable the company to compete with the existing undertaking of the local authority both inside and outside the county of London in such a way as to deprive them of their best business, actual and prospective. And it would be idle to deny that if the company got the powers sought for and the capital to put them in force they would be enabled to take away some business from the borough undertaking, seeing it would be worth the company's while to offer a supply of electricity at very low or even unremunerative terms to the would-be consumers so as to cripple the existing undertaking and force the undertakers to sell their undertaking to the company. So far as the districts of Wimbledon and Merton were concerned, that was the case he had to submit to the consideration of the House against the Bill. He was not concerned to oppose the Bill on other grounds, but it seemed to him that it would be only right and fair with regard to these two places that they should be excluded altogether from Clause 48. If he had an understanding on that point he would not feel it necessary to oppose the Second Reading of the Bill, but until he had he should do so, and with that object he begged to move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

*Mr. TIMOTHY DAVIES (Fulham) said he was very glad to second the Amendment, although not for the reasons given by the right hon. Gentleman. Even if the right hon. Gentleman withdrew his objection it was his intention to press the Amendment to a division. He was sorry that the Bill had been set down for Second Reading at so late a day in this part of the session when so many hon. Members had gone away, and when possibly more than half of them were absent from London. The progress of the Bill could not have been accelerated in any way by bringing on the Second Reading that night, and it might have been taken at a later date, when a full House could have been present. His objection to the Bill was founded on principle and not on a few details; and that could not be overcome by any suggested Amendments in Committee. They had been told that the whole of the London Members, with the exception of two, were in favour of the Bill. He thought that that was a most misleading statement, as there were a large number of representatives of London constituencies who were prepared to vote against the Second Reading. They had been also told that the two Members referred to were the agents of the Metropolitan borough councils, and that they took the very narrowest views on questions like that involved in the Second Reading of the Bill. He did not represent the Metropolitan borough councils, although his own borough agreed with the course he was taking. His object, and that of those who were supporting him, was to stop the Bill at this stage and prevent it getting into Committee, in order to save the money of the ratepayers and of the promoters, although with the latter he had not so much concern. They opposed the Bill because it proposed to give powers to the promoters gratis over a vast area which they had done nothing to develop, but which had been built up by the ratepayers' money to a very large extent. The area was different from any other in the world, and there were already within it thirty-five or forty authorities supplying electricity to the public. In the County of London alone there were sixteen municipal authorities. The area contained a large population which a few years hence would amount to no less than 10,000,000. It included large portions of four different counties. He admitted that the supply of cheap electricity was very important, but he could prove easily that there was nothing offered to consumers in the Bill which would come below the prices at present charged by existing authorities, especially to small consumers. The large consumers could take care of themselves and make their own bargains. There was nothing in the Bill to compel this company to supply electricity for power purposes at a rate lower than that at which it was already supplied. There were other things besides cheap electricity to be considered. If the Bill passed in its present form without some modification of some of its clauses it gave power to the company to break up streets without asking the permission of anyone. Great objection was taken to that power being given to the company. The number of authorities in the Metropolis who were entitled to break up the streets for their own purposes was already so large, and their powers were so extensive, and the expense caused to the local authorities by their actions so great, that he contended that this power should not be granted except in cases of absolute necessity. No one would contend that to have electric energy at the lowest price was a necessity. If this Bill was passed power would be given to this great monopoly to compete with its weaker neighbours, whether they were private companies or municipal authorities, and to supply for a certain period within particular areas energy at such a price as would compel their competitors to accept their terms for their undertaking. What would become of "cheap electricity" after that had been accomplished, and when at the end of ten or fifteen years this huge monopoly had the whole of the area entirely at its mercy? These great monopolies when they came to Parliament for powers always posed as philanthropists. From reading the Bill before the House one would imagine that eight or ten gentlemen were promoting the Bill as a matter of pure philanthropy, and were spending their money in order that people should be able to obtain cheap electricity. When they had obtained their powers it would not be 1d. or 2d., but 4d. or 5d. per unit that they would charge. Furthermore, there was no obligation on the part of the company to supply anybody unless they desired to do so. The President of the Board of Trade wished to insert a provision that this undertaking should be purchased by the London County Council at a certain date. Let the House contrast that with what transpired in 1906, when a Bill promoted by a "progressive" London County Council was before the Committee. That Bill was dropped owing to the then President of the Board of Trade seeking to make it obligatory upon them to provide energy to all who asked for it. If that was necessary then why not now? That right hon. Gentleman also suggested in 1907 that the Bill of that year should contain a clause giving power to the London County Council, if they so desired, to lease the undertaking until 1931, at which date the undertaking should resort entirely to the municipalities of London. This company now came asking for power to lease the undertaking until 1961, with a provision that it should be competent to the London County Council to purchase the undertaking in 1931. They could purchase it, but at what price? Not at the price of the cost of the material alone, but with the value of the goodwill for thirty years tacked on, and added to that price 10 per cent. was to go to the promoters. The thing was monstrous. The purchase clause was a sham, and was never intended to be anything else. He seconded the rejection of the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) expressed his pleasure in supporting his hon. friend the Member for Fulham in this matter. The hon. Gentleman's constituency was at one end of London, and his own was at the other, and that might be taken as the extent of the feeling that had been raised by this Bill. He did not intend to refer to the purchase clause, monstrous though it was, except to point out that the form of that clause was an indication to the House of how little they could trust a Parliamentary Committee to protect the interests of London. Those who had these interests at heart, therefore, must take the duty upon themselves and give the Bill its quietus. He did not rest his objection to the Bill upon the purchase clause, which it might be contended could be altered, but on far broader grounds. He objected to the creation of great monopolies. He objected to these great powers being handed over to a speculative syndicate. Surely London had suffered enough from similar policy in the past. Recently London had to buy out the water companies at a price which had tied a dead weight round the neck of the ratepayers for the next three generations. Yet, with a light heart, the House was asked, and London Members were urged, to repeat the old mistake upon a colossal scale. It was proposed to bring into existence a company with a capital of £4,500,000, and to grant to that company power to manufacture, sell, and distribute in bulk electrical power for London, and an enormous area round London. It was proposed to authorise the company to tear up the streets in order to lay down their pipes, to abstract from the Thames 200,000,000 gallons of water daily, and to carry their line, whether the London County Council liked it or not, through the Blackwall and Rotherhithe Tunnels. He mentioned these matters to show how extraordinary were some of the concessions which it was proposed to confer upon Sir Hugh Bell, Bart., and the syndicate of gentlemen named in the Bill. The Bill gave to the new company powers to compete with the existing municipal distributors of electricity. He knew the borough councils were not popular in certain quarters, but he could not forget that they represented the London ratepayers, and that it was the money of London ratepayers—and there were many millions of that money—which was at rest in these municipal enterprises. It was said by those who differed from him that they ought to be willing to accept the Bill, because the London County Council was to have power to purchase the undertaking. The company would be put in a position to destroy businesses which had been built up with the money of the London ratepayers, represented by the London County Council; and, when those businesses had been destroyed, it was proposed to buy the company, again with the money of the ratepayers of London, represented by the London County Council. Such a grotesque scheme had never been conceived outside the realms of Gilbertian opera. It was a farce from many points of view, but it was a tragedy for the London ratepayers. It was said—and this weighed with some people—that the Bill would give a cheap supply of electricity; but he contended, without fear of contradiction, that there was no security within the four corners of the Bill of a cheap supply at all. It was true the second schedule contained a scale of prices, but it was not a scale of prices for electrical power to the ordinary consumer, but for the supply in bulk to distributive companies. It might be that large industrial concerns which took a very large supply would get it at a shade lower than the price they were paying at the present time; but there was no kind of security in the Bill for the protection of the man with a small industrial concern, whom this House ought to protect. He was surprised that some of his colleagues were going to support the Bill. He considered their reasons were absolutely inadequate, and he could hardly understand how hon. Gentlemen who, upon a hundred platforms had denounced this policy of handing over London to a speculative company, could now turn their backs upon their convictions and vote for the Bill. He cordially supported its rejection.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKINNON WOOD, Glasgow, St. Rollox) said he could hardly give a silent vote upon the question. His two hon. friends had dealt with it as if it were a very simple matter indeed, but he did not know any subject which was much more complicated than the present position of the supply of electricity in London, and there was no subject affecting great industrial interests which was in a more unsatisfactory condition. He might be entirely wrong and his hon. friends right, but the reasons they had adduced did not prove it in the least. The hon. Member for Fulham was quite inaccurate in some of his descriptions of the Bill. He had pointed out that the Board of Trade required the Council to enter into an obligation to supply electricity, and he said that therein they had treated the Council worse than they had treated this company. Personally, he objected, as the mover of the Second Reading of the Council Bill, to its being made obligatory; but in the sense in which it was desired to make that Bill obligatory this Bill was also obligatory. It was an entire mistake to suppose there was any difference between the two.

MR. TIMOTHY DAVIES: It is not made obligatory upon the company to supply the small consumers.

*MR. McKINNON WOOD said his hon. friend displayed his ignorance in that remark. The Council was not obliged to supply small consumers. There was this contradiction in the arguments of both his hon. friends. They complained in the first place that the company would compete with the borough councils, and secondly, that it would not have to supply small consumers. It was for the protection of the borough councils that the provisions had been put in, limiting their powers of supply. It was a bulk Bill for the supply of electricity to distributors. He held no brief for the company, but he might say that the price in the Bill was the lowest ever inserted in any Bill for supply in bulk, and it was lower than the County Council itself proposed. The complication of the question arose from the fact that powers were given for electrical supply at the time when there was no central authority in London. So far as they were given to municipal authorities, they were given to vestries in areas too small for the purpose. The supply of electrical power was a matter of great industrial importance and urgency. The Committee which dealt with the matter in 1906 pointed out that in their opinion the provision of further electrical power in London was so important and pressing that they did not view with favour the possibility of the question being indefinitely hung up. He entirely agreed with his hon. friend in prefering a complete municipal solution of the matter; and in 1906 he had the honour, on behalf of the London County Council, of introducing a Bill for dealing with the question by way of creating a municipal bulk supply, though he must point out that if that Bill had passed they would not have got a complete and unified electrical supply. He very much preferred that solution to the solution with which they were faced at the present day. The objects with which he brought the Bill of 1906 forward were three. First of all it was that they should have a cheap supply of electricity in London; secondly, that they might ultimately have a unification of that supply; and, thirdly, that they might ultimately have a municipal supply. He had not changed his views. He believed in these objects now and thought them desirable, and any action he might take on this subject would be in the direction of those objects and in no other direction, but it was not so simple a question whether those objects were best obtained by rejecting the Bill or by dealing with it as proposed by the President of the Board of Trade. Last year, so much did he feel the urgency of the question, that when the County Council brought in a Bill with modifications to which he was entirely opposed, he advocated its Second Reading, hoping that it might be so shaped in Committee as to bring about the objects he had described. There was no municipal Bill this year, and there was no possibility whatever of one. He would not for a moment support the Bill if it were not for the important modifications proposed in the instruction of the President of the Board of Trade, nor did he in the least approve of the proposed terms of purchase which came to them from a Committee of the other House. The period of fifty-two years was too long and other terms required modification; but it was obviously a matter which should be referred to a Committee of the House. If the terms of purchase were still somewhat exorbitant, then it would be a matter for consideration on Third Reading. He wanted to point out the different classes of objection to the Bill. First of all, there was the kind of objection represented by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon. He said: "Cut Wimbledon out of the Bill and I do not care what you do." Members came from various borough councils in London and their argument was just the same. To hear hon. Members speak one would imagine that this company had unrestricted power of competition with Wimbledon, Bethnal Green, and Fulham. He was not ignorant as to the sources of the opposition, but the powers of competition were most carefully safeguarded. If the proposals of the promoters of the Bill had been carried they would have had certain advantages to consumers, but they would have permitted more effective competition with the existing authorities. But that competition had been carefully safeguarded. The existing companies had had a great opportunity of settling the matter in their own way. It was a very extraordinary thing. They had had no whisper of opposition to the proposals of the existing companies, but if the proposals of the existing companies were carried without this Bill they were sterilising the development of electricity in London, because once they gave these companies the power of linking up they would hear no more of cheapening electricity. If they had put forward a definite scheme for a comprehensive supply and a large central generating station, they would have occupied an unassailable position. But instead of that they had failed to agree. They had two Bills representing two groups of these companies. They put forward the view that there was an adequate provision at the present moment, that they supplied all the power that was necessary, and he supposed, quite cheaply enough. He thought electricity ought to be about half the price it was at present. They actually said that their present generating stations were adequate. Were progressive London members to accept that position? Were they to be so indifferent to the industrial development of London as to let the matter stand in that position and allow the borough councils and the existing companies to go on as they were at present? Committee after committee had had that argument before them and rejected that solution. No Committee had taken the view of the existing companies. Then they had an opposition which was more serious—that of the borough councils. When he had the duty of trying to pilot a municipal bulk supply Bill through a Committee, his bitterest and most effective opponents were the borough councils. They cared nothing for the supply of electricity in London, but they did care for the supply of electricity in Fulham, Bethnal Green, and Wimbledon. They took a purely parochial view. Month by month, almost week by week, the County Council had applications from borough councils for capital in order to extend generating stations, which in many cases were too small for economic working, and too badly placed to supply cheap electricity. The remedy for that was to have a cheap bulk supply, so that the supplemental supply might not be got by an extravagant waste of capital, but be given from a large station which could supply on the cheapest possible terms. Seeing that the London County Council would not provide that generating station, which was the solution he would have preferred, he was not prepared to say he would not allow anyone else to do it. It was to the interest, not only of the ratepayers of London, and the vast district outside, which was growing and requiring more electricity, but of the ratepayers in the areas which his hon. friends thought they were defending, because if those ratepayers were going on in an uneconomical way their undertakings could not possibly be so profitable or supply at so cheap a rate as if they were getting their bulk supply on the best possible terms. But the crux of the whole question, and this was the consideration which would determine his vote, was that they had not only not got a proper municipal supply, but they had no prospect of a unified municipal supply under the present system. The right of purchase that existed was nominal and not real and effective. The borough councils, though they had a nominal right of purchase, had in only one or two cases any practical hope of ever buying the undertakings of the company. One company which supplied nine different local authority areas had only two generating stations, and it was a common case that the mains were purchaseable, but they would not be able to buy the generating stations. What was the position about this right of purchase? Were the borough councils losing anything substantial? They were only losing a nominal right in nine cases out of ten and not an effective right, because the small area, even if they could purchase, could never be a permanent solution of the question. These borough councils objected as strongly to a comprehensive bulk supply being given by the County Council as they now objected to a supply being given by a company. His hon. friend did not raise the question of the area or the engineering proposals, and that was very natural because the engineering proposals were the same as existed in the Council's Bill, and the area was very nearly the same. He was rather surprised at the hon. Member for Fulham objecting to seeing the County Council go outside its own area for a municipal purpose. That was not the kind of sentiment he expected from him. That was the very difficulty they had to deal with in the case of the waterworks, which led to the setting up of a board, and that was the difficulty which had given rise to proposals about traffic. One of the reasons why he welcomed this proposal was that it would give the County Council power to purchase an undertaking which extended beyond its area, because they must recognise that where they had a great town and surrounding areas, which were best served by municipal undertakings, they must give the great town the opportunity of serving the areas which were not within the artificial lines of local government. That was one of the great advantages in the proposal of the President of the Board of Trade. He recommended the House to give the Bill a Second Reading and refer it to a Committee, who would consider what would be a just scheme of purchase, a scheme which would be fair to the ratepayers of London. He did not agree with the present scheme, but he believed they could not consider this Bill by itself. They had to consider the position of the companies. The Committee had agreed to give them powers of linking up. It would be a calamity to give the existing companies a power of linking up without creating a bulk supply. They had to consider the matter altogether. His ultimate object was unification and municipalisation of the electricity supply. They could not get that all at once. If they had carried their Bills in 1906 they would only have got one step towards that end. He was not prepared to refuse to take a step which was practicable at the moment; and everybody knew that there was no probability of the present London County Council bringing forward a municipal proposal. The difficult questions of purchase and of deciding what was to be the ultimate authority would thus be settled, and he regarded that as so great a step forward, that he would vote for this Bill.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford) speaking as a representative of three municipal authorities which had undertaken electric lighting and trams and were supplying great works with electricity, said that he was rightly asked by those authorities to look after their interest and welfare when a large supply like this was being created. The hon. Gentleman had put forward certain qualifications which he hoped might be embodied when the Bill came out of the Committee, and then appealed to them to let the Bill go to Committee, urging that if these things were not conceded they could deal with the Bill on Third Reading. But when they fought a private Bill on principle they must take it on the Second Reading. If they moved to reject a Bill on Third Reading the stereotyped argument was that they should have taken the earlier opportunity, that huge expense had been incurred and the Bill thrashed out before a Committee, and that it would be wrong to go against the Committee's decision? His hon. friend said he knew the sources from which the opposition sprang. He thought those were the right sources to look after their interests. He was not attacking private companies, but he was specially concerned in the question from the point of view of municipal authorities who had their own supply. Could they be expected to sit silently by while a big corporation came into existence, without taking every opportunity to defend the right given them by Parliament and to see that the welfare of the community was looked after? The promoters of this Bill were absorbing a large portion of Kent, and he wanted to know why they were going there. If the County Council did not purchase in the year 1931 then this large trust would have another ten years, and again if not bought up at the end of that ten years this huge corporation would continue for a further period. Practically this great corporation would say to the municipal authorities: "Although we have no authority over your area we are going to purchase you out of existence." Did the Government think that was an easy task? Why was the Water Board formed? Simply because there were a series of water companies in existence the areas of which were not confined to the area of the London County Council, but went out into the other surrounding counties. That was exactly the case in this Bill. The moment an attempt was made to buy out those outside areas they would say: "If you are going to purchase our electric supply we must have a voice in the matter." The same thing would arise in connection with the electric supply as happened in regard to the water supply.

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: But we have avoided that.

Mr. ROWLANDS said that was not so. On the contrary they were creating it. In his district they had a distinct supply of their own which they thought they could control themselves. There were other municipal authorities in the area dealt with who had control of their own electric lighting and trams, and supplied the local industries with electricity, and of course, they meant to have a voice in this matter. He supposed that his experience with regard to municipal light in London was not shorter than that of any other hon. Member in the House. In fact, he thought he had been mixed up with it longer than any other hon. Member. He knew the great difficulties attending any attempt to get areas extended. He was not going to deal with the question of purchase because that had nothing to do with it. His hon. friend had thrown that question to the four winds of heaven. He would like to know what security they had after passing the Second Reading that they would have any better terms put in upstairs. They were all aware that the details of the Bill must be discussed upstairs, but the measure having passed the Committee they had to look at the terms inserted with the consent of the promoters, and so far as they knew those were the terms that would pass. If they altered those terms root and branch they would take away the whole of the demand of the promoters; they would have incurred an enormous expenditure of the money of the local authorities, and on the Third Reading they would have to reject the measure. What did this octopus want to do? It wanted to cross the Thames through the tunnels constructed at the expense of the ratepayers, and come into the areas of the local authorities, and it was not going to supply the small consumer—the localities could do that, because it would not pay. It was said that they would have the protection of the Board of Trade, but he preferred not to rely upon that. In his district they had now the power to supply their own manufacturers with electricity, and they were doing it. He was strongly in favour of a cheap supply of electricity, but he was also strongly and determinedly opposed to creating another trust. Along with some of his hon. friends he had fought gigantic monopolies like the water companies, year after year, and he was old enough to remember when Mr. Cross's Bill was introduced in the latter part of the seventies. They succeeded in getting rid of the water companies and they had got a public supply. Now they had an important measure promoted by the Board of Trade, passing through a Joint Committee, the object of which was to get all the private interest in the Docks of London into the hands of a public authority, in order that the well-being of the community at large might be looked after. That

Bill provided for things which he did not care for, but they had always realised that it was necessary to have one great public authority representing varied interests, from the working men to the wharfingers and the merchants, and consequently they created a public authority to manage the river. If they could introduce a scheme to constitute a body for the purpose of looking after the interests of municipal authorities now supplying electricity in bulk they were prepared to consider it, but with the experience they had had of these great enterprises he hoped they were not going to create any more of them. The time to fight this Bill was now. They were not going to allow to be created a huge trust which had not in any way promised them a cheaper supply of electricity nor undertaken to meet the difficulty of giving a bulk supply under proper conditions. He contended that this was a question which ought to be in the hands of the representatives of the people.

* MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said he was going to vote in the same lobby as the hon. Member who had just spoken, but he came to the same conclusion from a somewhat different point of view. He was not so much in love with municipal enterprise of all kinds; but Parliament having for many years not only allowed but encouraged local bodies to supply electricity, he did not favour the proposal to create a private body now, with power to compete with the local bodies. The hon. Member who from the Treasury Bench said he was in favour of the municipal solution had a strange way of showing it. It was said that this Bill would supply them with cheap electrical energy, but there was no provision in the Bill that the consumer should get the energy cheap. Even if a limit were inserted it would be an illusion. This great body might begin with cheap energy and the effect would be to destroy other sources of supply. When that end had been achieved and the other competing authorities had gone, prices would go up and the consumer would have to pay a great deal more. The hon. Member who spoke from the Treasury Bench said that if they allowed existing companies to combine they would put up the price. Surely that was equally true of the body they were proposing to create under this Bill. He noticed that the purchase clause had gone, or at any rate, it had been abandoned.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): They are going to propose thirty years goodwill.

* MR. CAVE said that they were going to give purchasing powers to the London County Council. After all, the local authorities outside of London thought that they could manage their own affairs, and the proposal that the London County Council, with all its merits, should have power to extend its hand, not only over the great county of London, but over three neighbouring counties to the exclusion of the county councils of those counties, was one which he could not support. He did not wish to say a word against the London County Council, but the proposal now made was antagonistic to the principle of local government, because it proposed that one county council should have power to go into the area of others. The instruction proposed to be given to insert a power for the London County Council to purchase the undertaking would make the Bill worse.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) could not understand why the Government had taken up this Bill. There were many interesting private Members' Bills which they might have taken up which would have been a real boon to the community, instead of giving facilities for a company like this to fleece the public. His hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education had used an elaborate argument to show how they could get over the trouble. He had always thought it a wicked thing to get over trouble in our own time, and leave it to somebody else. If there was fighting to be done, why did they not tackle it themselves? Had the Government taken this course because they wanted certain opposition out of the way at the next election? The question was whether what was now proposed was right or wrong. These people were not coming in from love of the small trader. They were giving these people power for all time, and it was quite easy to see what would happen. Why were these great interests being studied? This Bill, while looking after certain interests, would leave all the other people out. Why did not the Government say to all the authorities in and around London: "We will create a board and give you representation upon it." That would have been a strong policy to pursue, and no one would have dared to say that the board was being created in the interest of a few people who desired to do the work for the public good, while also desirous at the same time of getting a little more percentage out of it for themselves. The question in connection with these enterprises always was "How much more can I get out of it?" He could not understand the late Progressive Leader in the London County Council speaking in favour of the Bill. There ought to be no easy path to an honest goal, and if they had to fight, let them fight now, and not put it off to future generations. They were asked to create the biggest trust that London had ever known or ever would know, and one that left the water companies absolutely in the shade. He thought he was entitled to ask whether there were many parties in the House who were interested in the Bill, and whether the Deputy Speaker, if he was in the Chair when the question was put, would instruct that no person interested in it should go into the lobby to vote upon it. They were entitled to know that, because it left a prodigious amount of suspicion in his mind. He hoped he might be wrong. He hated to think that anybody would vote from personal interest, but they should be satisfied on the point. Why had the Government taken it up? What was behind it all? He asked the Government to leave the matter entirely to the House rather than that a profit-mongering scheme like this should be foisted on London and the neighbouring districts.

*MR. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) said that the discussion showed how very complicated the question now before the House was. It was a question which could not be decided by a mere application of first principles, however lofty those principles might be. He

would like to say a word in reply to the observations that fell from his hon. friend the Member for Kingston and others with regard to the position of the local authorities outside of London. They asked why the local authorities outside London should be affected by the Bill. The answer was to be found in the considered Report of the Committee of the House which sat in 1906, which showed that no promoter could possibly put forward a scheme for the bulk supply of London which would not apply outside. There were two paragraphs on page 4 of the Report in the following terms—

> "The Committee are of opinion that the best means of providing for the supply of electrical energy in bulk, and for power and motive purposes, is by one large and inclusive scheme extending not only over the entire County of London, but also to adjoining boroughs and districts."

> "For the purpose of carrying out such a scheme some central authority is required with ample statutory powers and corresponding duties. In addition to the proposal of the London County Council various other proposals have been placed before the Committee. After giving full consideration to this question the Committee are of opinion that the London County Council should be the authority."

That, he submitted, settled the question raised in regard to the outside supply. He admitted that some of the municipalities were supplying electricity now with very great success, but, nevertheless, if it could be shown that the public could be better and more cheaply served by means of a large supply of electricity in bulk, which could be sold through the medium of the local authorities, that was a matter worthy of the consideration of a Committee of the House. Personally, he had a great deal of sympathy with the arguments of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway opposite, but he was bound to say in fairness to the Government, and in fairness to those who supported the course which had been taken, that the hon. Members who had spoken as representing London constituencies had spoken without a full knowledge of the facts. His hon. friend the Member for Woolwich had taken up a very strong position in regard to this Bill. The hon. Member said that he could not understand why the late leader of the Progressive Party should stick up for the Bill. He hoped that he would be able to show to the House that his hon. friend in so acting was doing what was really best for London, and for the municipal administration of the whole of the surrounding area. It was for that reason he supported the proposal of his hon. friend that this Bill should be allowed to go upstairs to a Committee.

Last year there was a Bill before the House, promoted by the Progressive majority on the former London County Council, to authorise that body to provide a bulk supply and to buy out the existing companies in London. That Bill would have enabled the County Council to supply the London borough councils at a very much cheaper rate than they could supply themselves, and would have afforded the only arrangement whereby the chaotic condition of the present supply could be made to work to the advantage of the public. He did not believe that the House realised the position of London in regard to the supply of electricity. There were no fewer than sixteen borough councils and thirteen different companies which supplied electricity at present, each of them having their own customers. As regarded the companies they were all purchasable at one time or another—in 1914, 1918, 1921, 1928, but all by 1931. A provision in the Bill of last year gave power to the London County Council to purchase all these undertakings at the dates at which they fell due, and the reason for this was that even with the existing powers of purchase, it would be impossible for many of the boroughs actually to exercise their power of purchase in 1931, because their areas were not conterminous with the areas of supply by the companies. They had not all of them a generating station and some of them had their generating station outside their area. It was therefore thought advisable in the public interest that in 1931 there should be one authority who should have control over so large an area so that it might buy the whole of the combined undertakings when these were purchasable in 1931. It was for this purpose that the Bill of the Progressive Party in the London County Council was brought forward. The electorate of London, however, had refused in a very distinct and definite way to authorise the Council to institute a bulk supply, and immediately after the election the Moderate majority in the London County Council practically said that they would have nothing whatever to do with the bulk supply of electricity. He maintained that the House was bound to consider this question from a practical point of view, and to recognise that the municipal authority in London for the present was not willing to undertake anything like the duties which such a Bill would have placed on them. So those who were anxious to protect the interests of the public thought it right to ascertain whether there was any other means of attaining that end. He thought they could, and that if this Bill went to a Committee upstairs with the Instruction which had been put on the Order Paper by the Board of Trade, it would come back in such a form as would enable the public in a very short distance of time to enter into possession of their rights and to supply electricity in bulk. He believed that without endangering the principle of ultimate public supply and possession an immediate and cheaper supply could be achieved by the Bill. Cheapness was absolutely essential, and that could be attained, because there was a clause in the Bill to establish what was known as a sliding scale, which would reduce the price in concert with increases in dividend. Also the very fact that this company would have power to compete with other companies, would undoubtedly lower the price. He believed that no one in the House would object to that, but that they did object to the borough councils being placed in a position of competition with this company. He certainly would not vote for any Bill which he thought had any power in it which would destroy the municipal work carried on by the borough councils. If the Bill were carefully read, he believed that the fears of the borough councils in this respect had not the serious foundation which was represented. It was proposed that the company should not have the right to supply electricity to small customers without the consent of the borough councils, and if the borough councils objected, the company could appeal to the Board of Trade, which, after going into the whole question of capital expenditure, might over-rule the objection as unreasonable. But even this point could be re-considered by the Committee upstairs. He did not see how anyone could desire to see the borough councils displaced as long as they were doing good work. This was the first time a Bill establishing a bulk supply had contained a clause of purchase at all. In 1898 the Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons considered the question. The London County Council then strongly represented that the bulk supply undertakings should be purchased, but that Committee reported against the proposal, stating that bulk supply was not a proper subject for municipal control. But they had got in this Bill a practical operative purchase clause. The main difficulty lay in the fact that there was no authority which could properly purchase the undertakings at the present moment, and therefore it was desirable that the Committee upstairs should establish the London County Council as an authority to purchase the bulk supply. His hon. friend had said that the terms were not good, but the Committee upstairs could vary them. He himself thought that the terms were somewhat harsh, and that the period before which purchase was to be made was too long. The great thing, however, was that the company's undertakings were to be purchasable at one time or another. An objection had been raised as to the possibility of this company buying up the existing companies, and so becoming a great monopoly. That was a matter with which the Committee was perfectly capable of dealing; but even under the present Bill the company could not do so without the leave of the Board of Trade. However, the Committee could strengthen the provisions of the Bill so as to make it absolutely certain that the company could not purchase the other undertakings. That was the position in which the London Members were satisfied to let the Bill go upstairs. If they allowed the present opportunity to pass of practically securing to the public of London the reversion at no distant date of the whole of the electrical undertakings, he thought they would be making a very serious mistake. It was for that reason that he asked the House to give its support to the Second Reading of the Bill accompanied with the Instruction to be moved by the President of the Board of Trade.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) said that the hon. Member who had just spoken had perhaps better explained this Bill and the motives of those who promoted it than any Member who had previously addressed the House. The hon. Member was referred to somewhat sneeringly as "the late leader of the Progressive Party" by speakers below the gangway, who saw in him an illustration of the inevitable tendency of office to modify extreme opinions. It seemed to him that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the front bench must feel that hon. Members below the gangway had been extremely ungrateful to them for not recognising that these proposals really constituted a Machiavellian scheme to convert the London County Council into the lighting authority for the whole of London. The process was quite obvious. They could not themselves provide a supply of bulk electricity, but they consented to the creation of a company for that purpose, in order subsequently to purchase its business. Then they would take powers by the two other Bills to take over the rights now possessed by the borough councils. In the end they would see the London County Council not only in possession of the revenue of all those powers, but the lighting authority for London, making it the greatest employer of labour in London, and a machine which could be manipulated for electoral purposes by the Government of the day. At present he did not know whether he was voting on the Bill as it was or the Bill with the proposed Instruction attached to it. It was obvious that the Instruction giving the London County Council powers of purchase would be carried, and therefore he had to regard the Bill as having that Instruction attached to it. As the hon. Member opposite who spoke for the Government (Mr. McKinnon Wood) mentioned Westminster, and did not seem to be well informed upon that subject, he would state what the position was. Westminster was possessed of powers of purchase under the

Acts of 1882 and 1888. The two great electric companies which supplied Westminster, the St. James's Company and the Westminster Company, combined in 1905 to erect a great generating and bulk supply station for Westminster, outside its local government area, in Marylebone. Although the hon. Gentleman was quite right in saying that under these Acts Westminster had no power to purchase the generating station, that power was specifically given by the Act of 1905 authorising the station. The city of Westminster was therefore in a very favourable position, and when those powers matured could possess, both as to bulk supply and distribution, a complete self-contained and self-controlled electric system. If hon. Members would refer to the Bill they would find that Clause 90 protected these powers possessed by Westminster. It was very explicit, and the question he wished to ask was what bearing had the Instruction, to be moved by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, on that clause. It was a mandatory Instruction to the Committee to confer permissive powers on the London County Council, and he wished to know whether it would render Clause 90 of this Bill nugatory. If it interfered with the protection afforded to Westminster by the clause, he should vote against the Bill.

*SIR JOHN BENN (Devonport) said he associated himself most fully with the views expressed by his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education. He asked the House to direct attention to three points—first, London badly wanted a bulk supply of electricity; secondly, how was that to be obtained; and, thirdly, the opposition which had been brought to bear against this private Bill with regard to bulk supply. Those borough councils who had electrical undertakings at present thought they could supply it. During the last few years Committees of both sides of the House had inquired into the matter, and had come to the conclusion that the present conditions of generating electricity in London were very bad. They were put upon London by no Liberal Government. The system of splitting up London into borough councils, and allowing them to set up their own electric stations on a sort of chandlers shop system with a single eye to the parish pump instead of to the general good, had led to confusion of the most distressing character. Two Parliaments had recognised that the only way to supply London was in bulk, so that by means of a large generating station or one or two stations on the outskirts of the Metropolis great manufacturers might be given a chance of making London flourish by being supplied with electricity at bottom prices. He had hoped that great object might be achieved by municipal enterprise. They tried it in 1906, when they brought in a permissive Bill which left the borough councils alone. The very men who were at the back of the opposition to-night prevented the passing of that Bill. [Cries of "No."] He would not make that statement unless he were prepared to fortify it. The hon. Member for Fulham, who seconded the rejection of the present Bill, quoted from a document which he now held in his hand. The opposition was engineered by the borough councils of London, and the document was signed by Mr. Mansfield Robinson, Clerk of the Shoreditch Vestry, the same gentleman who engineered the opposition to the municipal Bill of 1906 and to the second attempt of 1907. Of course, the Members representing the boroughs of London stood up for the borough council installations; but he asked the House to look at the matter from the wider point of view. Some Gentlemen opposite had not had the advantage of studying the question from the London point of view and had not, as some of them had, devoted a long time in trying to get at the bottom of it; and he wished to tell them that if they followed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon into the lobby, they would be thwarting municipal development. He had to say with the greatest regret that the present London County Council would not look at a municipal settlement. Supposing they were on the eve of another London County Council election, and that they put as the first item on their programme, another municipal electricity scheme, with £5,000,000 capital, London would not look at it. It was done in the memorable fight conducted by his hon. friend, and for the moment London would not have it. The hon. Member for Westminster properly understood this measure. He said it was a Machiavellian scheme for creating an electrical supply by the London County Council. The hon. Member was absolutely right. If the Bill were adopted with the instruction suggested by the President of the Board of Trade, he hoped and believed that in the fulness of time they would have the same happy result as was achieved under the Tramway Act of 1870. That Act gave companies free running power in London for tramways, but a Liberal Government inserted a wise purchase clause, and the Act was now called the Tramway Charter. After the companies had been running some time, the London County Council stepped in and were now establishing one of the finest municipal tramway systems. They were not able immediately to get through a municipal measure for the bulk supply of electricity, but, if these Instructions were adopted with regard to the present Bill, and the purchase terms were amended as they ought to be, they would have an opportunity of doing with regard to electricity what they had done with regard to the tramways. The London County Council, under the proposed purchase clause, would be able to step in and possess themselves of another heritage, and they would, he believed, manage the electrical undertaking as successfully as they had managed the tramways. He should therefore vote for the Second Reading of the Bill. He believed hon. Members would be ill-advised if they voted against it under the impression that they were thereby voting for a municipal supply against a company supply. Those who understood the matter and desired to serve London would follow the proposals of the front bench; and, if that were done, he thought the time would come when this great enterprise would become possessed by the people of London as an addition to those municipal enterprises which in the past had worked such good for the metropolis. He entirely associated himself with the late progressive leader of the London County Council.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) said that as the representative of a part of the county contiguous to the municipal area of London he had been in some doubt as to which way his vote should be cast, but he was grateful to the hon. Member who had just sat down for having removed any possible doubt in his mind. He had told them that London was anxious for a bulk supply of electricity and that the most desirable way in which electricity could be supplied in bulk was by the creation of a private company.

*SIR JOHN BENN: I beg the hon. Member's pardon. I said it was the only possible way for the moment. I think the municipal supply the most desirable.

MR. FORSTER said the hon. Member had in his mind the acquisition of the undertaking by the London County Council, and would only create it in the present case in order that it might be so acquired.

*SIR JOHN BENN: Precisely.

MR. FORSTER said they now knew how the matter stood. The hon, Member for Woolwich was perfectly justified in using picturesque language in describing this. He said it was a Parliamentary job, or used an expression of that kind. Would it not have been a little more honest to say they would sanction the creation of a private authority subsequently to be acquired by the London County Council, but they adhered to the view they had so often, so strongly, and so consistently expressed, that the only possible authority for the creation of electricity in bulk was the County Council? He remembered night after night, speech after speech, on Bill after Bill, when the hon. Gentleman opposite took up that attitude and flatly refused his sanction to the creation of companies for the supply of electricity in bulk. It would be more honest of hon. Gentlemen if they made it plain that they only supported the Bill because they intended to destroy the company as soon as possible. He would like to make it plain why he intended, now that he understood the situation, to vote against the Second Reading.

He at any rate was consistent. He still believed that the best way of supplying electricity in bulk was not by municipal enterprise, but rather by private enterprise or by the creation of a body *ad hoc.* He did not believe the London County Council was the best authority to control the supply of electricity in bulk. Then that part of his constituency which was affected objected very strongly to being brought under the control of the London County Council in any way. He did not think that even the right hon. Gentleman opposite could make it a matter of blame to them that they should prefer that local autonomy which had formed so prominent a plank in the edifice of his speeches. He entered a very strong protest against the line which had been taken by supporters of the Bill, and he thought it was a pity that the President of the Board of Trade did not make it clear sooner that the whole object of the Bill and of the Instruction that he had put down was that the company which they were creating should be destroyed at the earliest possible moment. His constituents thought they would be better off if the Bill did not pass.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee) said he was very sorry indeed for the position in which the hon. Member for Woolwich found himself. He had made a very excellent and charming speech, with his usual gifts of humour and flexibility, and they all knew that the views he put forward on these subjects were soundly and sincerely democratic. But what was the company in which his hon. friend found himself? The hon. Member for Sevenoaks and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon. What an unholy alliance! What a strange combination to fight for the interests of the people of London! He hoped the House would allow him to state the reasons which induced him to counsel them to send the Bill up for examination by a Committee. There were three Bills and three Instructions had been put down in regard to them. They could only discuss one Bill, but they ought not to overlook the other two, because the three Bills were inter-related, and they proposed to ask the House to apply a common policy in regard to all three. He had taken the advice of many of those who, on other subjects, had always on previous occasions voiced the opinion of the majority of the late Progressive members of the County Council and who at present voiced the opinion of the majority of the Liberal Members for London. It was in consultation with them that the Board of Trade had adopted the policy of counselling the House to agree to the principle of the Bill, subject to examination by Committee, and thus to afford every facility for existing private enterprise and for those who now sought the sanction of Parliamentary authority to develop the best possible system of electrical supply for London, and to arrange for the transference of that supply at the earliest possible moment to the government of London. At present there were sixty-six different generating stations in the London area, and fifty-five main distributing centres. The price of electricity in this city was on the average 1·38d. over the whole area. That was considerably more than double as much as the price in Newcastle, and yet the size of London and the area would make it possible, according to all the expert engineers whose opinion he had consulted, to make the cheapest possible supply. The industries of London were specially suited to derive benefit from the cheap supply of electricity. This new plan in its general aspects proposed to establish a great outside tap, by which through the agency of the existing distributing centres, the mains of London could be flushed with cheaper electricity, and railways, canals, and navigation could be supplied. The whole intention of this proposal was that there would be a superior economy from the production in bulk. That superior economy was derived from the great scale of production, from the advantage of possessing modern plant, and above all from the great advantage of having ocean-borne coal delivered in the close proximity of the generating station. He had heard it said that the cheapness resulting from this proposal would not reach the small consumers. He did not think this production in bulk could be carried out without benefiting the small as well as the large consumer. The price charged would be subject to periodical revision by the Board of Trade, who could eventually compel the undertakers to pass on any general benefit they received in the course of time to the consumer. He did not think it possible to flush London with cheap electricity without that benefit reaching the small consumers. An hon. Member had said that this did not promise to give a cheap supply. It promised to give a supply of bulk electricity at half the prices which ruled in the Metropolis at the present time. Of course, he did not say whether it would perform that promise, but the Committee would decide that point. All he could say was that all the ordinary harnessing apparatus for controlling private enterprise according to modern ideas was in full operation in the Bill. The maximum prices were fixed, and fixed at a lower rate than had ever been specified in any Bill before; there was compulsion to supply, and the usual limitation of dividends by a sliding scale; and in order to ensure that it was not a bogus enterprise it was provided that the whole enterprise should lapse unless £600,000 was subscribed in the first year, and unless substantial progress was made in the second. The opposition to the Bill came from two very different sources. It came from those who on perfectly sincere grounds and on grounds of regulated opinion were opposed to private enterprise of any kind. It came from those who voiced the narrowest selfishness of minor localities. It was those who were arrayed against them in an unfortunate and miscreated alliance. The borough councils had, no doubt, rendered great services, and he would be the last in the world to urge the House to speak ungratefully of them. But a borough council could not claim immunity from all competition which most improvements created. The hon. Member for Fulham had spoken of the purchase terms. They were not committed to those purchase terms. All he suggested to the House was that they should have these terms thoroughly scrutinised by a trustworthy Parliamentary Committee. He did not submit them to the House with the imprimatur of the Government bench at all; but never before had any purchase clause been inserted in a bulk supply Bill which had been passed. In addition to that they must remember that they were not dealing with a brand new area, but with an area already fully occupied, in which the operation of the new supply authority would be very strictly guarded in reference to the interests of the existing occupants of the ground. He agreed that the transference which the hon. Member for Sevenoaks had referred to was necessary and desirable. The enterprise would really not involve any very serious or complicated financial operation. As to the attitude of the Board of Trade in the matter, they were charged with particular duties with regard to the Bill. The Board of Trade was a great deal more than the party officer who for the moment represented it. The Board of Trade was a great accumulation of valuable knowledge; it was an immense ramification of machinery all over the country, operating and intervening under every conceivable condition in the numerous stages of the daily life and labour of the people. From the point of view of the Board of Trade, when they approached questions like this they were compelled to see in the foreground two main facts—the greatness of London and the importance of a cheap supply of electricity. They saw the greatest city in the world, with six millions of people; the greatest manufacturing centre; the greatest port, the greatest centre of human activity. They saw six millions of people living under conditions of the highest artificiality, and following these facts from a purely non-party point of view, whether collectivist or individualistic, Moderate or Progressive, capital or labour, they saw that to all these millions, rich and poor alike, whether in their units or in combination, cheap and abundant electricity was scarcely less important than cheap and abundant food. By all means let them discuss the true principles of municipal government, but let them not deny the assistance which applied science alone could give to the great mass of the people for whose welfare they were responsible. Any hon. Member who stood between this great city of London and an absolutely modern and uniform system of electric supply would run the gravest risk and assume the gravest responsibility. This was the fifth successive year in which an attempt had been made to furnish London with a bulk supply. Huge sums of money had been spent on fruitless proceedings. The uncertainty had hung like a pall all the time over electrical enterprise. The initiative of private promoters had been seriously discouraged. Nothing had been done for five years. Meanwhile, municipal enterprise had not advanced to fill the gap, and there was no immediate prospect that it would advance. In these circumstances, the House of Commons would take a very grave decision if it swept out of court the elaborate proposals now put forward without allowing them to receive the detailed attention that only an impartial Committee of the House of Commons could give. He could not conceive it being argued that a rush was being made upon the House by private individuals and corporations to grab concessions against the commonwealth for the exploitation of private interests. In 1903 the number of Private Bills deposited with the Board of Trade was 188, and in succeeding years the numbers were 159, 131, 151, and 102, an average for the period of 147. In the present year only ninety-eight such Bills had been deposited. This was the smallest number of Private Bills deposited in a session. Was it reasonable to contend that the House could be accused of being unduly lax in regard to the private enterprises put before them? Hon. Members on the Labour benches were quite consistent; they were against private enterprise in any form, and in favour of organised communal enterprise not carried on for profit. But what was to happen in the years intervening between the disappearance of private enterprise and the time when communal enterprise was to reign supreme throughout the land? He submitted to the House that they would take a grave responsibility if they dismissed this great enterprise of solid material advantage to London without allowing it to be examined by a Committee. He would not be doing his duty in the office which he had the honour to hold if he did not put this counsel before the House. After all, every one was giving up something. The Moderates acquiesced in the roposal to place upon the County Council ultimately the ownership of this large undertaking. The companies themselves had acquiesced in the transfer. Those who had been Progressive leaders had come to believe that this scheme was, on the whole, in the interest of the great community which they had represented. The opposition to the Bill had not been on broad principles, but of highly organised minor interests. He earnestly appealed to the House that the measure might proceed.

MR. ROWLANDS: Take off the Government Whips then.

*MR. CHURCHILL asked if the hon. Member felt that he would not vote according to his conscience if the Government Whips were telling? He did not think they should allow themselves to rise to any tragic height of tension in this matter. The proposition before them was a very simple one. It was, whether they should allow a proposal of this character to be examined carefully and properly by a Parliamentary Committee reserving to themselves the fullest right of rejection on Third Reading if, after that examination, it did not suit their views, or whether they should, without even investigating the proposal, cast aside the last attempt, for a considerable number of years, either private or municipal, to provide London with a bulk supply of electricity. A Committee of that House two years ago examined the whole question. They reported that the need of a bulk supply for London was important and pressing. If the House were to reject this measure on Second Read ng, the need would still continue important, but it would press no more.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on having enunciated what he thought was a most excellent principle on this subject—a principle which they had always heard contradicted by the right hon. Gentleman himself and by hon. Gentlemen opposite. He supposed that the Party on that side of the House had maintained that no more excellent way of contributing to the public service could be found than in such enterprises as this; first, a private company with a limitation, if they liked, of dividend, as in the case of the gas companies, a sliding scale to secure prices, and, ultimately, purchase by some public authority, not necessarily the County Council. He believed, himself, that that was a sound view, and he was delighted that they had found so able a convert to it as the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. At the present moment he might congratulate his own side of the House on having secured from the Government an acknowledgment of the principle which they had long opposed. There was one question put to the right hon. Gentleman by the hon. Member for Westminster, to which he himself had endeavoured to get an answer from the right hon. Gentleman before he began his peroration, and to which, he thought, the House was entitled to an answer, because it might have a material effect on this case. The Instruction which the right hon. Gentleman was to move was a matter of business not a matter of rhetoric. It was to include in the Bill a provision conferring purchasing powers on the London County Council. His hon. friend had spoken against that Instruction on behalf of the City of Westminster because Westminster had a special interest in the existing supply which was safeguarded by Clause 90 in the Bill. The question which his hon friend put to the right hon. Gentleman was, did he mean by his Instruction to put aside Clause 90 or did he not? Did he mean that in any case in 1931 the London County Council should become the purchasing authority, and did he intend to sweep aside the provision which the promoters of the Bill and the House of Lords had inserted in favour of the City of Westminster? At present Westminster had the power in 1930 to buy out two large electric lighting companies within its area, and also power to buy the generating station at Marylebone so as to give the City of Westminster the ability to have an entirely self-contained electric supply. In his judgment this raised a very important point. He himself thought it would be entirely wrong that in 1931 the London County Council should be the purchasing authority when it was unnecessary that it should be so. The City of Westminster was a very large and rich area, with a very able corporation, quite capable of managing its own affairs, and it had a fully equipped electric supply plant. Surely then, it ought not to be invaded by the County Council. That was not in the interest of the ratepayers of the City of Westminister nor in the interests of the ratepayers of London.

Mr. CHURCHILL said that tbe Instruction made it mandatory on the Committee to arrange for the transference to the County Council of all the powers which exist or which the Bill would confer on the promoters.

Mr. LYTTELTON said he understood that the Committee upstairs was not to have the right to consider whether the rights that had been conferred on the City of Westminster by two statutes were to be maintained or not. If that was really the decision of the Government then he did not see how the proposal could be accepted for a moment. Unquestionably it raised, in the acutest form, the position he had desired to take, and he would have to reconsider it.

Mr. JOHN WARD said he wished to make one or two observations, particularly one which had been suggested by the right hon. Gentleman—that there was no particular principle involved in this Bill, and that what they ought to do was to give the Bill a Second Reading and send it to Committee upstairs and then pass judgement on the Committee's Report. That advice would absolutely stultify the position of many hon. Members when the Bill came down to the House from the Committee upstairs. He remembered that when the Second Reading of a suburban Water Bill was before the House they were told that it was only necessary to send it upstairs when the Committee would make every inquiry——

Mr. CHAPLIN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 156 ; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 237.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John J. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Carlile, E. Hildred
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duckworth, James
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fell, Arthur
Ferens, T. R.
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnavonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
McCallum, John M.
McKenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
McLaren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks. G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montague, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tomkinson, James
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry, A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. McKinnon
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Claude Hay and Mr. Burdett-Coutts.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Barnes, G. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bowerman, C. W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Byles, William Pollard
Cave, George
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cleland, J. R.
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Crooks, William
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Forster, Henry William
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Halsam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)

Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNiell,John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nicholls, George
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Malley, William
Radford, G. H.
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberston,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rowlands, J.
Seddon, J.
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Snowden, P,
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Wardle, George J.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Timothy Davies and Mr. Pickersgill.

Question put accordingly, "That the wood 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 138; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 238.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Baring, Capt.Hn.G(Winchester
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T.H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H.C.
Brooke, Stopford
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Causton,RtHn.Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Duckworth, James
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Haldane, Rt.Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, RtHn.L.(Rossendale
Harvey, A. G. C.(Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hemmerde, Edward George
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Nicholson,Charles N(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Roberts, Charles H.(Lincoln)
Roberts,Sir John H(Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir GScott(Bradf'rd
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw.(Stafford)
Shaw,Rt.Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Sinclair, Rt. Hon John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H.Y.
Stanley, Hn A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Waring, Walter
Wason, RtHn.E.(Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry, A.
Whitley, JohnHenry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnes, G. N.
Bethell,Sir J.H(Essex,Romf'rd
Bowerman, C. W.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, Major E.F.(Lewisham)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S.
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Arthur(Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nicholls, George
Nield, Herbert
Radford, G. H.
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rowlands, J.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Seddon, J.
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Snowden, P.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Valentia, Viscount
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Ward,John(Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. Dumbartonshre)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winterton, Earl
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Pickersgill, and Mr. Timothy Davies.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Postponed Proceeding on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time," resumed.

Question again proposed.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL hoped everything he said would appeal to their instincts of humanity. He wished to express his regret that the Prime Minister did not think it consistent with his duty to allow the day for the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill to pass without the intrusion of other business. He wished to direct attention to the treatment of the women now undergoing sentences of imprisonment for various offences connected with the woman suffrage movement. These women wished, rightly or wrongly, to make certain alterations in the constitution for which the majority of the House had already voted. They might have acted illegally, but they should be located as political offenders and not as ordinary criminals. They were suffering indignities that he had no notion of until he saw a letter from an old Member of the House describing the treatment meted out to his daughter. He had received a letter from one of these ladies in which there was a pathos and a dignity which must appeal to their hearts, because, whether they liked speeches in Palace Yard or not, they certainly did not like cowardly and vindictive treatment of women who were as honourable as any in the land. This lady, whom he did not know, said they did not complain of their treatment, for to them the supreme wrong was that in the twentieth century it should be necessary for women to suffer as they were doing for citizen rights. The Home Secretary's replies to Questions were not accurate. The clothing was very badly washed, especially the stockings, and one was in constant fear of infection. The outer clothes were not washed and, as there was no lining in the bodice, the serge, which might have been already worn by dozens of prisoners, was in actual contact with the naked skin. It was quite untrue that new shoes were given. When this lady went to prison she spent quite a long time hunting through a basket full of old shoes, most unpleasant to touch and smell, for a pair likely to fit her and finally had to take odd ones, one being without a heel. It was not the case that all the prisoners were in good health, one being in the isolation ward, suffering from measles, probably contracted in prison. They had all been stripped in the presence of warders and searched as if they were convicted thieves. That was the worst they had to endure. After that hardly anything else mattered. That was a very pathetic and shocking letter. Did a lady of high culture, ability and good position, no matter what she had done, deserve that punishment, or did they like to see women punished in that way whom they would receive in their drawing-rooms and who were guilty of no moral offence? No other torture was comparable to this. These women were kept from all knowledge of their friends. They were deprived of their boots and only allowed to read after five o'clock in the evening. For highly cultured, sensible women this was almost sufficient to drive them into a lunatic asylum. Without saying whether he approved of their action or not he had no hesitation in saying that under a Christian Government such treatment in dealing with women was outrageous. These women were only trying to get the ordinary rights of citizenship. One lady who had written to him said that the shoes supplied to them were so wretched that the nails used to rise up in them and pierce the soles of her feet, and walking about became really torture. The conditions were rendered worse by the orders to which they were subjected. For these women such treatment was absolutely wrong, because after all their object was only to reform society and make the body politic better than it was. Why should they be degraded in this way? If would be enough for his purpose if hon. Members would take to heart what he said, and he would not delay the House. It was sufficient for him to state that for the mere chance of speaking these few words he had stayed in London two days longer instead of going over to Ireland, because he could not have enjoyed his holidays if he had not raised his voice to condemn such action as he had complained of, action not worthy of this country. There was another question in regard to which he had given the Home Secretary plenty of notice—he referred to flogging as a punishment in prisons. A number of sentences of flogging had recently been given by Judges in regard to which the right hon. Gentleman had not in the exercise of his duty thought it necessary to exercise the prerogative of the Crown. They did not know half the horrors in regard to what went on under this system of flogging. It was very painful to him to read such cases. He had taken special means to find out what the ordinary flogging in a prison consisted of, and he could assure the House that it was a very shocking affair. A triangle was fixed up, the prisoner's legs and feet were tightly bound to the arms of the triangle and there was attached a pulley and cords and two leather handcuffs, and the body was drawn up. The cat-o'-nine tails was a whip with a very long handle and nine cords, one-sixteenth of an inch thick, and at the end they were not waxed but tied together by hard, strong strings. Flogging with the cat-o'-nine tails had been utterly abolished in Scotland, it was not known in Ireland, where no Judge would inflict such punishment. In England it was only permitted in two classes of offence, namely, for attacks on the Sovereign and for offence under the Garrotting Act — robbery with violence. It was well known that two-thirds of the Judges of England would never inflict the penalty of the lash under any circumstances, and they had often protested against it. Flogging had been denounced in the strongest possible language in that House. It had been denounced by an ex-Home Secretary, Sir Matthew White Ridley, who, in every case of a prisoner sentenced to the penalty of the lash never allowed it to be carried into operation without carefully weighing the evidence of the case, and he generally reversed the decision. Sir Matthew White Ridley once said he would never forgive himself if he allowed the sentence of the lash to be inflicted upon a man where there was the slightest possibility of his being innocent, because the punishment was inhuman, and made the person who was punished never have the spirit of a man again. The present Prime Minister got up in the House of Commons on 28th March, 1900, and said that in all cases would wish the lash never to be inflicted, because it was a punishment in which the moral degradation of the man after its infliction was irremediable. That was on a Bill which authorised flogging, and the House of Commons rejected it by 100, expressing at the same time its strong disapproval of the penalty of the lash. At Cardiff assizes last month fourteen prisoners were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment and various inflictions of the lash. When he heard of those sentences he immediately sent a special messenger to the Home Secretary in order if possible to have the punishment stayed. He impressed upon the right hon. Gentleman that in none of these cases should the lash be inflicted until he had himself looked into the circumstances. In his judgment flogging was more degrading than death. He would rather be put to death than be flogged. If the Court of Criminal Appeal had been in operation when these fourteen men were sentenced it was certain that the convictions would have been quashed because there was no legal evidence of violence. They were sentenced in March, in the first week of April they were flogged, and the appeal court was not constituted until the 18th April. There was, therefore, no remedy except through the intervention of the Home Secretary, who was the depository of the prerogative of mercy exercised by the Crown. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that he would not interfere in such cases now that there was a court to which a prisoner could appeal. In reference to that matter the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken. The appeal would be on a mere matter of law, and the discretion of the Judge would be rarely, if ever, interfered with in cases of flogging. The Home Secretary had a higher privilege than even a Judge or the Court of Appeal. He was able to pass over mere technicalities, and, after taking into consideration all circumstances, advise the exercise of the Royal prerogative. He regretted that since the right hon. Gentleman's *régime* began there had been a considerable increase in the infliction of flogging for offences in jail.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): No.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said it appeared from the last Report that there were seventy of these sentences, and that only three were remitted. He hoped his information was wrong.

MR. GLADSTONE: There were twenty-eight.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that in all there had been 120 cases in three years. That was a very terrible state of things. He had received a letter from a prison governor stating that in many cases where the punishment of flogging was inflicted the warders were the aggressors by striking the first blow. The prisoners who were sentenced to be flogged for offences against prison discipline suffered the most terrible suspense during the ten or twelve days that elapsed between the passing of the sentence and the carrying of it out. The prison governor stated in his letter that he knew of a case in which a prisoner from that cause went stark mad. He hoped that these facts would be considered by the Home Secretary and that he would make an effort either to abandon as far as possible this form of punishment, or to abolish it.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham) said he desired to call attention to what he regarded as a most serious leakage of information which had recently taken place in the Navy. He referred to communications which had recently appeared in a leading newspaper. He intended merely to refer to the message and to the circumstances which enabled it to be made public. He had no intention to refer to the unhappy state of affairs in the Navy, because the House was doing, and had done, well to leave that matter entirely alone, as it had left alone a similarly unhappy state of affairs in the Navy in March last and the correspondence which appeared in the Press upon it. He would make no reference to the remarkable feature of that correspondence, which constituted a combined attack in the whole Press on Lord Charles Beresford. The only instance to which he would refer was the statement which appeared in a leading newspaper, giving an account of an incident that took place in the Fleet, upon which a Question was answered by the First Lord of the Admiralty earlier in the day. That statement, according to rumour, had been hawked round Fleet Street before it finally found a home in Printing House Square, a statement so improbable on the face of it that one would have thought that any newspaper would have hesitated before printing it. But the point which he wished to emphasise was not so much how the statement got into the newspaper, but how it leaked out of the Navy. As the House was aware, during the recent naval manœuvres no civilians were permitted on board any ship in the Fleet, and, therefore, the information must have been got from someone serving in the Navy. Some officer or man in the service might have made some communication to a friend who had sent it on to the newspaper, so that it might not have come to the newspaper at first hand. At any rate, it must have come from some ship at sea. It was exceedingly difficult to trace the authorship of such a statement. He did not propose to go into the question fully, but it was a most serious state of affairs when a statement of this nature, obviously proceeding from a member of the Navy, appeared in the public Press. The statement which the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty said was without foundation, was that Lord Charles Beresford had jeopardised the safety of two of His Majesty's ships. His sole desire in bringing the matter forward was to urge on the right hon. Gentleman the necessity of taking drastic steps to put a stop to this constant leakage of information on naval matters which found its way into the Press. The time had come to root out the mutual recriminations which appeared. The right hon. Gentleman should endeavour to discover the person or persons who gave to the Press this entirely ruinous, inaccurate, and cruel statement, and do away with Press agents in the Navy. The right hon. Gentleman would agree with him as to the gravity of the position when there could be a single man in the Fleet who would make such a communication to the Press reflecting very grossly on his Admiral. He hoped the First Lord would alleviate the anxiety which was felt on this matter and give an assurance that every effort would be made to discover who had caused the Memorandum to be published, and that he would do something to prevent such a breach of the Admiralty regulations in future.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said that, of course, he had no knowledge as to how the communication was made from the Fleet to the Press, and it was impossible to ascertain that, even if he were to try. No doubt the actual communication that was originally made to the Press was in every respect a true one. He assumed that the original communication was sent by some person in the Fleet to someone on shore.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): By wire?

MR. McKENNA: No; had it been sent by wire I must have known of it.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: By wireless telegraphy?

MR. McKENNA said it could not have been sent by wireless telegraphy without its being known to the Admiralty. He assumed it was made by a private letter, and the recipient communicated the information to the Press, and all the comments which the noble Lord rightly described as untrue were made not by the original communicator, but by writers for the Press. For those comments it would be most unfair to suggest that any officer or other person in the Navy was in the least responsible. The whole gravamen of the charge did not lie in the signal, but in the comments made upon it. There was no danger in the manœuvre itself. He trusted that the whole incident, which had been a most unhappy one, might be allowed to drop.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.) said he was anxious to make an appeal to the Home Secretary further to consider the case of the three men who were undergoing sentence of imprisonment on a charge of conspiracy, with a view to some modification of their sentence. The case he was referring to was that of three men who were now undergoing twelve months imprisonment, and he wished the House to understand that the issues were larger than appeared at first sight. Those issues included the higher questions of reasonable treatment for men who were driven into taking very injudicious steps in connection with the business in which they were engaged. The Home Secretary had stated in reply to Questions which he had put during the course of the session that the men who were sentenced to this term of imprisonment deliberately committed an act of conspiracy. Therefore, the right hon. Gentleman said, they were condemned not for something rash and uncontemplated, but for a very serious offence against law and property. The view he (Mr. Clynes) had come to after going fully into the matter was that the men were smarting under a sense of great wrong inflicted upon them, and were driven by the conditions of the moment into what were acts of folly rather than conditions of crime. There had been in Manchester an agitation arising out of very acute conditions of unemployment in that city. These men held meetings, which were to a great extent unconnected with the responsible and representative labour movement of that centre. They frequently met in one of the outer squares of the city, but they were driven on one occasion by the weather to another place. The situation on that particular occasion was stated in the course of the trial in the following terms by Superintendent Lauder, who said that on Sunday, 15th March, he attended a meeting of the unemployed in Stevenson Square. He reached the Square at 3.30, when the meeting had opened. When it had been some time in progress snow fell, and the men adjourned to another place. On being told that they could not remain there they returned to the square and speech-making was resumed. Batty and Brown (two of the three men in prison) arrived about five o'clock. Up to that time the meeting had been orderly. When they came Smith (the third man in prison) said: "Come on, we want a revolution." He (Mr. Clynes) need not read further from the statement of Superintendent Lauder. The men were scattered and they made their way to the house of Smith. There they indulged in a great deal of talk about what they would do, some even going to the extreme of rashly speaking of blowing up the Town Hall, and visiting the House of Commons for a similar purpose. The outcome of this kind of talk was that in the course of a day or two some of the men smashed some windows in Market Street, the talk being of committing a dramatic act in order to call attention to the grievances under which so many persons were smarting. The three men were afterwards brought into Court, were condemned on a charge of conspiracy, and were now undergoing a sentence of twelve months in prison. He suggested to the Home Secretary that these men were incited by a state of despair, and by the conditions under which they were harassed to commit these acts, which he, of course, did not seek to defend. The point he wished to make was that the men had been unduly punished, and that the sentence was harsh. What he desired was that the right hon. Gentleman, who had shown in the course of his frequent association with questions of punishment and crime a strong sense of humanity, should use the authority which his great office gave him, to secure that in this instance the punishment should be made a little more to fit the crime. The language of the men was, of course, inflammatory and boastful, but the example they set was in no way followed. It should be made clear that the representatives of organised labour in the city had in no sense endeavoured to excuse the acts which were committed and which were isolated instances of folly on the part of a few men, who had been severely punished for their fault. The evidence on which the men were condemned was the unsupported evidence of one man, who was himself a party to the business. This man, who was at Smith's house along with the rest of the men, was of a discreditable character, and had been twenty-four times in gaol. As a matter of fact, since the trial he had been in gaol once, if not twice, so that very little real dependence or trust could be placed on anything he had to say about other people. The men who were condemned were unable to take advantage of the Criminal Appeal Act, on account of the hurried nature of the police proceedings and other limitations which existed in the case of poor men of this kind who were swiftly brought into Court, speedily tried, and disposed of with the least possible delay, without being able to use the aids and advantages which money often conferred in Courts of law. An application was made in Court for an appeal in this case on a point of law resting on the uncorroborated evidence given by the discredited witness to whom he had referred. No appeal was allowed, and he had been driven to make the present appeal in the House in the hope that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would use the power with which his office invested him to mitigate the severity of the sentence passed on these men. It might be mentioned that the spy reported certain things to the police with regard to the intended commission of various acts, and so little importance did the police attach to them that no preparations were made to protect persons or property from the offences which it was alleged had been contemplated. Moreover, since these men were condemned, criminal records and police court proceedings showed that dozens of more serious cases of offences against life and property had occurred in which the guilty parties had been much less severely punished than the men whose cause he was now pleading. He could cite cases in which serious crimes had been committed and yet the offenders had been punished with no greater sentence than three or six months imprisonment. He suggested that in this case the purpose of the law had been served, and that the feeling prevailing in Manchester—the sympathy surrounding these unfortunate men—ought to have some weight with the right hon. Gentleman. He understood that memorials had been signed and that there was a considerable volume of opinion in favour of presenting a powerfully signed requisition in the hope that the Home Secretary might be induced to reconsider his decision. He hoped it would not be supposed that he was condemning the right hon. Gentleman for what he had done so far, because he was putting the case in no contentious spirit, but rather in a spirit of hope that as these men had served a period of five months imprisonment the right hon. Gentleman would exercise his power to secure that the term of their incarceration should be shortened.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) desired to call attention to two matters, one of which was the case of the crofters of the Island of Vatersay. He was glad that arrangements had been arrived at under which these men had been released from gaol, but he thought that if matters had been properly managed and arrangements had been arrived at with the proprietor when negotiations were commenced there would have been no necessity for these men to have broken the law. He was most anxious that a similar state of things should not come to pass in the Island of Lewis. The Vatersay crofters were small in number compared with the landless men in the Island of Lewis, where there were 7,500 landless people, or 25 per cent. of the total population. He had brought the matter before the Secretary for Scotland time after time, and the reply he invariably received was that it was being considered. The Government could never get further forward than the consideration stage. The difficulty in Vatersay was that the farm wanted by the cottars was held under a lease, but in the Island of Lewis there were 20,000 acres of land, none of which was under lease. What he suggested to the Secretary for Scotland was that he should take energetic and active measures to secure the whole or part of these lands for the people before leases were granted by the proprietor. His fear for a long time past had been that the men would break the law, though he had always advised them to agitate in a constitutional manner, and so far they had acted in accordance with that advice. But the Secretary for Scotland should do something to ensure that these 7,500 landless people should not be forced to live under the present unsatisfactory conditions. If negotiations were entered into without delay, he believed there would be little difficulty in obtaining the required quantity of land, but he feared that unless something was done trouble must ensue. These men were coming home from the fishing with very little money, and as they would be in a half-starved condition during the winter it was quite likely that they might be tempted to break the law. No legislation was required to provide for a case of this kind, because the Congested Districts Board had full powers to negotiate with the proprietor and to secure possession of vacant farms. In 1899 he moved an Amendment to the Queen's Speech asking for legislation for the crofters, cottars and fishermen of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, in support of which 142 Members voted, including the late Prime Minister and several right hon. Gentlemen who now sat on the Treasury Bench. The Government majority was only five. He therefore felt fully justified in urging the Government to take some action on these lines. If the Government did not intend to give effect to their pledges let them be honest and say so. What he asked was that the Secretary for Scotland should not rest on his oars but should do something for these people. He (Mr. Weir) had done his best to see that the law was obeyed. Matters would not have come to the present pass if the Scottish Secretary had been more active.

Mr GLADSTONE said he quite agreed that the hon. Member for N. E. Manchester had stated his case with great moderation. He must, however, point out that he did not accept his version of the case, though he was not able at that hour to discuss the matter. He had, as the hon. Member knew, very carefully examined it. The main allegation against the men was, as the hon. Member had stated, one of conspiracy. The Court held that there was evidence of a previous agreement to do damage. By pre-concerted action these men began breaking windows, causing damage to the extent of £100. The learned Recorder was most careful to warn the jury that they must not attach weight to the particular witness to whom the hon. Member referred unless his evidence was corroborated. The Court held that that evidence was corroborated and a conviction followed. The hon. Member said these men were smarting under a sense of wrong. Did he really think that the men(Brown and another) were acting under any such sense? He was not going to go into the record of these men further than to say that so far as he could ascertain neither of them appeared to have wished to get work, and in one case when work was got the man was found not capable of taking it. With regard to the third man, he (the Home Secretary) agreed he was a man of a very different order. He was in good employment at the time. He (the Home Secretary) was aware that he associated himself with the unemployed movement, but he did not at all question his *bona fides* or his belief in the rightness of his action. But still he was one of those men who did in fact meet together and who were proved by the Court to be guilty of serious conspiracy. It was really very difficult to draw a distinction between his case and that of the other men. He was afraid he could not at the present time see his way to interfere, but if, by petition or otherwise, any new information or argument was brought to his notice he would of course, consider it. His hon. friend the Member for Donegal had raised rather large questions that evening and he would not expect him (the Home Secretary) to go into the whole question of flogging which he had raised. Let him say this one word. His hon. friend quoted a letter which he said was from a prison governor in which the governor said, presumably speaking from his own knowledge—if he did not speak from his own knowledge his evidence was of no value—that in many of these cases of prison flogging the first blow was struck by the warders. If that was true how gravely it must reflect upon the prison governor. He need scarcely point out to his hon. friend that the prison governor was responsible. He was head of the prison. He reported the cases of flogging to the Home Secretary. If it was within his knowledge that provocation was given by the warder, and if, knowing that, he held his tongue and allowed the man to be flogged, then all he (the Home Secretary) could say was that he deserved to be dismissed from his post at once. He left his hon. friend to clear up that position. On the general question his hon. friend knew perfectly well there were two aspects of the matter, and the question was raised in two forms. The first was whether flogging as a punishment was desirable in the public interest. That was a very large and very interesting question. If there was to be any change in the present system he would desire a change in the direction of mitigation, but he was bound to say he did not take the view of his hon. friend. What was the last case which came before him? A young ruffian who had taken a large handful of mud and stuffed it into the eyes and mouth of a young girl and then robbed her. Well, that man was flogged, and he (the Home Secretary) would waste no sympathy upon him, though he did sympathise with his victim. There was the general question. He differentiated his views from those held by his hon. friend, who held strong views on that matter. He did not take up such a strong position. His duty was to act under the law, and when these cases came before him by way of appeal he was bound to look into them, and he did look into them. He sanctioned only two days ago the remission of a second sentence of flogging which had been imposed upon a prisoner. He was sure his hon. friend would not expect him to go further into the matter. One or two words on the hon. Gentleman's remarks as to the treatment of the prisoners in Holloway. He did not quite gather from his hon. friend whether he said what he did by way of protest against the system generally or whether he was arguing for special privileges to the particular persons to whom he was alluding.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said that what he wanted was that the suffragists should be treated as political prisoners as Dr. Jameson was treated.

Mr. GLADSTONE said that the treatment of Dr. Jameson came before the Act of 1898. That was a constitutional question upon which he and his hon. friend must agree to differ. His hon. friend made several declarations about the treatment of the ladies in prison. He must tell him he did not think they were accurate. He would not refer, of course, by name to the informant of the hon. Member, except to say that he observed the period spoken of was not the last period.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: It was last February.

Mr. GLADSTONE, proceeding, said that in regard to second division prisoners he was not satisfied in every respect with the present regulations, and he had already taken some action with regard to that. He was referring now to the general prison regulations. That matter was under his consideration, and would be for some time. But in regard to these particular ladies he must tell the House that their treatment was not really what his hon. friend in his genuine honest enthusiasm would lead the House to suppose. Their treatment was in fact different from that of prisoners in the third division. They were kept apart entirely from association with prisoners in the third division. Their clothes were now—whatever may have happened in the past—scrupulously clean, and he believed that in the case of most of these ladies they had actually new clothes and new shoes. His hon. friend had quoted the case of one prisoner who developed measles. That was true. There was a case of measles being developed by one of the prisoners, but there was no reason to suppose she contracted the ailment in prison. His hon. friend must remember that these ladies got two books a week in addition to the instruction books, besides which the chaplain could give them other books. They were associated together in work, and during that association they had an easier chair than was usually supplied. Their life was not of quite so ascetic a character as his hon. friend had sought to make out. They exercised twice a day, and they had writing materials. It must not be forgotten that after all the treatment was treatment in prison, and if prison discipline was to be worth anything it must be kept. He thought that, having regard to all the considerations it could not be said that the treatment of the women suffragists was cruel or inhuman. He had every reason to believe, though he had not had the Report, that almost without exception in the case of those particular ladies who had been sent to prison their health had in fact improved, and he had taken every care to see that if for obvious reasons they could not stand imprisonment so well as the more usual occupants of the prisons, they should be looked after, not to the disadvantage of other prisoners, but with very special care and attention by the medical officers. He thought that he had said enough to make it clear that his hon. friend had coloured the matter rather highly.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said that if the House would allow him at that late hour he would like to say one word on the criticism of his hon. friend the Member for Ross and Cromarty. Everybody was aware of the earnestness with which the hon. Member pleaded the cause of his constituents whenever there was a fitting opportunity in that House, and nobody would deny to him the credit which was his due on that account. But the hon. Member did not go properly into the facts and did not credit other people with the sympathy which he himself felt for the conditions under which those for whom he spoke lived. He wished to take first the question of the Vatersay squatters. The controversy which had just been concluded was merely the last incident in a long chain of events, and if his hon. friend had examined the whole history of the proceedings which had taken place in that parish and in that island for the last two or three generations he could not possibly get up in that House and hold the present Government responsible for what had recently occurred. He thought, with all respect, that his hon. friend had misunderstood the nature of the case. As regarded the Island of Lewis the conditions were difficult and serious in some respects, but they were not created yesterday. They were the sequel and result of a combination of circumstances and influences which had been going on in that island for many years, and for which no Government could be held singly and solely responsible. As a matter of fact, judged by many standards, the Island of Lewis, while he admitted there were great difficulties, had advanced and prospered. The people were better educated, the standard of life had been raised, the earnings of the people were greater, and there was more money going into the island than ever before. They found that the people made their way from that island earning their living in different parts of Scotland, and they found that they were not behind the people in other parts of

Scotland in winning their way and making a successful business of their career in life. He quite agreed that there was a great deal which might be done. These islands were remote, far from the facilities of transport, travel, and civilisation, and the other facilities usual near large centres of population, but for all that the people had great grit, and they did well when they met people from other parts of Scotland and from other parts of the world. The Government were not insensible to their responsibilities and duties to that part of the United Kingdom, and they were endeavouring to discharge their responsibilities to the best of their ability. He did not think that at that time of night he would be consulting the wishes of the House if he enlarged on the subject, but he could assure the hon. Member that the Government were no less awake than he was to their duties in regard to the parts of Scotland to which he had alluded, or than they were to their duties to other parts of the United Kingdom.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for to-morrow.

EAST INDIA LOANS [RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION WORKS, AND GENERAL PURPOSES.]

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom, on the security of the Revenues of India, by the creation and issue of capital stock, bonds, debentures, or bills:—(1) A sum not exceeding £20 000,000, for the following purposes: (*a*) The construction, extension, and equipment of railways in India by State agency or through the agency of companies; (*b*) the repayment of the principal of any bonds or debentures issued by any such company under the guarantee of the Secretary of State; (*c*) the discharge of any obligations incurred by the Secretary of State by reason of the purchase of any railway or the determination of any contract from or with such company; (*d*) the construction of irrigation works in India. (2) A sum not exceeding £5,000,000 for the general purposes of the Government of India."

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Hobhouse.

EAST INDIA LOANS BILL.

"To empower the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise money in the United Kingdom for the construction, extension, and equipment of railways in India, by State agency or through the agency of companies, for the construction of Irrigation Works, and for other purposes," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday 12th October, and to be printed. [Bill 362.]

CRIMINAL APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL [LORDS].

Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (MASTERS) BILL [LORDS].

As amended, considered.

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

Resolved, "That the Statement of the estimated Income and Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation for the year 1908–9 be approved."—(*Mr. Lambert.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 31*st July*, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Brought from the Commons.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

COMMONS REGULATION (TOWYN TREWAN) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Moved, "That the Order made on the 25th day of March last, 'That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH): My Lords, I am afraid I must make a short statement in regard to this matter. I do not propose to ask the House to object to what is intended to be done, but I think it right that the circumstances should be fully explained. The mere suspension of this Standing Order is not without precedent, but what is to follow under the suspension of Standing Order XXXIX.—namely, the passing of the Bill through the remainder of its stages—is a matter which has not been done before in the case of a Bill of this class; and I am sure your Lordships will see that, holding temporarily the position I do, it would be a breach of duty on my part to allow a new precedent to be made without informing the House of what is proposed. If this were an ordinary Provisional Order Bill I should be obliged to ask your Lordships not to allow it to pass with all this speed, because in that case the passing of it through all its stages on the same day after reading it a second time would be tantamount to cutting out the right of objecting on the part of any possible objector, as before being taken in Committee the Bill should lie on the Table for a certain period. But this is not an ordinary Provisional Order Bill. It is a Bill under the Commons Regulation Act, 1876, and the procedure under that Act is laid down with extreme precision. The procedure is extremely long and complicated, and up to the present it has been carried out in absolutely all its details. The inquiry for the purpose of securing this Order began in the autumn of last year, and in January the Board of Agriculture proceeded to make the Order. Some legal difficulties supervened, and it was not until 10th April that the draft was approved. It was then properly deposited in the locality for anyone who desired to do so to object to it. On 5th May the Select Committee of the other House of Parliament which looks after these matters was convened, but they could not proceed until the consent of two-thirds of the commoners had been obtained; that consent was obtained, but not until 28th May. Then, owing to the illness of the Chairman of Committe and the Whitsuntide adjournment, the Committee did not sit until 23rd June. They reported this month, and, so far as they can ascertain, there is no local opposition. The Bill was brought in on Friday, 10th July, in the other House, and the House of Commons suspended the corresponding Standing Order to that which your Lordships are now asked to suspend. The Bill now comes up to your Lordships' House, so far as we can tell, without the slightest local opposition. But there is a certain difficulty. My noble friend the

Chairman of Committees, who was communicated with at various stages of the matter by the Board of Agriculture, seems to have been entirely satisfied that this was a proper procedure and had undertaken to agree to the suspension of the Standing Order. The new circumstance that has supervened is the proposal to carry the Bill through all its stages now, which could not have been foreseen at the moment when my noble friend left the House; but in a letter sent to him by Sir Thomas Elliott early in July it is pointed out that if the Provisional Order is not confirmed this session, not only will the injury alleged to be suffered by the commoners be continued for another year, but there is a risk of the agreement between the various parties breaking down, while additional expense which the locality could ill afford would be incurred. It is understood that there are some threatened encroachments by buildings which the people are anxious to avoid. In the circumstances, the local people having had such ample opportunity to object if they had wished to do so, I think the House may safely agree to the request which is now made. I hope your Lordships will excuse me for having made this statement, but I naturally felt that there was a certain amount of responsibility resting upon me in regard to the creation of a precedent.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the House is grateful to my noble friend for the statement he has made, without which we should have been very much astonished at the proposal. I do not think the House can be too careful in maintaining its procedure, especially when private rights are involved. But I rose to ask my noble friend a question. He referred to a letter from Sir Thomas Elliott, in which he said it was of great importance that this matter should be put through during the present session. Well, in the situation in which we are placed that phrase is rather ambiguous. In popular parlance the present session very often means the present sittings of the House. If that be so, there would be reason for pushing a Bill through now. But it is possible that what is really meant is that the work during the present year, which would be put an end to by the Prorogation, should not be forfeited.

If that is what is meant, there is no reason why the Bill should not be passed through the remaining stages during the autumn sesssion. I should like to ask my noble friend whether, so far as Sir Thomas Elliott's letter is concerned, we should not fulfil all that is required if we passed the Bill during the autumn session.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I had an interview with the official of the Board of Agriculture who has charge of the matter, and I put that very question to him. Undoubtedly the opinion of the Board of Agriculture is that it is advisable to get the new authority set up as soon as possible, in order to prevent encroachments which might go on even during the few weeks that elapse before the Bill becomes law.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, this is a matter agreed upon by all the parties. The object of the Bill is to confirm a Provisional Order under the Inclosure Acts 1845 to 1899 relating to Towyn Trewan Common in the County of Anglesey, near where I live. I think I can state a reason which will induce noble Lords opposite to agree to the Motion. One of the purposes of this arrangement is to lay out a golf course. It is close to a growing seaside resort, and if the Bill passes now those concerned will be able to lay out the course during the summer months.

On Question, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (BATTLESHIPS AND CRUISER REPAIRS).

Return of the amount of money spent during the last two years on the repairs of battleships and cruisers launched since 1st January, 1898, together with the period of the repairs in each case. Ordered to be laid before the House.—(*The Earl Cawdor*; for the *Lord Ellenborough.*)

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Report of the Joint Committee with the proceedings of the Committee (Laid upon the Table yesterday); to be printed. [No. 202.]

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Agricultural Statistics, 1907. Vol. XLII., Part III. Prices and supplies of Corn, live-stock, and other agricultural produce.

TREATY SERIES, No. 22 (1908).

Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America providing:—For the conveyance of persons in custody for trial either in the Dominion of Canada or the United States through the territory of the other; and for reciprocal rights in wrecking and salvage in the waters contiguous to the boundary between the Dominion of Canada and the United States; Signed at Washington, 18th May, 1908. (Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 30th June, 1908.)

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4083. Japan. Tainan (South Formosa).

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.

Annual Report of the President, for the year 1907–1908.

FISHERY INVESTIGATIONS.

Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the scientific and statistical investigations now being carried on in relation to the fishing industry of the United Kingdom.

NATIONAL GALLERY, IRELAND.

Report of the Director to the Board of Governors and Guardians, for the year 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).

Order made by the council of the county of West Riding of Yorkshire, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the urban districts of Ravensthorpe, Soothill Nether, and Thornhill. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NAVY (BATTLESHIP AND CRUISER REPAIRS).

Return respecting. Laid before the House (pursuant to Order of this Day) and to be printed. [No. 204.]

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.
BEE PEST (IRELAND) BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (MASTERS) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.
WHALE FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.
POLLING DISTRICTS AND REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments, agreed to.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order) further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered (according to Order) and agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.
EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order) and passed.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Returned from the Commons with several of the Amendments agreed to; and several others disagreed to; with reasons for such disagreement.

Moved, "That the Commons reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords Amendments be considered."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I think perhaps the most convenient course would be, as these Amendments are rather numerous and the Commons reasons are not printed, that each Amendment should be read in turn by the Clerk at the Table with the Commons reasons for disagreement.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree to the Amendments made by the Lords in page 1, lines 5 and 10, viz.—

"In page 1, line 5, after (1) to insert the words 'until the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fifteen.'"

"In page 1, line 10, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'the person who is in receipt of a pension on the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fifteen shall not be deprived of that pension by reason of the expiry of this Act.'"

They disagree for the following reason: Because the effect of these Amendments would be to limit the duration of old-age pensions as proposed by the Commons. The Commons consider it unnecessary to offer any further reason, hoping the above reason may be deemed sufficient.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

*EARL CROMER: My Lords, as I was the mover of the Amendment which has now come back from the other House, your Lordships may expect me to make a few observations on the subject. After the remarks which fell from noble Lords opposite a few days ago, I never in the least expected that this Amendment would be accepted by the other House. I persisted, however, in moving it because, in common with the majority of your Lordships, I thought that it was our duty to do whatever lay in our power to remedy some of the defects of this very defective measure. It has now been rejected by the other House on the ground that it is an infringement of their privileges. On this point, as I said in moving the Amendment, I cannot express an opinion of any value. I wish, however, to say that I think the proposal on its own merits was worthy of a greater amount of consideration than it appears to have received, if only for the reason that it represented the views of some who have given a lifelong study to this important question, and who can speak on it with far greater authority than myself. The noble Viscount in charge of this Bill, though he dwelt at some little length upon the question of privilege, dismissed the Amendment on its own merits in a very few sentences. If I rightly understood his argument, it was two-fold. In the first place, he said that without any such provision as I proposed to include in the Bill Parliament could always alter the law which they are now passing. Of this, of course, I am fully aware, but I thought at the time, and I still think, that it would be far more difficult for Parliament to modify in any way engagements which will now be taken if a distinct promise is given for all time to the numerous classes who will be affected by this Bill than if a time-limit were imposed on the promise. I wished, therefore, to limit the operation of the Bill so that it might eventually be modified without any apparent breach of faith. I do not mean to say there may not have been some objections to the adoption of this course, but I still think that the point was well worthy of consideration.

The second objection taken by the noble Viscount was that it was not generally desirable to have time limits for the operation of an Act of Parliament. The noble Viscount naturally speaks on a point of this sort with a greater amount of authority than I can command, but I venture to point out that the analogy which he endeavoured to make with the Ballot Bill hardly holds good. In that case, I conceive that those who were in favour of the ballot wished the measure to form part of the permanent law of the country —as it has, in fact, become. In this case, however, the authors of the Bill itself recognise that it is a temporary and provisional measure, and it must undergo alteration. My object was to fix a time before which it would be incumbent on Parliament to make those alterations. Having said this much, I wish to add that it is clearly not desirable to raise an important constitutional question on an issue of this nature. I have little doubt, therefore, that the majority of your Lordships will consider that it will not be desirable to insist upon the Amendment.

My Lords, I have only to add that I do not in any degree regret the discussions that have taken place in this House on the Bill which is now about to become law. Neither do I regret the attempts which have been made to improve a measure which, although it aims at objects with which all of us must sympathise, is, in my opinion, one of the most ill-considered which has ever been brought before Parliament. I think those of your Lordships who have listened to the debates which have recently taken place in this House will agree with me in holding that the very cogent arguments which were advanced in this House against the Bill, more especially the financial arguments, did not receive any adequate answers. I will not, however, dwell on this point any more. Time can alone show who has been right in this controversy, and I am much mistaken if the future does not prove that we in this House, who have, at all events, endeavoured to look the real facts of the case in the face, have been wiser in our generation than those who, in order to gain a fleeting popularity, have, as it appears to me, deliberately sacrificed the future for the present.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Viscount WOLVERHAMPTON): My Lords, I should like to make one observation in order to remove from the noble Earl's mind any idea that there has been disrespect shown to him in this matter by an absence of discussion. I may say, for his and for your Lordships' information, that the moment this Amendment was read in the House of Commons Mr. Speaker interposed and told the House that, in his opinion, it would be a violation of the privileges of that House. Therefore, no debate took place; the House resolved to follow the Speaker's advice, and declined to assent to the Amendment.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, it may be convenient that I should offer in connection with the Amendment of my noble friend the few observations which I desire to make as to the position in which this House is placed. We now know that virtually the whole of our Amendments have been rejected in another place, with the exception of some of a quite insignificant character, and we know that that rejection has been entirely on what I would call the technical ground that they are an infringement of the House of Commons' privilege. We have a great admiration for the manner in which the noble Earl opposite leads this House. I hope he will forgive me for saying that my admiration would be greater still if I felt that in regard to this question of privilege the House of Lords had in him a rather more courageous champion.

The Government of which the noble Earl is a Member have been induced to accept what I venture to call the most extreme interpretation of the doctrine of privilege. Amendments have been rejected, not upon their merits—they have been rejected in spite of the fact that their merits are in some cases incontestable, and that they helped to carry out the objects of the framers of the Bill—but merely on this one alleged ground that the Bill before us is a money Bill, and that, therefore, this House has not the right to touch a line or a letter of it. I venture to maintain that in the strict sense of the word this Bill is not a money Bill. It has not the form, it has not the substance of what in strict parlance can be described as a money Bill. It is a Bill which introduces new principles for the relief of necessitous persons, and that is a subject in which this House has always taken an interest, and with which it has been free to deal on many previous occasions.

We conceived that it was our duty to discuss as thoroughly as we could in the short limits of time allowed us the details of the measure, and to make suggestions for its improvement wherever we considered that such suggestions could be usefully made, and for that reason we disregarded the advice given to us by a very distinguished Member of this House, Lord Rosebery, who recommended us to absolve ourselves of all responsibility for the Bill, and not to attempt to approach the task of amending it. I think I am not wrong in saying that our feeling that it was our duty not to follow that advice was in a considerable measure due to the fact that we knew from the language of His Majesty's Government that it was their intention to stifle discussion of details by an attempt to shelter themselves behind the privilege of the House of Commons.

Privilege has never been asserted in so aggressive a form as it has been in connection with this Bill. I will tell your Lordships why. Whenever the question of privilege arises there are two entirely distinct points. In the first place, is the House of Lords' Amendment or is it not an infringement of privilege? and, secondly, if it is an infringement, is it the desire of the House of Commons to insist upon its privilege to the utmost extremity? The first point is, I believe, usually determined by the authority of the Speaker. The other point is one that on the advice of the Government of the day has very often been decided on the side of this House. There is this great difficulty, that nowhere is there anything like a clear and authoritative description of what is and what is not the privilege of the House of Commons. There is no statute dealing with it. There is no written constitution to which we can appeal. There is no compact even between the two Houses. It is an attempt on the part of one House to limit the opportunities of the other.

That claim has been made sometimes in a moderate and sometimes in a very extreme form, but I take it that the most extreme form in which that doctrine can be put is that which is to be found in the famous Resolutions of 1671 and 1678, to which the noble Lord in charge of the Bill appealed the other evening, when he was good enough to reply to me. He regarded these Resolutions as a weapon absolutely sufficient for the purpose of demolishing the argument which I had submitted to the House. I should like to say, in passing, that the noble Earl, when he dealt with some remarks which I had made, rather gently ridiculed my argument upon the ground that I was basing myself upon somewhat antiquated precedents, because I had quoted the authority of two Speakers of the House of Commons and of Lord John Russell in the years 1837 and, I think, 1848. Well, the privilege Resolution is very much more antiquated than either of those deliverances, and if one was able to argue a case of that kind upon scientific grounds, I should be very much inclined to maintain that it did not by any means follow that, because certain rules were suitable for regulating the relations of the two Houses in the seventeenth century, the same rules were equally applicable in the twentieth century, but I am not going to enter into a dissertation of that kind this evening.

But I am going to take, as the noble Viscount in charge of the Bill took, the seventeenth-century Resolutions as the bed-rock, as to speak, of this controversy, and I want the House to consider what is said in them. This is what the Resolution of 1671 says—

> "The House resolves that in all aids given to the King by the Commons, the rate or tax ought not to be altered by the Lords."

And then in 1678 they resolved—

> "That all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons, and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills"—

that is, Bills granting aids and supplies—

> "The ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords."

That is the authority on which the noble Viscount relies. Even if we accept that Resolution as a conclusive authority, I venture to suggest to the House that this Bill is not a Bill granting aids and supplies to His Majesty. It is not a fiscal Bill in the strict sense of the word at all. It is not a Bill imposing taxation. I rather wish it was. If we were told something in this Bill about the taxation which it involves we should be wiser men than we are at present. All that this Bill does is to affirm that persons of a certain age are henceforth to have a right to a certain pension and to lay down the conditions under which that pension is to be receivable.

Again I am going to appeal to the noble Lord in charge of the Bill. The noble Lord in charge of the Bill himself moved Amendments doing what we are told we had no right to do—that is, varying the charges which may henceforth arise in consequence of this Bill becoming law. Does the noble Viscount remember that in the second clause he moved an Amendment altering the conditions as to residence? Well, obviously, that was an alteration which could not help making a difference in the charge which would result from the passing of this Bill. He moved the Amendment, but it is quite true that later in the discussion he gracefully gave way upon the point and allowed somebody else's Amendment to be passed. I cannot help thinking that I detected a moment when the noble Viscount saw that he was skating on very thin ice, and he gracefully abdicated the duty he had undertaken for that reason. But he had another Amendment—an Amendment varying the term of the imprisonment which might in certain cases be a disqualification for the receipt of a pension. Was not that to vary the charge? Unless I am very much mistaken the Amendment which we afterwards inserted to deal with that point has been rejected in the House of Commons on the very ground that it is inconsistent with the privilege of the House.

Then throughout the discussion the noble Viscount accepted two or three Amendments from us even suggesting alternative words to improve their language. He gave us no idea that those minor Amendments, at any rate, were an infringement of the privilege of the House of Commons. But whatever might have been the feeling of the noble Viscount upon that point, other counsels have apparently prevailed elsewhere, and what I wish respectfully to point out to the House is this, that if this new doctrine, for it really is a new and extended interpretation of the doctrine of privilege, is to prevail, this House had no right to discuss and amend the Territorial Forces Act of last year. It will have no right to discuss Bills dealing with education, Bills dealing with the Civil Service, or any of those numerous Bills which come to us in these days dealing with what we speak of as social questions, all of which involve charges on the Exchequer.

I come now to the Amendment of my noble friend. My noble friend's Amendment, if it had any effect, would certainly have had the effect of diminishing and not increasing the charge upon the country, but I pass that by. My noble friend certainly did not desire to interfere with the grants of aids or supplies to the Sovereign. What my noble friend desired to do was simply this. His Majesty's Government had proclaimed that their Bill was, in a sense, a transitional Bill. They told us that they were quite aware that a Royal Commission was dealing with the whole question of the Poor Law, and they reserved to themselves the right of amending their Act when that Commission should have reported. They actually put into the Bill themselves words under which the disqualification, owing to receipt of poor relief, was to come to an end in the year 1910, because they said it was their intention to review the whole system of this pension on the one hand and poor relief on the other before that date. My noble friend really only desired to do rather more thoroughly what His Majesty's Government themselves desired to do. There was no spirit of hostility in his Amendment, no attempt to wreck the Bill, and, I venture to think, it was a most helpful and reasonable proposal, coming to us as it did with a very considerable backing from those most important bodies whom we have not sufficiently taken into account—I mean the great friendly societies.

And let us not forget that my noble friend's Amendment was careful to save the rights of all existing pensioners, so that it would be nonsense to say that, if that Amendment had found a place in the Bill any single human being would have been robbed of the pension which had accrued to him. I supported my noble friend, taking the Government at its word, and desiring by voting for this Amendment to record my protest against the precipitation with which this important subject has been dealt with. But you have learnt from my noble friend that he does not desire to press this matter to the bitter end, and that he proposes not to insist on the Amendment. Therefore, so far as that particular question is concerned, I consider that the controversy is at an end. But I wish to add this. I do not think it is possible for your Lordships to accept without demur the line which has been taken by His Majesty's

Government in regard to the application of the doctrine of House of Commons' privilege. I think your Lordships will recollect that, upon another occasion of this kind, the late Lord Salisbury proposed to the House and carried a Resolution accepting certain Amendments made by the House of Commons, but making it clear that, if the House did not insist upon its Amendments it did not on the other hand accept the view taken by the House of Commons. And I propose at the close of this discussion to ask your Lordships to accept a Resolution in which we shall place the view which we hold to-day upon record. It is very short, and I venture to read it to the House. I propose that the House resolve—

> "That this House, although not insisting upon its Amendments to the Old-Age Pensions Bill, does not accept the Reasons offered by the House of Commons or consent that the said Reasons should hereafter be drawn into a precedent. The Bill is, in the opinion of this House, not one for the grant of aids and supplies to His Majesty in Parliament, and involves questions of policy affecting the treatment of necessitous persons, in which both Houses are concerned, and with which this House has in the past been accustomed to deal."

I propose at the proper moment, with your Lordships' permission to offer that Resolution to the House.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I am very grateful to the noble Marquess for the kindly terms in which he referred to myself, but, on the other hand, I am not quite clear as to the actual nature of the complaint which he makes against me as the Leader of the House. What has happened to the Amendments of this House is this. They have gone down to another place and some have been accepted by the House of Commons and others have been refused. Of those that have been refused, only four have been refused on the ground of privilege. The remainder have been refused for other reasons, which will be read as the Amendments come before us. As to this question of privilege, I am not quite clear what the noble Marquess thinks we ought to have done. When an Amendment goes down to the House of Commons and appears to Mr. Speaker to be a breach of privilege, he rises and states his opinion to that effect. Does the noble Marquess mean that in that case the Prime Minister should rise and say that in his opinion it is not a breach of privilege, or does he merely mean that in consideration of the substance of the Amendment the House should be asked to waive its privilege?

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I mean the latter. This has been done again and again. The Speaker has ruled that such an Amendment does raise the question of privilege, and, thereupon, the Minister has said that in his view the Amendment was within the scope and intention of the Bill and was a reasonable one, and has moved that the House do not insist on its privilege.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Exactly, my Lords. That may be done, but it is not likely to be done by those who are in a position to prevent its being done on the merits of the case; and, if that is done, it by no means alters your Lordship's grievance, if grievance there be. The grievance of the noble Marquess is not against us, but against the authorities of the House of Commons, who put a certain interpretation upon this question of privilege. It is not reasonable to place that particular responsibility on us on this bench or on my right hon. friends who sit on the Government bench in another place. When you come to the question whether privilege ought or ought not to be waived in a particular instance, then you come to the merits of the special Amendment and the views of the Government of the day. It may be desirable under certain circumstances in order to carry out a compromise between the two parties, or from a general desire to live at peace with all the world, to waive privilege on certain Amendments; but that deals purely with the substance of the Amendments and their political effect, and has no bearing whatever on the question of privilege.

The noble Marquess says that this is not a case in which privilege ought to be brought into play at all, because no money is voted. Is that seriously maintained by noble Lords opposite? That position has never yet been taken up in this House. If that were so, all the provisions dealing with money in any Bill except the Finance Bill and the Appropriation Bill might be dealt with in any way by your Lordships, and that is a claim that, so far as I know, has never been taken up in this House. The mere fact that it is stated in a Bill of this kind that certain charges will be paid out of the monies provided by Parliament surely does not prevent the rule, if rule it be, or the claim of the House of Commons from operating in cases of this kind? If it were so, it would be open to your Lordships to deal in any way with the finance, not merely of this Bill, but of any other Bill that deals with money, and that is a pretension which, so far as I am aware, no one has ever attempted to make on behalf of this House.

It is perfectly possible that the House of Commons may in some cases put a somewhat strained interpretation on its privilege. I remember a case which occurred in 1906 on the Irish Labourers Act, when an Amendment was sent down by your Lordships which it certainly never occurred to any of us in this House was a breach of privilege. Mr. Speaker said on that occasion that in his opinion the Amendment was an infringement of the privileges of the House of Commons, as it would enable an arbitrator to add an additional sum for compulsory purchase of land which would involve an increase of the rates, and that this was not within the competence of the House of Lords. That was, no doubt, carrying the doctrine of privilege very far, infinitely further than it is carried by the action of the other House with regard to any of the Amendments on this Bill, and in that case the noble Marquess did make a protest to the effect that this House—

> "Though not insisting on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed maintains its right to legislate with regard to the principles of valuation upon which property may be taken for public purposes."

That was a comparatively harmless pretension. But when we come to the Resolution which the noble Marquess has announced his intention of moving at the close of the discussion on this Bill, I am bound to tell him at once that we cannot possibly concur with it, because it involves the proposition to which I have just called attention as being an impossible one for this House to sustain—namely, that this House has a right to alter in any way the charges contained in any Bill that comes before your Lordships' House, provided that money is not actually voted in that Bill. That is a proposition to which we cannot possibly assent.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the noble Earl has made a distinction between a money Bill properly so-called, and such a Bill as that under consideration, because that distinction appears on the face of the Resolution of the seventeenth century upon which the Government rely as justifying the privilege of the House of Commons. No one who reads that Resolution carefully can doubt that the House of Commons who were responsible for passing the Resolution had what we know as the Finance Bill and the Appropriation Bill specifically in their mind. These Bills are preceded by a formal preamble which differentiates them from any other kind of Bill passed through Parliament. In that preamble the Commons definitely assert that it is on their initiative and their action that the aids and supplies are given to the Crown. You find the same phrases used in the Resolution of the seventeenth century, and it is quite obvious that what the Commons of that day intended was that the right of taxation and the right of supply rested with the Commons, and that those Bills could not be amended by the Lords. The distinction is a very rational one, because whatever Amendment your Lordships had introduced into such a Bill as we are now considering would not have affected the taxation of the country or the supplies granted to the King. Those matters depend upon other Acts of Parliament, which have to be passed in their turn. When those Bills came to be proposed, it would then be fully justifiable for the House of Commons to rely upon its privileges and to those privileges we should, of course, pay——

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am sorry to interrupt the noble Marquess, but I am extremely anxious to understand how far his argument goes. Would he hold that it was in the competence of this House to say that a pension, instead of being 5s. a week, should be £1 a week?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl asks me to define at this moment exactly how far the privileges of the House of Commons go. I should not presume to do such a thing. But the Commons have to-day rejected Amendments on the score of privilege which goes far beyond anything that your Lordships could have contemplated. For instance, one Amendment has been rejected which merely changes the authority to administer the Act from the County Council of London to the borough councils, and that is held to be a breach of the privilege of the other House. A doctrine of that kind, if it were admitted, would prevent your Lordships from dealing with any Bill involving machinery under which Imperial grants are made.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am extremely sorry again to interrupt the noble Marquess. But is the argument of the noble Marquess that this House can amend in any way it pleases any Bill in which money is not actually voted?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I do not see why I should be compelled to say that we can amend any Bill in any way we like, but I do say that we can amend one in the way we have amended the present Bill. That was a perfectly legitimate proceeding on the part of this House. The noble Earl, in the earlier part of his speech, said our quarrel ought to be with the authorities of the other House and not with His Majesty's Government.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I said that the Government did not move that the House of Commons should, on the merits, waive its privilege.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: No, they certainly did not. They relied on privilege, and nothing but privilege. Whenever Mr. Speaker said that a particular Amendment was a breach of privilege, the Government offered no reason on the merits, but moved at once that the Lords' Amendment should be disagreed with. Does the noble Earl think that Mr. Speaker thought they ought to have taken that course, because, if so, he is under a complete misapprehension, for in one instance it occurred to a Member of the House of Commons to ask whether it was not known that the House did waive its privilege, and Mr. Speaker thereupon said—

"Yes, constantly every session."

After that observation the Government did offer some reasons, and very bad reasons they were, for disagreeing with the Amendments of your Lordships. What appears to be the fact is that it was not the authorities of the House, who merely deal with dry technicalities, but the responsible Leaders of the House of Commons, who relied upon privilege to reject Amendments which they themselves did not dare to say were not reasonable. In one case, rather than do justice to the people, they relied on the privilege of the House of Commons.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): The Motion is that the House do not insist on the said Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 1, line 21, viz.—

"At end to insert the words 'as verified wherever practicable by certificates of birth or baptism or in the absence of such certificates by Census Returns or other official documents, or where no such certificates or documents are attainable in such other manner as may seem sufficient to the pension authorities.'"

They disagree for the following reason: Because so far as the matter is not capable of being dealt with by regulations the Commons consider the Lords' Amendment puts technical difficulties in the way of obtaining pensions which the Commons consider are unnecessary.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, as I had the honour of moving this Amendment, which was accepted by your Lordships without a division, I would respectfully ask that we might be told from the Front Bench opposite what were the grounds, beyond the mere dry technical statement, on which the Government rejected this Amendment. The sole object we had in view was that there should be some means of verifying the age of the applicants for these pensions. In the absence of such a provision the system will be open to fraud, and frequent losses must occur. The reason sent up by the House of Commons for disagreeing to this Amendment is that they consider that our Amendment puts technical difficulties in the way of obtaining pensions which they consider are unnecessary. The intention of the Amendment was to make it incumbent upon the applicant to prove his right to a pension by means of some document, and I feel that the refusal of this Amendment, resting in no degree upon the question of privilege, proves most unmistakedly that in this matter the Leaders of the Government in the House of Commons have been more anxious to inflict a rebuff upon your Lordships' House than to safeguard the public purse against fraud.

*VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: My Lords, I must express my strong dissent from the last statement of the noble Viscount, which has no foundation whatever. As he has properly said, no question of privilege was raised on this Amendment. The Amendment was fully discussed upon its merits in the other House, where the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a forceful and intelligent speech, stated to the House what were the objections to the noble Viscount's Amendment and showed how onerous the requirement would be in many cases, and how hard it would be to put poor people well known to be seventy years of age to the expense of providing themselves with birth certificates. There was no attempt whatever to inflict a rebuff upon your Lordships' House. The House was at first apparently in favour of defining the matter more fully in the Bill, but became convinced that it would be very unwise to do so. The House thought it would be very much better to leave the subject of this Amendment to be dealt with in the regulations. Those regulations, as the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed the House, are all but complete. I can assure the noble Viscount that no party feeling and no temper against the House of Lords were displayed by the other House.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 2, line 7, the Amendment being to leave out the words—

> "The thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and ten."

They disagree for the following reason: Because the effect of the Amendment would be to vary the period of disqualification for a pension. The Commons consider it unnecessary to offer any further reason, hoping this reason may be deemed sufficient.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: As I moved this Amendment, perhaps I may say a word upon it. My object in proposing it was to ascertain what was the intent of the House of Commons in framing the Bill in the form in which it came before your Lordships. Words were inserted in the clause on Report which appeared to me to lead to the result that, purely by inadvertence, the House of Commons might impose at the date named a large additional burden on the country without having meant to do so. If I rightly understand the matter, the question of privilege has been raised. In other words, that means that it was the intention of the House of Commons, if no legislation with regard to Poor Law reform took place before 31st December, 1910, that this additional burden should be laid on the country. If that be so, it would not be for me to contest the question of privilege, even if I could do so; and I am bound frankly to say that if I had thought that that was the intention I should not have pressed the Amendment. But it was not resisted by the noble Viscount on this ground at all. He resisted it because he said the House of Commons wished to bind the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a pledge which he had given that legislation with regard to the Poor Law should be the first thing taken up by the Government next year, so that it could pass into law before the end of the following year. I should have been quite content to have accepted the pledge of the Chancellor of the Exchequer without making it the subject of a statutory enactment. But the House of Commons knows the Chancellor of the Exchequer better than I do, and, as they have thought otherwise, I do not wish to insist on the Amendment.

VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON: This was an Amendment which the Speaker himself ruled out on the ground that it was a privilege Amendment. I plead guilty to having given a totally different reason to the noble Viscount opposite.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 2, lines 34 and 35, viz.—

> "To leave out the words 'up to attaining,' and to insert the words 'immediately preceding his attainment of.'"

For the following reason: Because the object aimed at can be met by regulations under the Bill.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 3, line 17—viz.

> "After the word 'and,' to insert the words 'if the term of imprisonment to which he is sentenced exceeds one month he shall be disqualified'"—

for the following reason: Because the Amendment reduces the number of persons disqualified by the Bill, and may, therefore, increase the charge. The Commons consider it unnecessary to offer any further reason, hoping the above reason may be deemed sufficient.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

*THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I understand that this Amendment is regarded by the House of Commons as a breach of privilege. The noble Earl the Leader of the House put a question just now to Lord Salisbury, so perhaps he will pardon me if I put a question to him. Does the noble Earl consider this Amendment a breach of the privilege of the House of Commons?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I confess I have no opinion whatever on the subject.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: If the noble Earl is in that felicitous state of ignorance, the noble Viscount (Lord Wolverhampton) who sits next to him can hardly claim to share it, because he himself put down this very Amendment. I am sure, after all the speeches with regard to the limitation of the liberties of this House with which this matter was preceded, that the noble Viscount had fully considered anything which could be held to be a breach of privilege, and it is extremely difficult to conceive any Government, especially the present Government, infringing the privileges of the House of Commons. As the Bill stood before the Amendment adopted by your Lordships, a person who had been imprisoned for one or two days would be disqualified for ten years after his release. Your Lordships said, with the entire approval of noble Lords opposite, and I think with reason, that you thought that would be rather hard, and that such a disqualification ought not to be inflicted upon a man unless he had committed an offence by which he incurred at least a month's imprisonment. That was the extent of the breach of privilege which was committed. I think that, had it been put to Mr. Speaker in the other House, he would have described it by the remark which he made in regard to a subsequent Amendment as "privilege gone mad." I think this Amendment is a cousin four or five times removed to a breach of privilege. That is as near as you can bring it. The noble Viscount was certainly of opinion that it was not a breach of privilege, or he would not have proposed it. I venture to say there is no one in this House who will get up and assert that this is in any tangible sense a breach of privilege. If the Government insist upon disqualifying a man because he was imprisoned for a few days for a trivial offence, then there will be a large number of persons disqualified. Perhaps the Government hope in this way to find some of the money which they need for public charges. But to call the Amendment a breach of privilege is something approaching nonsense.

LORD ATKINSON: My Lords, I should like to call attention to some of the awkward consequences that will follow from the enforcement of this principle. I observe that several of your Lordships' Amendments which have been read by the Clerk at the Table are objected to on two grounds—first, that they are a breach of privilege in that they affect moneys voted by the House of Commons; and, secondly, that the matter can be done by regulations. But, if that be so, the regulations must be an infringement of the privilege of the House of Commons. If your Lordships are not to be permitted to interfere in any way in these matters, it is rather hard that Treasury clerks should be permitted to do so, because that is the necessary consequence. Then there is the contention that your Lordships need have no hesitation in leaving these matters to be dealt with by regulation, because the regulations will be laid on the Table of both Houses. But the claim of privilege will be quite as applicable if your Lordships attempt to interfere with the regulations. If ever there was an instance of the privileges of the House of Commons being brought to absurdity it is afforded by the rejection of this Amendment. If it were to be held that any Amendment made by your Lordships' House which might, however indirectly and inconsequentially, lead to an increase in the public charge was a breach of the privileges of the Commons, then no Amendment could be made by your Lordships in any conceivable Bill that came to this House.

***VISCOUNT WOLVERHAMPTON**: My Lords, I should like to explain my position in the matter. I agree with every word which the noble Earl opposite said in regard to this Amendment. We all have our individual opinions. This Amendment, however, was objected to by the Commons, not on the ground of privilege but on its merits. As the noble Earl appealed to me on the point, I should like to say that I have not changed my mind in the matter.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am quite sure the noble Viscount says what he thinks to be accurate. He is quite incapable of saying anything else; but he is labouring under a complete misapprehension. This Amendment was not rejected by the House of Commons because the Commons disagreed with it. On the contrary, the Government admitted that the Amendment inserted by your Lordships' House remedied an obvious injustice. It was rejected by the Prime Minister entirely on the ground of privilege and on the ground of privilege alone; and because of this technicality, which was not supported by the Speaker when appealed to, for he said that the House did constantly waive its privilege in such cases, any unfortunate man who is put into prison for a few days is to be deprived of his pension for ten years. This is the kind of policy which the Government think will be approved of by the people. I am certain there is nobody in the House of Commons or in your Lordships' House or in the country who does not think that this Amendment ought to be inserted; yet it is rejected simply on the ground of privilege.

LORD ASHBOURNE: It is quite clear that, if your Lordships' Amendment is not insisted upon, the Bill passes to be interpreted exactly on its own words, which are that if a man is sentenced to the shortest period of imprisonment he will be deprived of his pension for ten years. Regulations cannot be brought in to give a different meaning to this provision.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: There can be no doubt as to the reason why this Amendment was rejected. The reason given by the Commons is that the Amendment would reduce the number of persons disqualified by the Bill, and might, therefore, increase the charge. The Amendment is rejected on pure, narrow, technical grounds that have no relation whatever to its merits, which we know go entirely the other way.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 4, line 2—viz.:

"After the word 'him,' to insert the words 'as to produce the largest income that can be reasonably obtained from it'"—

for the reason that it would apply tests of means which would be more stringent than those in the Bill and very difficult to administer.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: In moving this Amendment I called the attention of your Lordships to what must be admitted even now to be a blot in the Bill. As the Bill stands, without the Amendment, it will be possible for two persons, husband and wife, having each £1,200 invested in Consols, to obtain a pension of 1s. a week, and the object of my Amendment was to secure that a claimant of a pension who possessed property should prove that he made the most of that property before he could establish his right to a pension. The House of Commons have rejected the Amendment on the ground that it would apply tests of means which would be more stringent than those in the Bill and very difficult to administer. If it be the intention of the House of Commons that persons having property of the amount to which I have alluded should obtain pensions from the taxpayers under this Bill, I have nothing further to say. I have done my best to prevent what I consider would be a great waste of public money, and I will take no further action in the matter.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons, while agreeing to the Amendment made by the Lords to insert, after line 20, paragraph (*d*)—viz.:

"In line 20, at end to insert the words '(*d*) If any person is aggrieved by the refusal or neglect of a local pension committee to consider a claim for a pension, or to determine any question referred to them, that person may apply in the prescribed manner to the central pension authority, and that authority may, if they consider that the local pension committee have refused or neglected to consider and determine the claim or question within a reasonable time, themselves consider and determine the claim or question in the same manner as on an appeal from the decision of the local pension committee"—

disagree with the Amendment to insert paragraph (*e*)

"(*e*) the expression 'party aggrieved' shall include a member of the said committee who has taken part in the consideration of the report and has dissented from the decision."

They disagree for the following reason: Because they do not consider that a special appeal should be given in such a case.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on that part of the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

LORD ATKINSON: I moved this Amendment to prevent abuses; and I have not the slightest doubt that the Government will live to learn the gross abuse which the absence of this Amendment will give opportunity for.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree to the Amendments made by the Lords in page 5, line 30, and after line 40—viz.:

"In line 30, at end to insert the words 'for the purposes of this subsection the expression "borough" includes a metropolitan borough and the city of London, and the expression "council of a borough" includes the council of a metropolitan borough, and as respects the City of London, the mayor, aldermen, and commons of the City of London in common council assembled.'"

"In line 40, to insert as a new subsection '(3) The Local Government Board may appoint any person or any persons not exceeding three in number to be a member or members of any local pensions committee, or of any sub-committee appointed by the latter, who shall, when appointed, have all the rights of ordinary members of such committees.'"

They disagree for the following reason: Because these Amendments alter the constitution of the body appointed by

The Marquess of Lansdowne.

the House of Commons for carrying the Act into force. The Commons consider it unnecessary to offer any further reason, hoping the above reason may be deemed sufficient.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

LORD ATKINSON: As the mover of these Amendments, I look upon the Commons reason as unanswerable, because the reason given for their rejection is no reason at all.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: I understand that these Amendments are disagreed to on the ground of privilege. Here again is an instance of privilege run mad. Can any case be cited in which privilege has been pressed to this point? In view of the fact that it is the universal desire of your Lordships that those who are to have the advantage of this Bill should not have that advantage delayed, I presume that this is not the time at which your Lordships would wish to take up this question of privilege. But in the most serious form I enter a protest against this absolutely unrivalled case of interference with the rights and privileges and duties of the House of Lords. The interpretation of privilege set up by the Commons could be brought into every Bill which went down amended in any way by your Lordships. If, in order not to prevent this Bill being delayed until the autumn, your Lordships forbear to make any more formal protest than has been suggested, it must not be taken that we in any way abandon our rights in this matter.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 6, line 9, viz.—

"After the word 'representation,' to insert the words 'or if any person directly or indirectly deprives himself of any income or property in order to qualify himself for the receipt of an old-age pension, or for the receipt of an old-age pension at a higher rate than that to which he would otherwise be entitled under this Act.'"

They disagree because they consider this is not a matter which should properly be made a criminal offence.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: This was an Amendment which was accepted by the Government without any opposition at all; in fact, I think they were of opinion that it was an improvement. As the Bill originally stood, and as it will stand if your Lordships do not insist on your Amendment—and I do not propose, in the circumstances, to ask you to do so—a person who directly or indirectly deprives himself of any income or property in order to qualify himself for an old-age pension will not in any way be punishable, but will meet with the success which his fraudulent conduct is held by the Government to deserve.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons disagree with the Amendment made by the Lords to insert a new subsection after line 11, viz.—

"(2) The pension officer may at any time, without the matter having been referred to him, call upon and require a person in receipt of an old-age pension to establish that he has not since the same was granted to him become disqualified to receive it, and the pension officer shall inquire into the matter of the pensioner's disqualification and report on the same to the pension committee, who shall receive, and, as far as applicable, act upon the said Report as if it were a Report received under the provisions of Section 7, subsection (*c*) of this Act."

They disagree for the following reason: Because they consider that the subject of the Amendment is a matter for regulation.

Moved, "That the House do not insist on the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*Viscount Wolverhampton.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved to resolve, "That this House, although not insisting upon its Amendments to the Old-Age Pensions Bill, does not accept the Reasons offered by the House of Commons, or consent that the said Reasons should hereafter be drawn into a precedent. The Bill is, in the opinion of this House, not one for the grant of aids and supplies to His Majesty in Parliament, and involves questions of policy affecting the treatment of necessitous persons, in which both Houses are concerned, and with which this House has in the past been accustomed to deal."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Will your Lordships allow me to say a few words upon this Resolution? It has not been infrequent for this House to enter upon record its opinion of its own rights in opposition to the privileges claimed by the House of Commons. But I think on this occasion there is implicitly involved in this Resolution a claim which, as foreshadowed in the speech of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, and in the speech of the noble Marquess Lord Salisbury, I believe to be unprecedented. Let me point this out—that the privilege of the House of Commons is admittedly somewhat indistinct at its borders. No one can read the history of this question and the various Resolutions which have been arrived at, and the various acts which have taken place, without seeing that there is a certain borderland which is indeterminate and to a certain extent indefinite. But the House of Commons has always dealt with Bills of this kind as measures involving privilege. The noble Marquess referred to the Resolution of 1678, but, in addition to that, or in illustration of that, there is a long course of dealings by the House of Commons every year in which they claim that these subject-matters—the conditions under which money shall be spent—shall be treated as matters of privilege. The noble Marquess Lord Salisbury and the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition in their speeches apparently claimed that nothing but Finance Bills could be matters of privilege of the Commons. That is the logical result of the contention put forward by them. It would be perfectly easy to show that all you have to do would be to introduce a clause involving a charge in a Bill of this kind in order to bring it within the rule of the noble Marquess himself. The practice, it is said, has been that Bills of this kind should be treated separately from the funds, and then that the Appropriation Bill should supply the actual grant of the funds. All I can say is that this seems to me to be a new claim, that a Bill of this kind should be free from any privilege of any sort or kind. It is a new claim to say that there is no privilege of the Commons in a Bill of this kind. Certainly that is not claimed by the noble Viscount Lord St. Aldwyn. It was, however, claimed by the noble Marquess. I observed that the noble Viscount did not support that claim. He no doubt felt, as an old House of Commons man, that it would not have been accepted for an instant by the other House. Neither side of the House, in any House of Commons in which I have had the honour to sit, would have listened for a moment to a claim of that kind. I think it would be deplorable if a claim of this kind were put forward, because there is not the faintest chance that it would be admitted and allowed. Every one knows how jealous, not only Liberal Houses of Commons, but Conservative Houses of Commons have been upon this question of money grants. I am quite sure that if this Resolution, which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition, is to have the meaning which, in accordance with the speeches delivered, it seems to convey, it is putting forward a claim which for hundreds of years has never been advanced in this House.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I am afraid that if the records to which the noble and learned Lord referred were examined with particular minuteness it would be difficult to say that the contentions on either side have been conducted on rules of strict logic. The misfortune is that each House claims to be, and undoubtedly is, the guardian of its own privileges. That is to say, that the majority of the House from time to time has a right to declare what its privileges are, and that nobody shall interfere with them, and occasionally I cannot help feeling that the other House has somewhat partially considered the question, and not taken up the only logical position that could be taken, that, where it is only a question of an indirect effect upon the finances of the country, nobody has ever successfully contended that this raised a question of privilege. Let us take the most ordinary case. Suppose a question of criminal law affecting such and such an offence. It is quite true that the question of greater or less punishment by imprisonment involves a greater or less charge upon the country, but that I do not think involves any question of privilege of the House of Commons. There is a broad distinction between a direct and an indirect effect upon the supplies or aid granted to the Sovereign. I do not think that the Motion which the noble Marquess has now moved puts forward any new claim on the part of this House. It is only right to maintain the claim, which has often hitherto been conceded, and if not conceded specially waived, by the House of Commons.

*THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: My Lords, I would venture to suggest that there is no precedent for the position in which we are now placed. Here is a measure raising a vast and wide question and involving enormous expense; but through the action of the Government, while one House is debarred by the guillotine from discussing it, by an exaggerated interpretation of privilege the other House is debarred from amending it.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack referred so pointedly to me that, although I am far from claiming to be an authority on the great constitutional question at issue, I hope your Lordships will permit me to say a few words. I was surprised at the contention of the noble Earl who leads the House and of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack that, either in moving or supporting this Resolution, we on this side make such a claim as that which was suggested by those noble Lords.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Did the noble Viscount hear the speech of the noble Marquess who leads the Opposition?

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: Yes, and I do not think it justified the interpretation which the noble Earl put upon it. My noble friend has never claimed that the only Bills to which privilege should apply are the Appropriation Bill and the Finance Bill of the year. My noble friend has never said that privilege could not arise on a Bill such as this. What has always been said is that a question of privilege would arise if by the action of your Lordships a charge was directly imposed upon the taxpayers. But the question before us to-day is no question of that kind. It is a question of two Amendments, one of which fixes the term of imprisonment at a month instead of seven days, and the other concerns the authority by which this Act should be administered. It seems to me that an interpretation has been placed on the privileges of the House of Commons which I have never heard of before.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The noble Viscount who has just sat down has put his case very moderately; but, unless my recollection is entirely wrong, what he said is not at all the same as that which was said by the two noble Marquesses opposite. What I understood the Leader of the Opposition to say was that because no money was voted by this Bill it did not come under the term of aids and supplies mentioned in the House of Commons Resolution. From that I deduced that the noble Marquess considered that the privileges of the House of Commons were not involved in any Bill in which money was not actually voted, and from that I further deduced that it could be only a Finance Bill or an Appropriation Bill to which that would be said to apply, and that therefore a Bill such as this would not be subject to privilege at all.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Earl deduced from my observations a good deal more than those observations really contained. The noble Lord in charge of the Bill told us that we were debarred from amending it owing to the terms of the Resolution of 1671. I thereupon said that I could find nothing in this Bill which brought it within the terms of that Resolution. I maintain that that is so.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: That is exactly what I said.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Then I hope we are agreed. I heard with great pleasure the admission of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack that, in regard to this question of privilege, there was no very distinct borderland, and that, I think, is one of the reasons why the difficulty of dealing with it is so great. I have no desire to encroach upon the frontier of the House of Commons; but my complaint is that the action of the House of Commons in this case has been an encroachment upon our frontier; the two Amendments which have just been referred to are conspicuous instances of that—notably the Amendment of Lord Midleton, who proposed, as the House will remember, to substitute, as part of the machinery of the Bill, borough councils instead of county councils. During the earlier stages of this discussion the Leader of the House said that, whatever else we might not do, we had, at any rate, the right to amend the machinery of the Bill. Now the clause to which Lord Midleton moved an Amendment is a pure machinery clause. I cannot see that it would cost a single half-crown in point of money. And yet that Amendment has been rejected on the ground that it is an interference with the privileges of the House of Commons. That is what I call an encroachment upon our privileges, and it is against appearing to acquiesce in that encroachment that I desire to guard myself. It is for that reason and for that reason alone, and not with any idea of putting the clock back, that I have placed this Resolution before the House.

On Question—

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 37; Not-Contents, 23.

CONTENTS.

Devonshire, D.
Wellington, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.

Camperdown, E.
Cawdor, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cromer, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Eldon, E.
Haddington, E.
Halsbury, E.
Mar, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Plymouth, E.
Waldegrave, E. (*Teller.*]
Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
St. Aldwyn, V.

Bangor, L. Bp.

Ashbourne, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Clinton, L.
Curzon of Kedleston, L.
De Mauley, L.
Ebury, L.
Killanin, L.
Lawrence, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Newlands, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
St. Oswald, L.
Sanderson, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Ripon, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward*)
Carrington, E.
Crewe, E.

Althorpe, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Wolverhampton, V.

Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Castletown, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Eversley, L.
Farrer, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Hemphill, L.
Herschell, L.
Pirrie, L.
Reay L.
St. Davids, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

Returned from the Commons with several of the Amendments agreed to, and one of the Amendments disagreed to, and an Amendment made in lieu thereof.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS: The Commons' reason for disagreeing to one of the Lords' Amendments is as follows. They disagree to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 5, line 39, viz.—

"After the word, 'funds,' to insert the words 'and the professor or lecturer is not eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies, or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology; or (*b*) the erection of any church, chapel, or place of religious worship or observance by means of private benefaction within or without the precincts of the University or college ' "--

for the following reason: Because the first part of the Amendment is not in the proper place in the clause, and they propose to insert a corresponding provision elsewhere; and because the second part of the Amendment is contrary to the principle on which public money was given to the University.

THE EARL OF CREWE: The alteration made by the other House transfers to another place in the section the words providing that the professor or lecturer is not eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology. That is a purely grammatical point, and I move that the House agree with the Commons in that alteration. The other Amendment, on which I shall move that your Lordships do not insist, is the one upon which considerable discussion took place relating to the building of a chapel. I do not want to repeat the arguments I used on that occasion, further than to say that this particular point represents a compromise which was arrived at on the subject in another place; and as the division last night showed how very nearly your Lordships were divided on the subject, I hope you may be disposed not to insist on the Amendment to-day.

Moved "That the Commons' Amendment to the Lords' Amendments be agreed to."—(*The Earl of Crewe*).

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Might I ask whom this compromise was between?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: It would take a pretty long time to explain that, and would involve the discussion of the entire history of the question over some years.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Well, to put it short, was it between the Nationalists and the Nonconformists?

[No Answer was returned.]

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That this House do not insist on that part of the said Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I certainly do not desire to suggest that we should insist upon our Amendment, particularly in view of the narrowness of the division last night. The point was one about which we had ourselves no doubt, but we desired to give the House of Commons, which had already changed its mind more than once upon the subject, another opportunity of discussing the question.

On Question, Motion agreed to

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (MASTERS) BILL [H.L.].

Commons' Amendments considered (on Motion), and agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

Read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. [No. 203.]

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 31*st July*, 1908.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill (by Order).—Read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against: From Marshfield; and Wiltshire Brewers' Association; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: From Aberffraw; Alsager; Belan and Bryntwrog; Gaerwen (four); Haslingden; Kearsley; Liverpool; and Llanddensant; to lie upon the Table.

NATAL (TRIAL OF DINIZULU).

Petition from Edwin George Jellicoe, for inquiry; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.

Copy presented, of Report of the President for the year 1907–8 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

OFFENCES (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th July; *Mr. Lonsdale*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 289.]

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACTS, 1879 AND 1884.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 30th July; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*] to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.; [No. 290.]

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of the West Riding of Yorkshire, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the urban districts of Ravensthorpe, Soothill Nether, and Thornhill [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th July; *Sir Daniel Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 291.]

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Agricultural Statistics, 1906. Vol. XLII. Part III. Prices and Supplies of Corn, Live Stock, and other Agricultural Produce [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 22, 1908).

Copy presented, of Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America providing: (1) For the Conveyance of Persons in Custody for Trial either in the Dominion of Canada or the United States through the Territory of the other; and (2) for Reciprocal Rights in Wrecking and Salvage in the Waters contiguous to the Boundary between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. Signed at Washington, 18th May, 1908. Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 30th June, 1908, [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 4083 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the principal and other Foreign Countries in each year from 1896 to 1905–6 (Thirty-fourth Number) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND BRITISH POSSESSIONS).

Copy presented, of Abstract and detailed Tables showing Countries of Consignment of Imports and Countries of Ultimate Destination of Exports (Supplement to Vols. I. and II.) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DENMARK (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF).

Copy presented, of Translation ot the Law etsablishing a New Customs Tariff for Denmark; together with comparison, as far as possible, of the Raes of Customs Duty contained in the New Tariff with the rates at present in force, and the English equivalents of both [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GAS UNDERTAKINGS.

Return ordered, "relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom, other than those of Local Authorities, for the year ended the 31st day of December, 1907, (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No.

338, of Session, 1907)."—(*Sir Hudson Kearley.*)

GAS UNDERTAKINGS (LOCAL AUTHORITIES).

Return ordered, "relating to all, authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom belonging to Local Authorities for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1908, (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 339, of Session 1907)."—(*Sir Hudson Kearley.*)

EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION.

Copy ordered, "of Statistical Tables relating to Emigration and Immigration from and into the United Kingdom in the year 1907, and Report to the Board of Trade thereon."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Men Employed by Tramway Companies.

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number of men employed in connection with the traffic department of tramway undertakings in the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have made inquiry, but I cannot find that there is any exact information on this subject. I understand, however, that the total number of the cars is 11,561, and that on an average the number of employees may be estimated at four men per car. This would give the estimated number of men employed as 46,244.

Acquisition of Estate of Mrs. Charlotte E. Hynes.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Estates Commissioners intend to compulsorily acquire from Mrs. Charlotte Elizabeth Hynes, in the County of Cavan, for the purposes of the Evicted Tenants Act, the lands of Deanfield and Rynn, amounting to 200 acres; if these are the only lands this lady has in her own occupation; if he is aware that she has never evicted a tenant; if the Estates Commissioners have already refused to sanction her sale to her tenants of tenanted land because she would not sell these lands to them at their own price; if it is the policy of the Government under the Act that one proprietor is to be dispossessed of his entire property to create three or four others; and if he will inquire into this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have gazetted notice of their intention to acquire, for the purposes of the Evicted Tenants Act, the lands referred to in the Question. The objections of the owner to the acquisition of the lands will be duly considered and judicially determined; and therefore, seeing that the matter is *sub judice*, it is not considered desirable to enter into details of the matters alleged in the Question.

Acquisition of Untenanted Evicted Holdings on the Warren Estate.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners propose to acquire compulsorily the six untenanted evicted holdings on the unsold portion of the Warden estate at Sneem, County Kerry.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that there are only two evicted tenants on the Warden estate for whom they consider it necessary to provide holdings. They hope it will be possible to provide one of them with a holding on untenanted land on the Warden estate itself, and the other with a holding on untenanted land on another estate.

Listowel Fair Rent Applications.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when will the decisions in the fair rent applications heard at the last Sub-land Commission Court held at Listowel be delivered.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that they anticipate that the decisions in the cases heard at the last sitting of the Sub-Commission Court at Listowel will be announced in September next.

Scottish Firms and Post Office Contracts.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Postmaster-General what was the extent in money of the contracts placed in the year 1907 for waterproofs, boots, bicycles, and tools for the use of his Department, and how much of that sum was placed with Scottish firms having their premises in Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The figures for the financial year 1907–8 are as follows—

	Total Value of Contracts.	Amount placed with Scottish Firms.
	£	£
Waterproofs -	13,950	1,980
Boots - - -	14,595	Nil
Cycles and parts -	27,656	8,860
Tools - - -	3,985	Nil

In addition, a sum of about £11,600 was spent locally for the repair and hire of cycles, and over £900 of this was spent in Scotland. A Scottish firm also received orders from the cycle manufacturer for most of the tyres supplied on the new bicycles purchased during the year. The value of these orders for tyres is estimated at over £2,000. This sum of £2,000 is a part of the £27,656 shown above, but is not included in the £8,860.

"The Iron and Coal Trades Review."

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the postage for an issue of the weekly *Iron and Coal Trades Review*, weighing 1 lb. 15 oz., is only one halfpenny, while the postage on the monthly *The Vulcan*, weighing 6½ oz., is twopence; whether he will explain the principle upon which the postal authorities discriminate between two journals dealing with the same class of news and catering for the same class of readers, and advertisers; and whether he will consider the advisability of redressing this difference of treatment.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Under the Post Office Act of 1870 the privilege of transmission by post at the newspaper rate is limited, among other restrictions, to publications issued at intervals of not more than seven days. *The Iron and Coal Trades Review* conforms to this condition and is registered at the Post Office as a newspaper. In view of the fact that the newspaper post is unremunerative I am not prepared to introduce a Bill to extend the privilege to monthly publications.

Postmen's Duty at Port Talbot.

Mr. J. WILLIAMS (Glamorganshire, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether postmen at Port Talbot have been compelled to perform duties proper to the class of sorting clerks and telegraphists against the recommendations of the Hobhouse Committee; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made in order to ascertain whether salaries proper to the duties are being paid at this office.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) So far as I am aware, the postmen at Port Talbot are only employed on duties proper to their class, but I am having inquiry made into the matter.

Tenders for New Scottish Fishery Cruiser.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if firms will be excluded from tendering for the new cruiser for the Fishery Board unless they are both shipbuilders and engineers; and, if so, is there any reason why firms of approved standing in these lines of manufacture should not tender conjointly, as is the usual practice in the case of the mercantile marine.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am informed that the Fishery Board's past experience leads them to the conclusion that for their special purpose tenders should be invited only from firms capable of themselves undertaking the whole work of construction.

Irish Fisheries Grant Supplementary Estimate.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the omission of the words, "for the year ending 31st March, 1908," in the revised Supplementary Estimate of £114,000 for bonuses and capitation grants for Irish teachers, passed under Closure on the 28th instant (No. 255), and which were inserted in the Supplementary Estimate of 22nd June (No. 186), will prevent these allowances being paid immediately for the year ending 31st March last, in fulfilment of promises previously made.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I understand that the increased allowances are to be paid in respect of the financial year ended 31st March last, but of course it is not intended that Parliament shall provide more than one year's grant in any given financial year.

The Jasdan Succession.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the decision of the Government in the case of the Jasdan succession was arrived at prior to, or after, presentation of a memorial against change of the immemorial custom of succession by the sons and grandchildren of the late Chief of Jasdan; whether any memorial has been presented by the Kathi community generally praying the Government not to interfere with the immemorial customs of the tribe by enforcing the rule of primogeniture; and what reasons, if any, were given in the Government's reply to such memorial for the introduction of primogeniture.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) The memorial to the Secretary of State in Council of the sons and grandsons of the late Chief of Jasdan was not submitted till after the installation of the present chief. A number of memorials from Kathi chiefs and others against enforcement of the rule of primogeniture are now under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council.

Naval Officers and Foreign Languages.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that none of the officers accredited to foreign capitals have passed for interpreter in any foreign language; and, in view of the utility of this knowledge, whether he can state how many executive officers there are in the Navy, of midshipman's rank and above, and how many of these have passed for interpreter in German, excluding officers of the Mercantile Marine belonging to the Royal Naval Reserve.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) It is true that none of the naval officers accredited to foreign courts have qualified as interpreter, but it must be remembered that until 1904 no executive officer above the rank of lieutenant could be appointed as an interpreter. There are 3,364 officers on the executive list, and of these ten have qualified as interpreters since 1905. There are a good many officers, however, who, without being able to pass the high standard required for an interpreter, are nevertheless possessed of a knowledge of the German language.

Pay for Rough Carpentry Work in Government Workshops.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the work described as rough-carpentry, viz., the fixing and alteration of racks in storehouses, etc., is, when done by private firms, performed by skilled workmen, who are paid the standard rate of wage of the district; and whether he will take steps to place the workmen doing this class of work in Government yards and workshops on the same level, so far as wages and conditions of labour are concerned, as the workmen employed by private firms.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The facts are as stated in reply to previous inquiry on this subject, and no reason is seen for departing from the present arrangements, which have been in existence for many years.

Loss of H.M.S. "Whiting."

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty with reference to His Majesty's ship "Whiting," which has been blown ashore at Hong Kong and may become a total loss, whether he is aware that the ship has no officers according to the Navy List; and whether he can state what is the crew on board her, assuming no men are on leave, and where she was moored in the harbour.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) My hon. friend is well aware that the fact that no officers are shown in this month's Navy List is no justification for assuming that there were none on board the ship at Hong Kong this week. The Admiralty have no information on the matter, which is entirely within the discretion of the Commander-in-chief on the station.

Postal Delay at Waterville and Cahirdaniel.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the frequent delay in the delivery of the mails at Waterville and Cahirdaniel; and whether he will make representations on the subject to the railway company and others responsible for the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this subject and on its receipt I will send the hon. Member a reply.

Bolton Postal Staff.

MR. W. T. WILSON: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state how many postmen and how many persons in the other grades of the service there are employed in the Bolton postal district; and what is the volume of work, in units, in that district.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The following are approximately the figures:—Bolton: Number of postmen employed, 90; number of persons in other grades of the Post Office service, 160; volume of work, 597 units.

Manchester Postal Staff.

MR. W. T. WILSON: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state how many postmen and how many persons in the other grades of the service there are employed in the Manchester postal district; and what is the volume of work, in units, in that district.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The following are approximately the figures:—Manchester: Number of postmen employed, 900; number of persons in other grades of the Post Office service, 2,300; volume of work, 9,612 units.

Postal Telegraphic Duties at Bournemouth.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, in Paragraph 286 of its Report, the Hobhouse Committee recommended that sorting clerks and telegraphists in Classes 1 and 2 should be divided between postal and telegraphic duties, and that Bournemouth is now in Class 2; and whether, in view of this specific recommendation not previously objected to by the Department, he will state the reason for withholding the application of the scheme to Bournemouth.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am aware of the recommendation in question. In answering the hon. Member's Question on 20th July I explained why the recommendation cannot properly be carried out in the case of all offices in Class 2.

Post Office Accommodation at Ballymoney.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction that exists in Ballymoney with the Post Office accommodation; whether he is aware that premises for a new Post Office for the town were advertised for six years ago, and that central and commodious premises are at present available; and whether, in view of the effect of the present limited accommodation on the employees, and of the fact that the whole of the town has to be traversed to get from the railway station to the Post Office, he will consider the advisability of having the office transferred to more central and more suitable premises.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am not aware of the circumstances stated, but I will inquire and will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Deaths under Anæsthetics—Suggested Royal Commission.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home

Department whether his attention has been called to the recent deaths of three persons under anæsthetics in London hospitals, and which were the subject of coroners' inquiries on Saturday last the 25th instant, viz., Henry Walter Furlonger, aged fifty-two, an employee of the City of London Brewery, who died in the Central London Throat and Ear Hospital; Lydia Thompson, aged forty-five, who was given an anæsthetic at the Royal Free Hospital for an operation to remove a needle which had penetrated her hand, and in neither of which cases had the operation actually commenced; and Harold Cecil Buttram, aged sixteen, who died at the London Hospital in the middle of the removal of some dead bone from his jaw; and whether, having regard to the continued cases of deaths under anæsthetics, he can now see his way clear to recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have seen newspaper reports of two of the cases referred to. I am in communication with the Lord President of the Council, and through him with the General Medical Council, on the question whether a course of instruction in the administration of anæsthetics can be included in all cases in the course of study required for a medical qualification; and I think that the question of holding a formal inquiry by Royal Commission or Committee may with advantage be postponed, at any rate until I know what action the medical authorities are prepared to take in this matter.

Cost of Reformatories and Industrial Schools.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state the total annual cost of the reformatories and industrial schools of England and Wales; and what proportion is borne by national and local funds.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The total cost for the year 1907 was £428,888. The Treasury contributed 42 per cent. and the local rates nearly 42 per cent., the rest coming from subscriptions and profit from labour. Taken separately, the Treasury contributed 56 per cent. and the rates 26 per cent. in the case of reformatories; while for industrial schools the proportions are: Treasury, 37 per cent.; rates, 47 per cent.

Cost of Prisons.

MR. LEIF JONES: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state the total cost of the prisons of England and Wales, both county and national, including therein interest on capital expenditure, annual charges for maintenance and pensions, the expenses of the Prison Commissioners, and the proportion of this expenditure borne by local and national funds.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The total cost of the prisons of England and Wales, including State inebriate reformatories, for the year ended 31st March last, for salaries and maintenance, is £722,396 3s. 9d. There are no charges for interest on capital expenditure. The whole of this expenditure falls on Imperial funds. The annual charge on the Superannuation Vote on account of Prisons, England and Wales, was on the 30th instant, £83,736 1s. 10d. In addition to this, some £500 to £600 is paid each year in gratuities to retired prison officers who are ineligible for pension. These charges also fall on Imperial funds; but local funds bear a certain pension charge in respect of men who were in the prison service before 1878, and have since retired. It is, however, impossible to state exactly how much this charge is. It is now comparatively small.

Cost of Inebriate Homes.

MR. TOULMIN (Bury, Lancashire): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state the cost of inebriate homes for England and Wales for the last year for which Returns are available, including annual interest charges on capital expenditure, annual charges for maintenance, the amounts contributed by the State, and the amounts contributed by local authorities or private enterprise respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The cost of certified inebriate reformatories in England and Wales in 1906 was £55,489. Of this amount the State contributed £27,644, and local authorities £27,845. Details of the expenditure will be found in the inspector's Report. The cost of the State inebriate reformatories, which is borne wholly by the State, is included in the figures relating to prisons given in the Answer to a Question by my hon. friend the Member for the Appleby Division, to-day. Particulars are given on page 104 of the Report of the Prison Commissioners, issued in 1907. Besides the reformatories, a number of inebriate retreats have been established by philanthropic bodies and private persons, but no contribution is made to these institutions from public funds.

Cost of Lunatic Asylums.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state the total cost of the care of lunatics in England and Wales for the last year for which Returns are available, whether borne by Imperial or local taxation, including therein the annual interest charges on capital indebtedness, the yearly cost of the maintenance of all asylums, the expenses of the Lunacy Commissioners, and the charges made for the Broodmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, together with the proportion of money obtained from Imperial and local taxation.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) In the year 1905–6, the last for which complete figures are available, the total expenditure of the local authorities of England and Wales in respect of lunatics and lunatic asylums, as ascertained provisionally for the purposes of the summary of the Local Taxation Returns, was £3,551,955. This is made up as follows—

	£
(1) Loan charges (other than those paid by the London County Council)	642,686
(2) Maintenance and other charges not met out of loans - - - - -	2,909,269
	3,551,955

The total amounts received by the local authorities in that year in the shape of grants from the Exchequer and other receipts which can be definitely allocated as being in respect of lunatics and lunatic asylums were—

	£
Grants - - - - - -	878,193
Miscellaneous receipts not derived from taxation -	421,664

There is in addition to the above, the cost of the Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum and of the Lunacy Commission which fall entirely on Imperial funds. The former of these, including expenses charged to other funds or votes, but allowing for appropriations in aid, was, in the same year (1905–6) £38,966, and the latter £18,764.

Overworking of Children and Young Persons.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the Reports recently made by factory inspectors dealing with the disease and mortality caused by systematic overwork of children in conditions often detrimental to health, he will consider the advisability of introducing fresh legislation for the purpose of increasing the penalties for such offences under the Employment of Children Act, 1903, and in cases of repeated conviction for these offences for providing for the imprisonment of those who are responsible, without option of a fine, instead of the fines now imposed by the Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The whole question will receive my careful consideration, and I will bear in mind the point which the hon. Member raises as to the adequacy of the existing penalties.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether his attention has been drawn to the Report on pages 178 ff. of the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for 1907, with respect to the employment of children in the North of Ireland; and whether, if such cases as that of L.M. described by the inspector are cognisable under the Acts relating to the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, he will instruct the inspectors to cause proceedings to be taken under those Acts in all similar cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am aware of the Report in question. The circumstances do not seem to be such as would suffice to establish a charge of wilful neglect or ill-treatment under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act; but the whole question raised by these Reports will receive my careful consideration.

MR. HUGH LAW: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the Report of the Chief Lady Inspector on pages 152 ff. of the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for 1907, with regard to complaints relating to conditions of employment or supervision of the work of young women and girls which, directly or indirectly, affect conduct or morality injuriously, and to her Report on pages 184 ff. of the same Report with regard to employment after childbirth; and whether he will consider the introduction of legislation with respect to either or both of these matters.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Yes, Sir, the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector is a Report issued by my Department under my directions. The first of the questions referred to is a very far-reaching one, which arises in connection with all kinds of employment of women and not merely employment in factories and workshops. The second question is being made the subject at the present time of a comprehensive inquiry. Both will receive my full consideration, but I cannot make any statement as to the possibility of legislation.

Cost of Police.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state what is the total annual cost of the police in England and Wales (including the Metropolitan Police), and the proportion borne by national and local taxation, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. If my hon. friend will refer to the last Report on Police (Counties and Boroughs, England and Wales) for the year ending 29th September, 1907, Table VI. c., pages 248–9, he will find that the total gross cost of the police was £5,864,151, and that of this amount £2,161,789 came from the Exchequer Contribution Account, and £3,145,457 from local rates. The balance consisted of sums received for services of additional constables and certain other receipts.

Annual Cost of Poor Relief.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the total annual cost of poor relief, and all purposes wholly connected therewith, in England and Wales for the last year for which Returns are available, and what proportion is borne by local and national taxation.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The total expenditure on these purposes in England and Wales during the year ended at Lady-Day, 1907, was £13,957,000. It is estimated that of this sum £790,500, or 5·6 per cent., was met by means of repayments by relatives and other receipts not derived from taxation, and that of the remainder £2,591,000, or 18·6 per cent. of the whole, was borne by national taxation, and £10,575,500, or 75·8 per cent., by local rates.

Adjustment of Financial Relations between County and Borough Councils.

MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what steps the Board are prepared to take in view of the varying practice of Parliamentary Committees with regard to the adjustment of financial relations between county boroughs and county councils when the rateable value and cost of administration of the county area are affected by the extension of a county borough; and whether the Government will appoint a Special Committee or a Joint Committee of both Houses to consider the questions raised by the decisions of the House of Lords in Caterham Urban District Council *v.* Godstone Rural District Council and in Durham County Council *v.* West Hartlepool Corporation.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) This matter is receiving my attention; but I have not at present arrived at a decision with regard to it.

Heating Lighting and Cleaning of Scottish Schools.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the circular issued by the Scottish Education Department relative to the cleansing and disinfecting of schools, and to the fact that totally inadequate sums have hitherto been provided for the fuel, lighting, and cleansing of the twelve schools in the parish of Lochs, Island of Lewis, will arrangements be made for such amounts to be provided as will admit of effect being given to the instructions contained in the circular.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The proper lighting, heating, and cleansing of the schools in any district is a duty which rests upon the school board of that district, and the necessary expenses must be met from the school fund of the district. No Exchequer grant is made specially for this purpose.

Appeal Against Magistrates' Decision in the Cleave Case.

MR. HUGH LAW: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will direct an appeal against the decision of the Liverpool magistrates in the Cleave's case.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) My hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. The propriety of appealing against the decision in question has been carefully considered; but the Board are advised that it is not likely that any useful purpose would be served thereby.

War Office Accounting Officer.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any and, if so, what official at the War Office has yet been appointed accounting officer of that Department in place of the Director-General of Army Finance whose office has been abolished.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Mr. Charles Harris, hitherto a principal clerk in the Department of the Finance Member of the Army Council, will be nominated to be accounting officer for Army Votes on his appointment as assistant financial secretary when the retirement of Sir Guy Fleetwood Wilson takes place.

Increased Salaries for Excise Officers.

MR. W. NICHOLSON (Hampshire, Petersfield): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, as the duties of the Excise officers will be more important under the Pensions Bill, due provision will be made for increasing their salaries.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) In my Answer of the 2nd ultimo to the hon. Member for Blackburn, I have already indicated my readiness to consider favourably a recommendation from the Board of Inland Revenue to award gratuities to those Excise officers who may be called on to undertake the new work this autumn in connection with old-age pensions. I am not in a position to add anything to that Answer.

Salaries of Excise Officers.

MR. W. NICHOLSON: To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer what are the present minimum and maximum salaries of a second-class and first-class Excise officer respectively; and if only two officers out of nine can at present expect to receive a higher appointment which will entitle him to a salary exceeding £250 per annum.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The minimum salary of the first and second-class Excise officers is £180 and £115 per annum respectively, and the maximum salary £250 and £160 per annum respectively. As shown at pages 28 and 36 of the Estimates for the Revenue Departments, 1908–9, the present number of appointments with a salary exceeding £250 per annum for which Excise officers are eligible on promotion is 556, and the combined total of first and second-class officers and assistants of Excise is 2,975.

Supplementary Estimates.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what has been the total amount of money voted this session in Supplementary Estimates for which specific provision was not made in the Budget, with details of the heads under which such moneys were voted.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The total amount was £378,496, made up as follows—

	£
Stationery and Printing - -	5
Public Education - - -	114,000
Houses of Parliament Buildings	5,000
Repayments to the Civil Contingencies Fund - - -	41,491
Expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905 - -	200,000
Relief of Distress (Ireland) - -	13,000
Government Hospitality - -	5,000
	378,496

Purchase of the Hort Estate.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants of the Hort estate, in the County of Kildare, signed proposals for the purchase of certain grass lands, portion of the said estate, in such parcels as the Estates Commissioners should think fit to allow to each tenant; that the Estates Commissioners offered to the Land Court a price for the said estate which was acceptable to Mr. Justice Ross, provided the offer was amended so as to exclude from its scope the lands in possession of one certain court tenant, and that the other tenants of the estate were willing to agree to this condition; that cattle-drives have taken place on this estate and that the Estates Commissioners have withdrawn their offer to purchase in consequence thereof; whether he is aware that Mr. Justice Ross has said that these cattle-drives had been improperly brought to his notice in order to prejudice his mind against the tenants, and that he subsequently admitted that such cattle-drives may have been done at the instance of a grazier; and will he say if the intending purchasers have been in any degree identified with the cattle-drives, and, if not, will the Estates Commissioners be informed that in the interest of the vendors and purchasers the offer should be renewed by them.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they made an offer for the purchase of the estate in question, which was for sale in the Land Judge's Court, but they subsequently withdrew their offer because it had been brought to their notice: (1) That the cattle of the grazing tenants had on four occasions been driven off the lands, and that men with blackened faces and turned coats had cleared the lands and assaulted the police; and (2) that the tenants on the estate had signed undertakings to purchase only on the condition that the entire of the grass lands should be sold to them. The Estates Commissioners add, however, that they are prepared to consider any application which may be made to them by any of the parties concerned. So far as the proceedings in the Land Judge's Court are concerned the registrar of that Court has furnished me with the following statement: The offer for purchase of Hort's estate by the Estates Commissioners has been before the Land Judge on two occasions. The first occasion was 18th May, 1908, when counsel appeared for two persons claiming to be tenants on the lands, and directed the judge's attention to the fact that one of the conditions of the offer was that their tenancies should be determined before the sale, and possession of the lands should be given to the Estates Commissioners. The Land Judge decided that one of these claimants held under a regular tenancy to the Court, and that he would not and could not in justice determine his tenancy. In the other case the Land Judge disregarded the claim, on the ground that the claimant held merely under an agistment contract, and that he could not interfere in the matter. When the matter was under discussion mention was made of cattle-driving having taken place on the estate, and the Land Judge said that this topic should not have been introduced into an argument on a question of law, and could only have been introduced with the view of prejudicing the mind of the Court. The Land Judge did not say that these cattle-drives might have been done at the instance of the grazier; he refused to enter at all into the question who was responsible for them. The second occasion on which the matter was before the Land Judge was on 22nd July, 1908, when the Estates Commissioners' letter intimating their intention to withdraw their offer was under his consideration. On this occasion it was again attempted to introduce the subject of cattle-driving, but the Land Judge absolutely refused to allow the matter to be discussed before him, stating that the reasons which influenced the Estates Commissioners to withdraw their offer were not for him to consider, but if it were the fact that the Estates Commissioners refused to apply public moneys in purchasing estates in respect of which intimidation had been used, and cattle-driving had taken place, he thoroughly approved their conduct.

Unpaid Mess Debts Contracted by Staff-Sergeant Scully, Dublin Metropolitan Police.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it came to the knowledge of Inspector Dunne of the Dublin Metropolitan Police some time back that Staff-Sergeant Scully, who has since absconded, had contracted large debts with butchers for meat supplied to the mess; if the superintendent arranged with the sergeant before he went away that the latter should pay the debt by instalments; how many payments were made in this way, and what amount remains unpaid; whether this system of discharging debts incurred for the benefit of the mess is in accordance with the rules of the force; if these circumstances were brought under the notice of the Chief Commissioner of Police before he made his Report, upon the recommendation of which the Treasury refunded Inspector Dunne a considerable sum of money, and, if not, will the Chief Commissioner institute an inquiry into the methods introduced by Inspector Dunne, who has also recently denied to the men under his control the privilege so long enjoyed of electing the man they thought best qualified to take charge of the mess, and appointed a man of his own selection; whether, in consequence, the cost to the men has considerably increased without any corresponding advantage in the fare; and whether any of the increased expenditure is levied to pay off the old debt by instalments as agreed upon with the sanction of Inspector Dunne.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Chief Commissioner informs me, on the authority of Superintendent Dunne, that there is no foundation for the suggestions contained in the first part of the Question. An allegation was made to the superintendent that ex-Staff Sergeant Scully was not paying his mess accounts regularly, but on examination the superintendent found that all accounts had been paid and vouched for. There was, therefore, no occasion for the superintendent making arrangements that any debt should be paid by instalments, and there were no irregularities to bring under the notice of the Chief Commissioner. The superintendent has not interfered with the selection by the men of one of their own number to take charge of the mess. The cost of the mess has considerably decreased since the appointment of a new messman on 1st instant.

Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement of Mr. James Sisk.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can now see their way to reconsider their decision to take no action in the matter of the reinstatement of Mr. James Sisk in his former holding on the Fleury estate, Glenwood, County Cork, seeing that the planter, Mr. Michael Walsh, has surrendered the holding and the landlord is willing to reinstate the evicted tenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are not aware of any change in the circumstances of this case since I answered the hon. Member's Question of 13th instant. The Commissioners will, however, communicate with the owner on the subject.

Treatment of Irish School Inspectors.

Mr. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that for some years the two chief inspectors of the Natioal Board of Education have been acting in an arbitrary manner towards many of the subordinate inspectors under their jurisdiction, and at the same time threatening them that, if they intended to have any Questions asked in Parliament as to their treatment, the Commissioners would visit those who so complained with the severest punishment within their power to inflict; and whether he will state when and in what manner the Commissioners authorised the chief inspectors to adopt intimidating methods of this kind towards subordinates for merely complaining of their treatment.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that their chief inspectors have for many years been duly authorised to impress upon the inspectors generally that to endeavour to influence the action of the Board by procuring Questions in Parliament in reference to their personal or official concerns was contrary to the regulations of the public service and of the Commissioners. So long ago as 2nd May, 1867, a special Treasury Minute on the subject of private solicitation of Members of Parliament was issued. Inspectors can always appeal to the Commissioners against arbitrary acts on the part of the chief inspectors, but no such appeals have been made nor, so far as the Commissioners are aware, have any such arbitrary acts taken place.

Royal Irish Constabulary Bill.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when he intends to proceed with the Royal Irish Constabulary Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It is intended to introduce and proceed with the Bill in the coming Autumn Session. Before the Bill can be introduced the necessary Financial Resolution must be passed, and the Committee dealing with the subject has, through pressure of business, been deferred until 12th October.

Irish Education Grants.

MR. BARRIE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been directed to the circumstance that, under the revised Supplementary Estimate, Class 4, Vote 10, Public Education (Ireland), issued on 24th July, and voted under the Closure on 28th July, convent schools will get augmentation grants much in excess of those to other schools; for instance, a convent school with a roll of 220 will get £55 augmentation, while an ordinary school with a like roll would get only £38, viz., £10 to principal and £7 each to four assistants; and is it intended to pay conventual teachers on a higher scale, out of public funds, than ordinary teachers.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that in the case supposed in the Question the figures are as stated, but that in respect of the whole Vote for National Education, including the sums provided upon the revised Supplementary Estimate, convent schools are not paid on a higher scale than ordinary national schools.

MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that a fresh Estimate has been presented in connection with the grant of £114,000 to Irish primary education, those interested in the preservation of schools with attendance under fifteen may assume that the National Board is not bound by the former condition to the effect that schools under fifteen must be suppressed, and that it is open to the National Board to represent to the Treasury the ugrent need of maintaining many of these schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In my opinion the Answer is in the affirmative.

Welsh Disestablishment.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Prime Minister whether the receipt and consideration of the Report of the Welsh Church Commission is a necessary preliminary to the introduction of a measure dealing with the disestablishment of the Church in Wales.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The Government hope that this Report may soon be in their hands, but they could not bind themselves to postpone making their proposals until after the Report is received.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The Jasdan Successor.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the decision of the Government in the case of the Jasdan succession was arrived at prior to, or after, presentation of a memorial against change of the immemorial custom of succession by the sons and grandchildren of the late Chief of Jasdan; whether any memorial has been presented by the Kathi community generally praying the Government not to interfere with the immemorial customs of the tribe by enforcing the rule of primogeniture; and what reasons, if any, were given in the Government's reply to such memorial for the introduction of primogeniture.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): The memorial to the Secretary of State in Council of the sons and grandsons of the late Chief of Jasdan was not submitted till after the installation of the present Chief. A number of memorials from Kathi Chiefs and others against enforcement of the rule of primogeniture are now under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council.

Unemployment in Gateshead.

Mr. J. JOHNSON (Gateshead): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the *personnel* of the public bodies dealing with the distress in Gateshead; and what is the scope of their operations.

I beg also to ask the President of the Local Government Board how many unemployed workmen there are in Gateshead; and what amount has been spent in relief during the present year.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. John Burns, Battersea): I will answer together these two Questions. The public bodies referred to are the distress committee, the board of guardians, and the town council. The names of the members of them cannot conveniently be set out in answer to a Question, but I will send a list to my hon. friend, if he desires it These bodies act within the sphere of their several functions. The clerk to the distress committee informs me that he cannot give an accurate estimate of the total number of unemployed workmen at Gateshead. He, however, states that 187 applications for employment were registered by the committee during the year ended at March last, and that 125 men have since made application to them. The total expenditure on poor relief in the Gateshead Union for the year to 25th March last was £46,600.

Friday Sittings in the Autumn.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will consider the desirability of meeting the convenience of Members by arranging that the House shall not sit on Fridays during the proposed autumn session except and until it is found that the full day sittings of Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays are not likely to afford sufficient time for the completion of the business of the House before the date for ending the session.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) I regret that I cannot see my way to adopt this suggestion.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Resolved, That this House do meet To-morrow, at Ten of the Clock.—(*Mr. J. Pease.*)

POLLING DISTRICTS AND REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

*The CHAIRMAN: As regards Schedule B, there is an Amendment on the Paper in the name of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone, but I do not think that it is in order. He seeks to put in certain words which I do not think can be raised on the schedule.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said the words which he proposed to put in were only explanatory of the words already in the schedule. They did not in any way interfere with the meaning of the schedule beyond emphasising what were the points therein contained. He submitted that so long as they did not go outside of the Resolution, there could be no objection to any verbal alteration, provided that they did not in any way increase or diminish the charge. He submitted this Amendment in order to raise a question which ought to be a little more discussed by the Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he did not think, in the first place, that there was any precedent for such an Amendment at this stage; and, in the second place, unless there was something in the nature of a discrepancy between the resolutions in Committee of Supply and the schedule to which the noble Lord could point in this matter, he certainly did not think that he could raise his Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL said he could point out that in this case the Public Accounts Committee had reported to the House that words of the kind he suggested, namely, after "grants" to insert "to meet a temporary emergency," ought to be inserted in the Appropriation Bill, and it was only with a view to carrying out that recommendation that he asked the House to assent to these words. With regard to precedent, he agreed there was none, and there was none for the particular procedure adopted, except last year.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that after the explanation of the noble Lord all he could say was that the point ought to be taken on the discussion of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) asked the right hon. Gentleman whether it was his ruling that it was impossible to insert in the Appropriation Bill any Amendment coming within the terms of the original Resolution on which the Appropriation Bill was based.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he was not ruling absolutely that, but he must point out that if they could raise Amendments of the kind now proposed, they could discuss again altogether the terms on which these grants were made. He thought that would be undesirable.

LORD R. CECIL said that this was virtually a matter of first-rate constitutional importance on which there ought to be a definite and clear ruling. The Amendment did not in any way affect to raise the question of the policy of making these grants; he merely proposed to insert the words in order to make it clear why these grants were made. He respectfully submitted that a discussion on the Report of the Public Accounts Committee would not really have met the case. They knew that the Public Accounts Committee had reported that certain words should be inserted in the Appropriation Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that according to previous rulings on the Appropriation Bill the Amendment was out of order.

Bill reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time to-morrow.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Lords Amendments considered.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 1, line 5, after '(1),' to insert the words 'until the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and fifteen.'"

*MR. SPEAKER: With regard to this Amendment and the next, I have to say that in my opinion they are what are called "privilege" Amendments, and I say so on the ground that they vary the grant of the old-age pension as determined by this House, and, if no further legislation takes place, they would make the grant to end after a certain period of time. In my opinion these two Amendments are privilege Amendments.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendments," put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 1, line 21, at end, to insert the words 'as verified wherever practicable by certificates of birth or baptism or in the absence of such certificates by census returns or other official documents, or where no such certificates or documents are attainable in such other manner as may seem sufficient to the pension authorities.'"

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) moved, "That the House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment." In the first place, this was obviously a matter which ought to be dealt with by regulation. No Amendment of this kind could possibly cover all contingencies that would arise and have to be provided for. As a matter of fact, the regulations which had been framed were much more elaborate than anything contained in these words. It was perfectly clear if they accepted the Amendment that the man over seventy years of age, when required, would have to prove it in the way it proposed, and they would thus impose upon the person applying a charge of half-a-crown or three shillings and sixpence, though it was known to everybody in the locality that the man had reached the age of seventy, and the pension officer had satisfied himself by other means that the applicant was seventy years of age. Why should a man in a case of that kind be compelled to provide official documents, the getting of which would involve a great deal of trouble, and make it really difficult for him to get his pension? In fact, in the case of a deserving old person, they wanted to make it easy for him to get his pension. There were cases where it would be necessary to have some sort of evidence, and these were the cases which would be carried up to the pension officer. There might be some cases of difficulty, but for these there were elaborate regulations, and therefore on these grounds he moved to disagree with the Lords Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the object which the Lords had in view, so far as he could judge, was to make good a plain defect in the original Bill. The amount of charge thrown upon the taxpayers, or as he should rather say the accuracy of the estimate of the charge, would really depend upon the success attending the efforts to prevent the receipt of pensions by persons not entitled to them because of their being under the age of seventy. He thought the scheme in respect to that age would have to be modified in the future, but as all financial estimates, all the prophecies of the Government, of the charges on the public depended upon the accuracy and success with which they were able to prevent persons getting pensions, it was quite clear the machinery of the Bill and its loose wording might be somehow or other greatly improved. This could not be denied. The right hon. Gentleman had told the House that he had already had regulations drawn up of a more elaborate character than this Amendment, or any that could be introduced into the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had not shown the House these regulations, but he was quite ready to accept the statement.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was obvious that he could not lay the regulations before the House until he knew what were the decisions to which they came, because these regulations might be affected very seriously one way or the other by these very vital Amendments.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there was force and substance in this objection, and if the right hon. Gentleman was far advanced with his regulations——

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the right hon. Gentleman considered that the regulations would be more effective for attaining the object of the Lords Amendment, then he did not quarrel with the decision at which the right hon. Gentleman had arrived.

LORD R. CECIL did not think the right hon. Gentleman had really done justice to the Amendment. It did not require the production of official documents in every case, nor at the cost of the pensioner; it merely said that where it was practicable a certificate should be provided, but the committee had the alternative of doing without it; it was merely an indication of the method to be pursued. He did not envy the position of a pension officer in certain parts of the United Kingdom who, in doubt as to the age of the applicant, demanded the certificate. That was a much less workable arrangement than to indicate on the face of the Bill that official evidence when required should be procured, not at the expense of the applicant, but at the expense of the pension committee, who should themselves say the particular instances into which the pension officer was to be entitled to inquire. The right hon. Gentleman said the regulations were in draft, but that he could not present them until he knew the final form of the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had them all ready.

LORD R. CECIL said that if they had seen them in draft Members would know what they were doing. So much was left to regulation that practically all that the House had done was to tell the Government to draw up a scheme for old-age pensions. It would have been better had the Government presented the draft regulations at the earliest stage for discussion, and afterwards amended them if necessary. He did not propose to divide the House on this Amendment after what the right hon. Gentleman had said.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'must' to insert the words 'satisfy the pension authorities that.'"

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that this was really a drafting Amendment, and he did not think that it really mattered much. If the Lords thought they were better than the words of the Bill he was not disposed to quarrel with them; it was a pure matter of drafting. Then in line 24 they would have to put in the word "has" instead of "have."

Motion made, and Question, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendments—

"In page 2, line 24, to leave out the first 'have,' and to insert the words 'he has,' and to leave out the second 'have,' and to insert the word 'has.'"

"In page 2, line 1, to leave out the words 'means of the,' and after the word 'person,' to insert the words 'must satisfy the pension authorities that his yearly means.'"

"In page 2, line 2, to leave out the word 'must,' and to insert the word 'do.'"

Agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 7, to leave out from the word 'until' to the word 'Parliament' in line 9.'"

*MR. SPEAKER: It appears to me that this is also a privilege Amendment, and the effect of it might be to vary the period of disqualification. The Bill says the period of disqualification shall be determined on 31st December, 1910; but if these words were struck out the period would be indeterminate; it might be a shorter or a longer time; they would, at all events, vary the period the House has fixed. I therefore consider this a privilege Amendment.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendments,"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*,)—put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 2, line 34, to leave out the word 'for,' and to insert the words 'during the last.'"

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that this was very largely a question of drafting. They had had a discussion about it, on the initiative, he thought, of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone, and they had then decided to stand by the words of their own draftsman. He moved to disagree.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said he did not quite understand the ground on which the right hon. Gentleman refused the Amendment. He had informed them quite clearly that the Government intended the words to mean that a person should not be disqualified if he had continuously for the last ten years up to attaining the age of sixty made certain payments, and it seemed desirable that that should be made as clear as words could make it. This Amendment would leave no doubt in anybody's mind, and they clearly carried out the expressed intentions of the Government. In the interests of clearness and of the avoidance of litigation the House would be well-advised to consider whether it would not do well to accept the Amendment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he quite agreed that this was not a very important point, but he could not agree as at present advised that it was merely one of drafting, and he was very anxious to know exactly what the policy of the Government was as expressed by these words. Judging by what had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer it appeared that in the opinion of the Government there was no question of substance involved. He was not sure that that was so. Was it not the case that if the Lords Amendment were accepted the mere omission of one month in the last ten years would disqualify ? On the other hand, if the Government form were taken was it not also the fact that any ten years since the man was seventeen or eighteen and began to earn wages, would enable the pension to be given ? He was not quite satisfied with the Lords' drafting or with the Government's drafting either. He took it that the Government were reluctant to make the mere omission of a month or two months in the last ten years a disqualification. There he agreed with them, and he thought the Lords Amendment was too stringent. On the other hand the Government form was far too lax. He wondered whether the Government could not arrange, perhaps not then, but before the Bill was finally settled, some form of words which would meet the general view of the Government, the rest of the House, and the House of Lords.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE thought they had made the policy of the Government abundantly clear on the Report stage; that policy had been stated very fairly by the right hon. Gentleman, and he thought the words they had inserted, and which they proposed to stand by, quite adequately expressed that intention. He agreed that the Lords Amendment would be too severe; he preferred the words as they were inserted originally, more especially as the House had accepted them at the time, with the exception of a few dissentients. It was the expression of the general sense of the House, and he was not disposed to depart from it.

Lord R. CECIL said he was left in complete doubt as to what the real intention of the Government was. In the Report stage the Government said that what they intended was that a man should have been a subscriber to a friendly society for the ten years immediately preceding attaining the age of sixty. Now the Chancellor of the Exchequer said in his charming manner that he quite agreed with his right hon. friend as to what the House ought to do. But he understood that his right hon. friend put two alternatives before the Government and did not express agreement with either, but really expressed a wish to have a different solution of the question.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the Leader of the Opposition put to him the specific case of rural societies which had become insolvent, and appealed to him to take that into account. That was why on the whole he preferred words which were not too absolutely stringent, and he thought the words of the Commons were better for that very reason, that it would enable them to take into account cases of that kind. If that society became bankrupt, through no fault of the person who had paid subscriptions all his life, just a year or two before he attained sixty, it was a case which they ought to take into account, and he responded to the appeal of the Leader of the Opposition. He preferred the words as they stood.

Lord R. CECIL said the right hon. Gentleman now deliberately said that he preferred vague words which left the matter in dispute to words which were precise and defined what the meaning of the House actually was. That was what it came to. That was a most extraordinary conclusion and was entirely different from the position taken up on Report, when the right hon. Gentleman said, with all the authority of the Government draughtsman behind him, that they meant exactly what they said they meant, that a man must have subscribed for the ten years up to attaining the age of sixty, and that they insisted on the words because they were so clear. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin made an appeal to him in an especially hard case, and he said he would introduce words to deal with the case if he could. Now he said the words were not clear, and because they were not clear he hoped they would be able to get round the difficulties mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin. Surely that was a most admirable instance of the absurdity to which they had been put in the discussion of this Bill. He hoped the Government, if they could not accept the Lords Amendment, would draft an Amendment which really carried out their wishes. It seemed perfectly clear that the words contained in the Bill were doubtful. The Leader of the Opposition spoke without favour to the Lords Amendment, or to the policy of continuous payment for ten years, or discontinuous payment, and what he regarded as perfectly plain was that the words meant that any ten years before attaining sixty would do. Surely it was absurd for the Government to say that the words were perfectly clear. It was plain beyond the shadow of a doubt that they were not clear, but did they carry out what the Government said was their original intention? If they now said that was not their meaning, it was quite open to them to move to amend the Lords Amendment or to say they would introduce in the other House words which would make their meaning plain.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) hoped the House would disagree with the Lords Amendment. The noble Lord was very particular about thrifty persons not being handicapped, but let him put a simple case, that of a man who had made a bit of money up to forty-five or fifty, went into business, and at sixty entirely failed, through no fault of his own. There were many in the unions who had failed in that way. Because in the last ten years of his life he had been away from his friendly society and come into poverty he was to be shut out, and the Lords had put in this cast-iron rule.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he had taken a somewhat active part in the original discussion on the Report stage, and he did not quite agree with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that an agreement was arrived at, because, as far as he was concerned, he said he was not satisfied with the language as it stood in the Bill, and he hoped the Government would find it possible to amend it. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had given one hard case; but he thought he had entirely lost sight of the second class of case which was raised at an earlier stage. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had referred only to one class of case where a society lapsed through bad management, and a man suffered through no fault of his own. There were plenty of cases where a man having failed to maintain his subscription and his membership having lapsed, the society reinstated him into his former position. The words of the Bill would would exclude such a case. He considered the Amendment restrictive and unfair, and he could not vote for it. Still, he felt strongly that what the Leader of the Opposition had said ought to be listened to. He believed that when the Bill came to be translated into action, words such as those in question would lead to difficulty and in some cases to the greatest possible injustice. Perhaps the point might be cleared up by the regulations. There must of necessity be difficulties in the phraseology of such a Bill which could only be cleared up by means of regulations. The House had not seen the regulations, and would be proceeding in the dark. But the fault for which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was arraigned was one which had also been committed by others He himself had declined to produce regulations when Bills were in progress, because it was impossible for the permanent officials to prepare the regulations till they had the whole Bill before them. All they could do was to frame part of the regulations governed by the main principle of the Bill. Difficult points of this kind could not be dealt with by regulation till the Bill was complete.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): Everybody appears to agree that it would be undesirable to accept the Lords Amendment, which, so far from bettering the position, would make it worse by imposing greater stringency than this House intended and than right hon. Gentlemen opposite contemplated. We have only power to accept the Lords Amendment, to reject it, or to amend it. I do not see any means by which it could be amended which would make it adequate to the requirements of the case. I think the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is the right one. The Chancellor of the Exchequer concurs, and it appears to us that, under the very wide language of the regulation section, a regulation might be made which would adequately deal with this particular case. If so, that would be better than adopting hard and fast words in the Bill.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said the words of the Bill were "if he has continuously for ten years up to attaining the age of sixty." He was inclined to think that a Court of Justice might construe that as meaning continuously during the last ten years. He suggested that the words "if he has continuously during a considerable part of the last ten years" would be better.

LORD R. CECIL asked if it was competent for the House to amend the Lords Amendment, and then make any necessary consequential Amendment.

***MR. SPEAKER**: If the Lords Amendment is agreed to, it is competent for this House to make any consequential Amendment.

Lords Amendment disagreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 3, line 17, after the word 'and' to insert the words 'if the term of imprisonment to which he is sentenced exceeds one month he shall be disqualified.'"

***MR. SPEAKER**: I am of opinion that this is a privilege Amendment. It extends very largely the benefits of the Bill. The effect of it is to remove the ten years disqualification from persons sentenced to imprisonment of less than one month—that is, it limits disqualification for ten years to persons who are sentenced to more than one month. The effect of this will probably be to exclude a smaller number of persons; in other words, to add a certain number. Accordingly, it varies the charge. I may point out, however, to the House that the door is always open to the House not to insist on its privilege, if it desires to accept an Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should like to know whether the Government propose to insist upon their privilege.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes; I move that the House disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that the Amendment removes what is a manifest hardship in the Bill, and I should have thought the Government would have seized the opportunity of asking the House to waive its right and accept the Amendment. I am the more surprised that they have not taken the opportunity which the Lords have given them of modifying the Bill in favour of the pensioner, seeing that, as I understand, the Amendment was either moved or accepted by their representative. As to the action which the Government are now taking—action for which they have given no reason whatever—it appears that in their desire not to accept an Amendment of the Lords they deliberately refuse what is admitted to be an improvement in the Bill.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) asked if they were to understand that the Lords Amendment extended the number of those who would be applicants for old-age pensions.

***MR. KEIR HARDIE** (Merthyr Tydvil) said that the terms of the Amendment tended to modify this clause very considerably and removed possibilities of very great injustice. He regretted the decision of the Government, but would vote with them.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham) hoped that after that debate the assertion would no longer be made in the constituencies that the Liberal Government were the only people who were in favour of old-age pensions.

LORD R. CECIL desired to move that the House should not insist on its privileges in the case of this Amendment. In the absence of some such Amendment serious injustice might be inflicted. If a carter was convicted of not having his cart lighted, or of being asleep in his cart, and the magistrates imposed a sentence of imprisonment without the option of a fine, he might find himself absolutely disqualified for a pension. That was a perfectly outrageous proposal.

MR. ASQUITH: I do not think, so far as I can form a judgment, that the effect of the insertion of these words would be anything like so great in extent as seems to be supposed. But we are here dealing with a question which in my opinion is of the greatest importance to the procedure and privileges of this House. If the House, whatever may be its opinion on the merits or demerits of a comparatively small change in the Bill, were to allow the precedent—it would be a precedent—to be set of accepting an Amendment of this kind, in my opinion we should very greatly impair the rights and privileges we have always hitherto asserted, and we should be doing so for a price which is not worth exacting. On that ground I ask the House to refuse to agree with the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I put the point of order, are there not countless precedents for this House waiving its privileges in these matters and accepting an Amendment from the Lords which technically violates its privileges?

***MR. SPEAKER:** I think almost every year, certainly very frequently, this House does not insist upon its privilege. It accepts Amendments, and in sending a message to the other House the statement is made that this House does not insist upon its privilege.

MR. LUPTON expressed the hope that the Government would accept the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 145; Noes, 33. (Division List No. 239.)

AYES

Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brooke, Stopford
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Causton,RtHn.Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill,Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crooks, William
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S.
Dewar, Sir J. A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch,George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, RtHn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George

Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford,W.)
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W.(Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Roberts, Charles H.(Lincoln)
Robson, Sir William (Snowden)
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Herbert L (Cleveland)
Schwann, Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Wadsworth, J.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, RtHn.E.(Clackmannan
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton).
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, RtHn.Sir Alex.F
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bowles, G. Stewart
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Forster, Henry William
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness, Walter Edward
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Heaton, John Henniker
Hope, James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S)
Magnus, Sir Philip
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Thornton, Percy M.
Winterton, Earl

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Lord Edmund Talbot.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 4, line 2, after the word 'him,' to insert the words 'as to produce the largest income that can be reasonably obtained from it.'"

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I want to submit to you, Sir, that this is an infringement of the privileges of this House. The effect of it would undoubtedly be to diminish the number of those who could claim a pension. The effect of the Lords Amendment is this. The pension officer would be obliged to recognise the income of a man, not in accordance with what it actually is, but in accordance with what it ought to be if he invested his money in a different way. For instance, if he invested it in Consols, the pension officer might say: "You are only getting 2½ per cent. for your money, and you should invest it at 5 per cent.," or, if he had £200 in the Post Office Savings Bank, he might say: "You ought not to invest it in the Post Office Savings Bank. If you were to invest it in some industrial security which you might acquire you would get 5½ per cent." That would have the effect of diminishing the number of those who could claim a pension, apart altogether from the merits, and consequently I submit on the question of privilege that it is an interference with the privileges of the Commons, because it is quite clear that under the words as they stood originally the pension officer would have no right at all to tell a man who claims a pension to invest his money at 4, or 4½, or 5½ per cent. instead of putting it in the Post Office Savings Bank or in Consols.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have considered this question, and I think the Lords

Amendment is really an explanation of the words: "profitably used." Who is to say whether a man has properly or improperly used his money? What is intended by the words, "profitably used"? These are vague general words, and it seems to me that the explanation of the words is that the money is so invested "as to produce the largest income that can be reasonably obtained from it." An investment in Consols would not in many instances, but might in others, be the largest income that could be reasonably obtained. That is a matter of argument. I think that it would be the doctrine of privilege run mad to insist upon this as a breach of privilege. The House may or may not accept the Amendment, as it pleases.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that in that case he moved that the House disagree with the Lords Amendment on the ground that it practically directed a man to invest his money in something that would produce more than the $2\frac{1}{2}$ or $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. which it would produce if invested in Government securities. It was not desirable that the House of Commons should practically drive a man away from investing in Government securities.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was clear that the right hon. Gentleman had never considered the merits of this question. The Government had sent up to the House of Lords a most slovenly piece of work, and the House of Lords had dealt with a plain and obvious blot in the Bill. A man had a choice between investing his money in some permanent security, like Consols, or of putting it in a building society, in a trade union, or in buying an annuity. If such an investor remained content with a small return only, he was able to preserve the *corpus* of his property for his children and, at the same time, to get a pension for himself from the State. The House ought to make up its mind how it meant to deal with the case. If a man possessed the money they ought not to encourage him to secure a provision for his old-age out of the taxpayers' money while leaving the *corpus* of his property to his children. If, on the other hand, they said it was desirable that people should leave their money to their children, and that they should be encouraged to invest their property in Consols or a similar security, rather than in a trade union or benefit society, then, at all events, let them say that that was their policy. He did not think it was a justifiable policy, but the Government had not, throughout the whole course of the debates, given one single word of explanation of what it was they meant. The case, which was really one of substance, might be put plainly and simply in this form. A man had £200 invested in Consols or some mortgage. This brought him in, say, £6 or £7 a year. If he had only this £6 or £7, he had a right, when he was seventy, to come down on the State and say: "Give me 5s. a week." But he had the £200 to leave to his children. Was that what they wanted to encourage? Let them make up their minds. If the man, instead of accumulating these few hundred pounds, had spent his money in contributions to a benefit society or to a trade union or in the purchase of a life annuity, he would have a larger income, he would have a smaller claim on the State, and he would not have the *corpus* of his property to leave to his children. He thought the Government should say under which of these two plans they meant to take their stand. It would make all the difference in the working of any scheme of old-age pensions. The language of the Bill should be made perfectly clear. Which of these two things did the Government mean? He submitted that the Lords were perfectly justified in trying to make the language and policy of the Bill perfectly clear. Whether their solution was the right one was another question, but that the House of Commons had never been allowed to argue.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the right hon. Gentleman had asked him a question and, with the leave of the House, he would answer it by putting to him the specific case of a man who had £200 saved up and who had a family dependent on him—let them say an unmarried daughter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not my case.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not say it was the case of the right hon. Gentleman. But the case the right hon. Gentleman put to the House was of a man with £200 saved up, which he could leave to his children. His case was: Suppose the man had an unmarried daughter living with him. What the right hon. Gentleman said was that in that case they ought to force——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he must interrupt. The right hon. Gentleman was putting into his mouth, as an illustration, a case which he had not put. Let them suppose that the owner of the £200 wanted to leave his money, not to an unmarried daughter living at home, but to a nephew who was extremely well-off in America.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE did not think the man with £200 would take the same trouble to save his money for a rich nephew in America that he would if he had some one dependent upon him in his own house. He would take an illustration which was a more practical and a more usual one, that of an old man who had an unmarried daughter, or it might be a widowed daughter, looking after him. He was seventy-two or seventy-three, and the right hon. Gentleman said he must buy an annuity with his £200. He bought an annuity. He might live six months, and then, at his death, he left those dependent on him absolutely penniless. The right hon. Gentleman called upon them to decide what the Government were going to do in such a case. His reply was that they stood by the Bill, which would not impose upon such a man the necessity of buying an annuity, which he might only enjoy for two or three months and then leave those dependent on him penniless.

MR. BOWLES said he did not know what the Government really intended by this part of the Bill. Did they mean that the means of a person for the purposes of the Act should be "the yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property belonging to that person which, though capable of investment or profitable use, is not so invested or profitably used by him." Did that or did it not mean that account should be taken of the income which might reasonably be obtained from the property? Unless the words meant that, they had no administrative or practical meaning at all; and the sole effect of the Amendment was to make that apparent. The right hon. Gentleman gave an instance of an old man with an unmarried daughter looking after him, and said that it would be very unfair indeed for him to have to buy an annuity and leave his unmarried daughter who was dependent upon him penniless. But was it quite clear that under the clause as it stood without the Lords Amendment the man might not be forced to do so? Could the right hon. Gentleman point to the words which would enable the old man to say to the pension officer: "I am not bound to do it; I resist your demand, and I will not buy an annuity, and nevertheless, you will have to give me a pension." As the Bill stood, as it left this House, it was perfectly open to the pension officer to suggest—he was not at all sure that it would not be the duty of the pension officer to say: "No; you have £200; so long as you have that £200 invested in Consols, I cannot grant you a pension, and that on the ground that you are not profitably using your £200 within the meaning of subsection (3) of Clause 4 of the Act." That was the point. The sole effect of this Amendment was to make it clear that they were to take into account the property of the man, the use which he made of it, and whether that was the largest income he could reasonably obtain from it. The Amendment would remove all doubt upon that point.

MR. GOULDING (Worcester) said that this was another of the clauses which, owing to the operation of the guillotine, the House had had no opportunity whatever of discussing.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: This was discussed.

MR. GOULDING: The right hon. Gentleman is wrong. This particular provision was not discussed at all.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It was discussed. The Leader of the Opposition, certainly, and the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone, put this dilemma in the debate. Whether the answer was satisfactory or not is another matter, but it certainly was debated.

MR. GOULDING said the right hon. Gentleman forgot that it was put to him as the guillotine was falling, and there was no opportunity whatever of any further discussion of the matter. He could not for the life of him see why the right hon. Gentleman could not accept the very reasonable Amendment inserted by the Lords. Surely it was not desirable to encourage the poor to hoard their money, to hide it in a stocking. They should rather encourage them to invest it. The Amendment gave a distinct guide and direction to those who were to estimate the yearly income to see that reasonable precautions were taken to invest the money instead of hoarding it.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) asked the Government to explain what they meant by the words the yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property "if profitably used by him." Take the case of a man with an unmarried daughter, owning a piece of land which he was holding up. He was getting no income out of it, but he was holding it up for the benefit of his unmarried daughter, because he knew that at the time of his death this land would have ripened and would be worth more. What was the pension officer to do in a case of that kind? Was he to say that this man was entitled to a pension or not?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said that, to his mind, the Lords Amendment would increase the hardship in rural districts to a considerable extent. Many cottagers had household gods such as old clocks, old brass candlesticks, warming-pans, and china which had been in their families for a hundred years or more and which they valued for themselves. There were collectors who would be quite ready and willing to give £50 or £100 for the contents of these cottages, because there was an immense demand for these articles, and under the Bill that value would have to be capitalised and the interest reckoned as part of the income of the cottager, although he had no doubt the pension officer would take a very lenient view of such cases. He hoped the House would resist the Lords Amendment. The clause itself, for the reasons he had stated, was an unjust one. Such property as these people might have which from the point of view of sentiment they would not sell, but which a collector would value at anything from £25 to £100, should not be regarded as property from which an income could be derived.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR, by leave of the House, asked the Attorney-General whether, in his view of the clause, a man who sold the remainder of a life annuity and invested the proceeds in some permanent investment would or would not be "directly or indirectly depriving himself of any income or property in order to qualify himself for the receipt of an old-age pension" under subsection 3.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said he certainly would say, so far as his own opinion was concerned, that a *bona fide* act of the kind described by the right hon. Gentleman would not be an attempt within the meaning of the section which forbids a man to deprive himself of his income. It would be a perfectly reasonable and legitimate change of investment. The clause was directed against the person who obviously intended to bring himself within the scope of the Bill by lessening his income for that purpose. A reasonable change by a man in the use of his money, still retaining it in profitable use, would not bring him within the penalties laid down in the clause. As the Bill stood it sought to prevent hoarding, and it said that any man possessed of property must put it to a profitable use. The inquiry of the pension officer went to that extent only. But the Lords Amendment would push the inquiry very much further, and the pension officer would have to go, not merely into the broad general question as to whether a man was profitably using his money, but into the question of how he had exercised his judgment in the use of that money, whether he had done it reasonably or unreasonably. He had rather gathered that the Opposition objected to the great scope already given to the inquiry by the pension officer; they were seeking now to push that inquiry into a sphere of a very dangerous character. They would make a mistake if, under cover of preventing fraud, they proceeded to stimulate reckless and improvident investment.

Sir H. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.) said the case which might arise was even stronger than had been stated by the Leader of the Opposition. A man of seventy otherwise qualified might have £739 invested in Consols. With £266 he could purchase himself a Post Office annuity of 13s. a week and still have £470 of his original capital invested in Consols. There was an even stronger case. An old couple of seventy living together might have £2,218 invested in Consols, and still, if they chose, draw from the State a pension of 2s. a week. He was perfectly aware that not many cases of that sort would arise, but, at the same time, the point could hardly be dismissed by a humorous observation.

Mr. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) asked whether old furniture, an old clock, or ornaments and things of that sort, in the possession of these persons would come under (b) or (c). If it fell under (b) there would be no danger, but if it fell under (c) it was another matter.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not think that under the Bill, as it stood, the old clock would be taken into account at all by the pension officer. But if the Lords Amendment were inserted it would undoubtedly be taken into account.

Mr. CROOKS said it appeared to him that some people wanted to turn the pension agent into a touting agent for speculative builders. He thought this was legislation for poor people. Could anyone imagine a man who had toiled for a daily wage for seventy years developing into a speculator? They would never find a working man who had put by £2,200. He had a better opinion of the Englishman than to believe that he would descend to subterfuges of the kind suggested in order to obtain a pension. That might be the view of the noble Lord and other hon. Gentlemen who had an intimate knowledge of the criminal classes, but after all, the majority of the people were not of the criminal class. The whole opposition to this declaration was frivolous. Those supporting it did not know what they were talking about. He had never come across these working men with hundreds of pounds. He wished he had. He did not believe they existed save in the imagination of those who were opposing this declaration.

Lord R. CECIL said the last speech rather confirmed a doubt which he had felt as to whether those who called themselves Labour Members really knew anything about the subject. The hon. Member had suggested that it was impossible to find a working man who had saved any money.

Mr. CROOKS: Nothing of the sort.

Lord R. CECIL: Of course, the man who had saved £2,000 would be an extreme case. The point of the discussion was a perfectly simple one, and it had not been met by the Government. At present subsection (c) of the clause was absolutely vague, it might mean one thing in one case and another thing in another, and the result would be that in some districts pensions would be given under one set of terms, in others under another set of terms. That could not be desirable. All the Lords did was to make a guess at what the House meant and to try to put it into clear language. If they meant, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, that people were not to be forced to buy an annuity, but could invest their money in any way they liked, then let them say so in the Bill. The point was that the Bill teemed with instances where the meaning was left absolutely vague and unclear, which must lead to injustice. He confessed that the Attorney-General's speech seemed to him, if he might say so, not really to deal with the point. He said they could not put on the pension officer the duty of inquiring whether the investment had been made profitably or not; but the subsection itself said—

"The yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property belonging to that person which, though capable of investment or profitable use, is not so invested or profitably used."

That was to say, if there was property which was not profitably used so as to produce the income expected to be derived from that property, then the property was not being dealt with in the way directed by the Bill. That was a view which it was possible for any pension committee to take, and if the House were to deal with the thing fairly they should make their meaning clear. It was farcical to say that they had discussed this matter, which he thought was interrupted by the fall of the guillotine. It had never been discussed by the House, and despite the humorous observations of the hon. Member for Woolwich he thought this was a proper opportunity to discuss the matter. He thought the right course would be to agree to the Lords Amendment, and then subsequently to amend that so as to carry out the true intention of the House.

MR. MOND (Chester) said they had only one lot of money to go round, and the more they gave to the people who did not want it the less they would have for the people who did want it. As far as he could see, the case of capital was provided for in the Australian and New Zealand schemes, and if persons owned more than a certain amount of money they were not entitled to a pension. He had always been surprised that no provision of that kind was made in the Bill. He did not think the Lords Amendment met that point, but he suggested that it might be possible to draft the regulations so as to meet it.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) thought the Amendment as it stood was open to the objections of his right hon. friend, and he therefore hoped it would not be agreed to. There was another point which he did not think had been touched upon. What was to become of the case of a man who had put money into the reversion of a small cottage property? Would it be treated as if that property had to be sold and an income taken from it or not? For the time being there would be no income from it. Would any income be taken into account?

Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment" put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, line 20, at end, to insert the words '(*d*) If any person is aggrieved by the refusal or neglect of a local pension committee to consider a claim for a pension, or to determine any question referred to them, that person may apply in the prescribed manner to the central pension authority, and that authority may, if they consider that the local pension committee have refused or neglected to consider and determine the claim or question within a reasonable time, themselves consider and determine the claim or question in the same manner as on an appeal from the decision of the local pension committee.'"

Question "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment" put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, after subsection (*d*) to insert the words '(*e*) The expression "party aggrieved" shall include a member of the said committee who has taken part in the consideration of the report and has dissented from the decision.'"

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved that the House should disagree with the Amendment. The proposal was that any member of the pension committee should have the right of appeal. He thought that was very undesirable. It would add enormously to the expense, and the moment anyone had got any political or other reason against a party to whom a pension was granted, he could pester the Local Government Board, and enter into the whole matter again.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there was no definition in the Act. The right hon. Gentleman had criticised the definition given by the Lords of the person aggrieved and there might be substance in his criticism, but was he going to substitute any other definition? The term "person aggrieved" might be so easily interpreted that a definition was not required, and in that case it was only the would-be pensioner who had the right of appeal.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: And the pension officer.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Then that will be all right.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, line 30, at end, to insert the words 'for the purposes of this subsection the expression "borough" includes a metropolitan borough and the city of London, and the expression "council of a borough" includes the council of a metropolitan borough, and as respects the city of London, the mayor, aldermen, and commons of the city of London in Common council assembled.'"

***Mr. SPEAKER**: This appears to be a privilege Amendment which alters the constitution of the body appointed by this House to carry the Act into execution, and in whom is vested the expenditure of the money to be granted.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE moved that the House should disagree with the Amendment.

Motion made and Question, "That the House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, after line 40, to insert as a new subsection '(3) The Local Government Board may appoint any person or any persons not exceeding three in number to be a member or members of any local pensions committee, or of any sub-committee appointed by the latter, who shall, when appointed, have all the rights of ordinary members of such committees.'"

***Mr. SPEAKER**: This gives to the Local Government Board the power of varying the constitution of the body to whom the House has entrusted the expenditure of the money, and therefore I think this also ought to be considered a privilege Amendment.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE moved that the House should disagree with the Amendment.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendments—

"In page 6, after line 6, to insert as a new subsection: '(6) Any reference in this Act to pension authorities shall be construed as a reference to the pension officer, the local pension committee, and the central pension authority, or to any one of them, as the case requires.'"

"In page 6, line 7, after the word obtaining, to insert the words 'or containing.'"

Agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 6, line 8, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'either for himself or for any other person, or for the purpose of obtaining or continuing an old-age pension under this Act for himself or for any other person at a higher rate than that appropriate to the case.'"

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE moved that the House should agree to the Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was glad the Government were doing all they could to strengthen this clause, because fears which were expressed at an earlier stage of the debate, that political organisations would be dragged into this matter, had already begun, unfortunately, to be fulfilled. He had just had put into his hands the copy of a letter from the Downend and Soundwell Liberal Association in these terms—

"Dear Sir or Madam, —As you are probably aware, the present Liberal and free trade Government is making provision for an old-age pension. The above association is compiling a register for the district of persons who are seventy years of age or will attain that age this year. The committee of the association desire to place their services at the disposal of any person who is eligible, and will assist such to obtain the pension."

If that kind of practice was to prevail, and if the experiment of obtaining old-age pensions was to fall into the hands of political organisations, on whatever side they might be, they would produce one of the gravest political scandals possible. This letter he believed to be authentic, and it had been put into his hands by an hon. Member who, at any rate, believed it to be authentic. He regarded it as absolutely scandalous, and he hoped the Government would by every means in their power prevent such a state of affairs.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he agreed that it would be a grave misfortune and might easily become a disaster if a Bill of this sort was to be worked for the purposes of corruption, and therefore he strongly deprecated any attempt of that sort.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 6, line 9, after the word 'representation,' to insert the words 'or if any person directly or indirectly deprives himself of any income or property in order to qualify himself for the receipt of an old-age pension, or for the receipt of an old-age pension at a higher rate than that to which he would otherwise be entitled under this Act.'"

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had very grave doubts with regard to this Amendment. He had come to the conclusion that on the whole it was undesirable to insert the words. He thought the penalty much too severe. Supposing a man rearranged his pension with his employer with a view of getting a little more, whatever view they took as to the desirability or undesirability of it he thought they must admit that to make it a penal offence was rather severe. The subsection might be capable of that interpretation, and he therefore on the whole thought it undesirable to insert the words and moved that they should disagree with the Lords in this Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

LORD R. CECIL said he largely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman, but he did not know whether his intention had been drawn to subsection (3) of Section 4 of the Bill. The subsection proposed by the Lords was really only carrying that out.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had given his attention to subsection (3) of Section 4. He wanted to draw the distinction. A person who acted in the manner suggested ought to be disqualified, but it would be rather severe to make his conduct a penal offence.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 6, after line 11, to insert as a new subsection: '(2) The pension officer may at any time, without the matter having been referred to him, call upon and require a person in receipt of an old-age pension to establish that he has not since the same was granted to him become disqualified to receive it, and the pension officer shall inquire into the matter of the pensioner's disqualification and report on the same to the pension committee, who shall receive and, as far as applicable, act upon the said report as if it were a report received under the provisions of Section 7, subsection (*c*) of this Act.'"

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not object to the substance of the new subsection, but to its insertion in the Bill. It was really a matter for regulations, and there was an advantage in dealing with it in that way. Regulations could be altered and adapted according to circumstances as they arose, and he had no doubt that in practice they would discover a good many things which they could not at present foresee. It would be very undesirable if they had to introduce a Bill to amend matters of procedure in every particular because they had inserted in an Act of Parliament what ought to be left to regulations. Matters of this kind, therefore, really ought to be dealt with in regulations, and for that reason, and not because he disagreed with the substance of the subsection, he moved that they should disagree with the Lords' Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

MR. BOWLES said he could quite understand the reluctance of the right hon. Gentleman to incorporate a provision of this sort in the Bill, because they must all agree that the duty upon the pension officers would be very disagreeable. The right hon. Gentleman, however, must feel and know that, however disagreeable the system was, it would have to be carried out unless the taxpayers were to be completely overwhelmed. He preferred that it should be provided for by regulation. Unless, however, the regulation was clear and stringent and was observed throughout the country, the Exchequer would be little less than overwhelmed. If the duty was made obligatory upon the pension officers, that no doubt would meet the case, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would assure them that that would be so.

Mr. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said he was rather sorry to hear the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because he did not think it was necessary to have this Amendment either on the face of the Bill or in regulations. He hoped nothing would be done by the issue of regulations after the passing of the Bill to require the pension officer or anybody else to go touting round ascertaining whether a man had ceased to be qualified for a pension. The Bill already provided a penalty for a man who was found to be in receipt of an old-age pension when he did not fulfil the statutory conditions or when he was not qualified, and he thought that was sufficient.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the cases were altogether different. This was a case of a person who, though qualified at the time the pension was granted, had since become disqualified, having possibly received a legacy. He thought in such a case the pension officer should be entitled to go and ask for information.

Mr. BARNES said he quite agreed that in a case of that character it would be the duty of the pension officer to go and inquire into the matter, and, if necessary, have the name of the person removed from the register; but he did not want anything put in the Bill or any instructions given which would make it the duty of the pension officer to go touting round to discover such cases. It would make it rather awkward for the old people if they were to be continually liable to inquiry as to any alteration in their circumstances. He therefore regretted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had indicated his intention of considering the matter in connection with the regulations, and he hoped he would not carry it out.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 7, after line 17, to insert as a new subsection: '(3) Every regulation under this Act shall be laid before each House of Parliament forthwith, and if an Address is presented to His Majesty by either House of Parliament within the next subsequent twenty-one days on which that House had sat next after any such regulation is laid before it, praying that the regulation may be annulled, His Majesty in Council may annul the regulation, and it shall thenceforth be void, but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder.'"

Agreed to.

Committee of seven Members appointed to draw up reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to certain of the Amendments made by the Lords to the Bill.

Committee nominated of,—Mr. Asquith, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, and Mr. Eugene Wason.

Three to be the quorum.

Committee to withdraw immediately.—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

Lords Amendments considered.

Lords Amendments—

"In Clause 3, after the word 'divinity,' to insert the words 'Provided that no test of religious belief shall be imposed by the governing body of either of the two new Universities or any constituent college on any such professor or lecturer as a condition of his appointment or recognition by the governing body as such professor or lecturer.'"

"In page 3, after line 35, to insert the following new subsections '(3) The governing body of a University or constituent college to which the statute relates, or any other person, corporation, or body directly affected by the statute may, within three months from the notification thereof in the Dublin *Gazette*, petition the Lord-Lieutenant in Council to disallow the whole or any part thereof. (4) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may refer any such petition to the Irish Universities Committee with a direction that the committee hear the petitioner personally or by counsel, and report specially to the Lord-Lieutenant in Council on the matter of the petition. (5) If the committee report in favour of the disallowance of the statute or any part thereof, the Lord-Lieutenant may, by Order in Council, disallow the whole or part thereof accordingly, but any such disallowance shall be without prejudice to the making of a new statute.' "

"In page 4, lines 1 to 3, to leave out Subsection (2) and to insert as a new subsection '(2) The Dublin Commissioners shall be the Right Hon. Christopher Palles, Alexander Anderson, John Pius Boland, Sir William Francis Butler, Denis Joseph Coffey, Stephen Gwynn, Henry Jackson, Sir John Rhys, The Most Rev. William Walsh, Bertram Coghill Alan Windle; and the Belfast Commissioners shall be His Honour James Johnston Shaw, Samuel Dill, the Rev. Thomas Hamilton, Donald Macalister, Robert T. Martin, Sir Arthur William Rücker, Johnson Symington.' "

Agreed to.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, line 39, after the word 'funds,' to insert the words 'and the professor or lecturer is not eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies, or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology; or (*b*) the erection of any church, chapel, or place of religious worship or observance by means of private benefaction within or without the precincts of the University or college.' "

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) said that this Amendment of the Lords had in one way and another got the Bill into rather a state of confusion, and he proposed to deal with the matter in another way. The Amendment divided itself into two parts, and with the first part down to the word "theology" he proposed to agree. But then the Amendment went on to reinsert certain words which were inserted for the first time in Committee upstairs, and when the Bill returned to the House on Report the words were excised. They were reinserted in another place by a majority of one. He believed that for a considerable time the Government had looked forward to the unique experience of having a majority of their own, but by the influence of the Episcopal bench the Amendment was carried by one, and the hopes of his noble friend were dashed to the ground. Owing to what had passed in the House on the Report stage it was not possible now to accept the Amendment in reference to the erection of chapels. To make good sense of the entire clause he proposed to disagree with the Amendment, and then at the end of line 41 to insert the words "and no professor of, or lecturer in, theology shall be eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies, or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology." He moved in the first instance to disagree with the Lords Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said that as the Chief Secretary was aware, at an early stage of the proceedings he had disagreed with his action with regard to the chapel clause, and he had described it then, as he believed it now, as an attempt at the last moment to conciliate Nonconformist opinion on the other side of the House, which had been so remarkably quiescent in the earlier stages and was prepared to allow its own Government to do what it would have vigorously resented if it had come from a Conservative Government. This was an attempt to placate them, and to send them away for the holidays with a pleasanter taste in their mouths. Far be it from him to deprive them of that pleasant addition to their holidays. They would find a satisfaction he should not share. He would like to take that opportunity of saying that in the discussion of the Amendment he had apparently fallen into a strange error, because he was reported to have said that he "hoped" this would be a denominational University. What he obviously meant to say, and he thought did say, was that he 'believed" it would be a denominational University; and holding that belief, he had said that not only must there be active participation in the work of the Roman Catholic hierachy if it was to be a success, but he had gone on to point out that, being a denominational University in his judgment it was not only a hardship but altogether illogical and unjust to draw these particular distinctions with regard to places of worship. He had thought it necessary to make that correction, because his remarks had been criticised in some portion of the Press, and had naturally led to some controversy amongst those who might happen to know that he held views of a different kind, although he did not know whether they attached any interest to what his views were on this subject. He did not propose to offer any opposition to the action of the Chief Secretary; so far as he was concerned, he accepted the decision arrived at on the Report stage as final, and he would not trouble to divide the House against a proposal which, although he did not like it, formed part of the Bill for which the Government was responsible. He had no doubt it might be advanced as an expression, in milk-and-water fashion, of those old principles of undenominationalism which at one time formed the staple argument of hon. Gentlemen opposite, but which, in these later days, they had not only abandoned, but in the abandonment took credit to themselves for the establishment of this University, which they would eventually find to be nothing but a denominational institution. That being so, he thought it would have been fairer if, instead of cutting off a small portion of it, they had given a denominational University right out, and allowed the chapels to be built.

Mr. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.) said the Chief Secretary would not be surprised at finding the Irish Members as a matter of principle going into the division lobby against him on this question. Personally, he did not much like agreeing with the Lords on anything, but he had no constitutional objection to them. This Amendment represented the views of Irish Members in Committee, which they afterwards supported on the Report stage. He did not propose to join with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin in attempting to make party capital at the expense of the Nonconformists on this matter. Of course the right hon. Gentleman would go away much happier on his holidays if he thought he had made a little party capital. The right hon. Gentleman's view was that the University was going to be an entirely denominational University. The view of the Nationalist Members from Ireland was that these Universities were going to be free Universities. Clause 3 thoroughly secured that. Hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House who were opposed to protective tariffs and to artificially keeping foreign goods out of the country, ought to join with the Irish Members in keeping in the Bill a clause that would have the effect of not artificially keeping religious teaching out of the University. The House ought clearly to understand the position. The effect of the Amendment inserted by the Lords would be this. There were to be no tests for teachers or students; no compulsion for students to attend religious instruction or religious worship; but it would be open to any denomination by private enterprise, and out of private funds, to erect a chapel for the purpose of religious worship, whether it was in Belfast or in Dublin. The question of the site, which in the first instance would be secured by public money, was dealt with by his hon. friend the Member for Waterford on the Report stage of the Bill. The University was to be a free University; no one was excluded from it on the ground of any particular religion; but the Bill as it now came down from the Lords left it open to any denomination, by their enterprise and their enthusiasm for their religion, to erect a chapel at which the students of that particular denomination, under no compulsion except the compulsion of conscientious belief in their religion, might attend their religious worship. He thought that with regard to this Bill the Nonconformists had behaved admirably, and that, notwithstanding any taunt that might be levelled against them from the front Opposition bench, they might go to their constituencies with the consciousness and satisfaction of having done more in a few years of liberal administration to settle this great question, than the Unionist Party had been able to accomplish in twenty years. The opposition to this Amendment was somewhat narrow. The Amendment if allowed to stand would have the effect of conferring freedom upon the University. The Nationalist Members, in making this protest, were by no means indifferent to the action of the right hon.

Gentleman the Chief Secretary. On the contrary, they were extremely grateful to the right hon. Gentleman and to those hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House who had principles as logical and pressed them as logically to a conclusion as did they who sat on the Irish benches; but he simply wished to say that Nationalist Members would feel it their duty to vote in favour of the Lords Amendment and against the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said the hon. Member who had just sat down had spoken in a very unjust manner towards what he was pleased to call the Tory Party. He presumed he meant the Unionist Party. If a Bill to endow a Roman Catholic University in Ireland out of public funds had been proposed from that side of the House every Member of the Nonconformist Party opposite would have raised such an agitation against it that no Unionist Party cou'd have carried it.

MR. KETTLE said he might not have conveyed his meaning precisely. He was perfectly willing to recognise the frank and generous way in which the Tory or Unionist Party had behaved, but it did not come very well from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin to make rather cheap party capital at the expense of the Nonconformists in view of the fact that his Party had been in office for nearly twenty years and did not face the problem which the Chief Secretary had solved.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS did not think it could be said that his right hon. friend had attempted to make party capital. They had to congratulate the Chief Secretary on the successful way in which he had given this University, a denominational one—no other kind would have satisfied the people of Ireland—and it was mere hypocrisy not to acknowledge and describe it as an endowed Roman Catholic University supported out of public money. The other question on which his right hon. friend had to be congratulated was the very cheap price at which he had secured Nonconformist support, viz., the refusal to allow any place of worship to be erected by private funds. They had swallowed the camel and strained at the little gnat.

MR. BUTCHER expressed deep regret that the Government had found it necessary to take up the position which they had adopted. The whole object of their labours for many weeks past had been to give the Roman Catholics the kind of University which they would like, and on this point, where the religious feelings of the nation were deeply touched, they proposed to refuse a little parcel of ground on which a chapel might be built by private benefaction. It seemed a most narrow, technical, and lamentable ground to take up. What to hon. Gentlemen opposite was a mere matter of the maintenance of the undenominational formula was to those for whom the University was designed a matter which touched them in their daily life. At present there was no proposal, because there was no money, to build a residential college. But one of the very first objects of private benefaction, and he hoped also of some State help, would be the erection of a proper residential college within the grounds of the University, and when it came to a residential college it would be a matter of extreme pain to the members of the college that that which had been associated with college life from time immemorial in all the great Universities, should by the *fiat* of that House be denied to them in Ireland. Even though they insisted, probably rightly, on having a technically undenominational University, was it necessary that they also should have an irreligious University? That was the light in which it would present itself to the people of Ireland, and he deeply regretted that that great gift, long delayed, but at last conferred upon the Irish people, should be marred by this graceless act.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) said the Government could hardly be congratulated on their consistency in regard to this particular Amendment. The Chief Secretary accepted it in Committee, but gave way in the House, and if he was to be consistent in his inconsistency he might have accepted the decision come to by the other House. He found it difficult to use harsh words against the Chief Secretary because he felt indebted to him for the measure as a whole, but he felt that the action the Government were now taking was a sign of great weakness. It was simply giving way to the most extraordinary exhibition of narrow-minded bigotry. He should certainly give a hearty vote for the Amendment.

MR. HAY MORGAN (Cornwall, Truro) said there had been a considerable amount of cheap and vulgar sneering at the position taken up by the Nonconformists, and remarks of a similar nature to those of the noble Lord had been made in another place. The position taken up by the Nonconformists was represented as very narrow and bigoted, and when it was proposed to leave out this Amendment from the Lords there was at once an insistance that it was of the greatest importance. He respected the good feeling of hon. Gentlemen opposite with regard to it, but, at the same time, Nonconformists had their feelings too, and their position was this: they had recognised from the start that the University in the South of Ireland and the University in the North of Ireland would become denominational Universities, from the very fact that in the South there was a large preponderance of Catholics and in the North a large preponderance of Protestants. They as Nonconformists and Liberals could no more object to that than they could object to a county council, or a local authority, in Wales being Nonconformist from the simple fact that most of the electors were Nonconformist. Their position had been quite consistent. They had endeavoured to say that when they were passing a Bill, although it created two Universities which would inevitably become denominational, the Bill itself should not be a denominational Bill. If the Amendment were permitted to go into the Bill, and they allowed a chapel to be built either in the North or in the South, from the very nature of the case that chapel would be a sectarian one. It must belong to some particular denomination, and whatever the denomination was the University would be stamped with that denominational mark. They thought it far better that the private benefactors who were ready to erect a chapel should erect it outside the precincts of the University, and by so doing their religious faith and aspirations would be completely satisfied.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore) expressed the deepest regret that the Government had not seen their way to concede this point. In Trinity College there was an ancient chapel, the symbol of the Protestant religion, and services were held there. It was, after all, a poor thing to provide a University presumably for Irish Catholics with a proviso that there should be no chapel within its precincts for the celebration of divine worship according to the Catholic religion. They were committing a great mistake. While respecting the Government for the way in which they had dealt with a very thorny question, he should be compelled to go into the division lobby against them.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) also desired to express his regret that the Chief Secretary had been unable to accept the Amendment. All the circumstances connected with the establishment of the University must be regarded as exceptional. They were called for by the fact that the Roman Catholics in Ireland were unable to accept the facilities for higher education which were provided in the present University of Dublin. When this Bill became an Act, Dublin would enjoy the exceptional privilege of being, he believed, the only city in Europe except one in which there were two Universities. In making this gift to the Irish Roman Catholics, he very much regretted that Parliament, by refusing to accept this Amendment, should accompany the gift by what would always be regarded as a grievance by the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He could not conceive any reason why the University, which would be governed almost, if not quite, exclusively by Roman Catholics, the professors of which would be mainly Roman Catholics, and in which the students themselves would be of one religion, should be refused the privilege of possessing a chapel in which the students might worship according to their religion. It was to him of the essence of the gift that it should be acceptable to the recipients and be welcomed by them. It was such gifts that equally blessed givers and receivers. He had felt considerable interest in the Bill, and he appealed to hon. Members opposite to show a generous spirit in dealing with the matter.

MR. MASSIE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said the hon. Member for Cambridge University had spoken of the graceless refusal of the demand. This chapel was never demanded at all either by politicians or bishops. The hon. Member himself in his good nature gratuitously proposed the chapel and so started the whole difficulty. It was precisely because they regarded them as free Universities that they desired that they should not be handicapped by a very prominent sign of exclusiveness. It was precisely because they regarded them as in theory undenominational that they desired to preclude as much denominationalism as possible, and especially that which would peculiarly stamp the University as denominational. But it was not at all surprising that those who desired to make out that these Universities were entirely denominational should seek to add a chapel in order that they might be as denominational as possible.

MR. WALSH (Lancashire, Ince) said he was very much surprised at the changed attitude of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. He remembered, when they were debating the point in Committee as to whether there should be power given whereby a site for the erection of a chapel might be provided even out of the funds of the University, the right hon. Gentleman himself protested at what he described as the rather narrow spirit that some Members were manifesting. The right hon. Gentleman thought then that inasmuch as no chapel was to be paid for out of the funds of the University, and no Chair of theology and no professor of theology would receive a penny of public money, it was only proper that at least a site within the grounds of the University might be provided. At a later stage that power of providing a site was taken away, and now they found the right hon. Gentleman had completely veered round. He certainly thought hon. Members were taking a rather ungenerous and narrow view of the matter. It was admitted by hon. Members below the gangway that the Universities would be denominational from the very fact that a large preponderance of Roman Catholics resided in one portion of the country, and a great preponderance of Protestants in the other. The fact was incapable of contradiction. Why not meet it in as fair and generous a manner as possible?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about minorities?

MR. WALSH said there would be two minorities. Minorities were always right it was said, and he remembered the right hon. Gentleman saying that suffering was the badge of all their tribe. He would not like to retort that the minority would have to suffer, but he could not conceive any minority actuated by such a spirit that they thought themselves compelled to suffer if some other people were given an opportunity of following their worship in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken as to certain old and famous Universities having chapels within their precincts. It seemed to him a very narrow view they were taking in not allowing a pious donor to hand over a few thousand pounds wherewith to erect a chapel. After all, the Bill made it impossible that a penny of public funds should go to any faculty of theology. There was no theologian to be endowed out of the funds of the University and there was to be no religious or denominational test. There was no compulsory attendance at Divine worship. The Bill was a splendid Bill framed on most generous and democratic lines, and he certainly thought it was rather an unhappy ending that this tinge of narrowness and exclusion should come into what was otherwise a very desirable measure.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.) said that he had voted for the chapel at an earlier stage and he would support it again. It would be ungracious to spoil the Bill by refusing the power to erect a chapel; it was straining at the gnat and swallowing the camel.

*Mr. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said that everybody understood what a chapel meant. Every other part of this University was liable to change according to the requirements that arose in the course of time, but he understood a Roman Catholic chapel was a consecrated building whose purpose could not be changed. That made the whole difference, and he thought that that consideration might have made some difference in the minds of Roman Catholics. That was an argument which cut two ways. In the case of an ardent Roman Catholic he could quite understand the desire that the building consecrated to that use should never by any possibility be devoted to any other use. On what terms was this University going to be made denominational? Surely on the terms that it was to be democratic. It was intended to serve the uses of the people, and those who used it in one place might be Roman Catholics and in the other Protestants. In dealing with a University as a place of education to last for centuries subject to the necessary changes of times and circumstances it was better to set apart a separate site and a building to be devoted to religious uses, consecrated to that purpose only. In this way those who belonged to one particular religion would have all the advantages they desired, and all the opportunities of attending religious services in a place devoted to that one purpose. In this respect he agreed with the latest form in which the Bill appeared.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 142; Noes, 40. (Division List No. 240.)

AYES

Acland, Francis Dyke
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, James
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henry, Charles S.
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.

Stanley, Albert(Staffs,N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, RtHn.E.(Clackmannan
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n
Wilson, P. W.(St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Collings,Rt. Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Cowan, W. H.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Forster, Henry William
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Heaton, John Henniker
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Lardner, James CarrigeRushe
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mooney, J. J.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Seddon, J.
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walsh, Stephen

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland-Burke.

Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, line 41, after the word 'teaching' to insert the word 'or' and leave out the words 'or religious worship.'"

Agreed to.

An Amendment made to the Bill in lieu of the Lords Amendment—

"In page 5, line 39, which was disagreed to, by inserting in page 5, line 41, at the end thereof, the words 'and no professor of or lecturer in theology or divinity shall be eligible for membership of the General Board of Studies or of any faculty other than the faculty of theology.'"—(*Mr. Birrell*).

Remaining Lords Amendments agreed to.

Committee appointed to draw up reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by the Lords to the Bill.

Committee nominated of, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Birrell, Mr. Bright, Mr. Walter Long, and Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Three to be the quorum.

To withdraw immediately. — (*Mr. Birrell.*)

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

BEE PEST (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

WHALE FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords Amendment to omit subsection (1) of Clause 5 considered.

MR. MOONEY (Newry) objected to the omission of the subsection which he contended did not interfere with the general scope of the Bill, and he did not know why it should be left out.

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said that this subsection had originally been inserted with the object of exempting bottle-nosed whales from the provisions of this measure. It had, however, been pointed out that the bottle-nosed whale was a Royal fish, and that the insertion of the subsection would interfere with the Royal prerogative in a substantial degree. For that reason the subsection had been omitted. He could not tell what distinguished bottle-nosed whales from any other kind.

Lords Amendment agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT (AUTUMN SITTING

MR. ASQUITH, in moving "That this House, at its rising to-morrow, do adjourn until Monday, the 12th October next; that for the remainder of the session Government business have precedence at every sitting; that at the conclusion of Government business on each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that on Fridays the House, unless it otherwise resolves, shall at its rising stand adjourned until the following Monday," said that this Motion completed the sessional arrangements foreshadowed about a fortnight ago. The substance of the Motion was that the House at its rising to-morrow should adjourn till 12th October, and for the remainder of the session should give precedence to Government business. This was directly in accordance with precedents which had been followed for many years in respect to autumn sessions, and any other arrangement would involve an intolerable strain on the time and attention of hon. Members. The only innovation was the last clause which provided that on Fridays the House should stand adjourned until the following Monday. That was a convenient arrangement, because if it was not put in the Resolution the Speaker might be compelled to take the adjournment until Saturday. It was, however, only a very formal matter. On 12th and 13th October they would take the Children Bill, the Prevention of Crimes Bill, and other small Home Office Bills if time permitted. On Wednesday, October 14th they would take the next of the allotted days for the Licensing Bill and dispose of Clause 2, and on 15th and 16th October they would proceed with Clause 3.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked whether it was proposed to proceed with the Committee stage of the Bill *de die in diem*.

MR. ASQUITH: Not necessarily He would not like to commit himself on the point, but he thought that substantially they would proceed without interruption. There might be an interval of a day here and there. On the first day of the sitting the President of the Board of Trade would move his instruction on the London Electric Power Bills, and if it was not disposed of at that sitting they would ask the House to take it after Eleven o'clock on one of the allotted days. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House at its rising to-morrow do adjourn until Monday, 12th October, next; that for the remainder of the session Government business have precedence at every sitting; that at the conclusion of Government business on each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that on Fridays the House, unless it otherwise resolves, shall at its rising stand adjourned until the following Monday."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the Prime Minister had suggested that this Motion was in accordance with precedents for many years. There were two precedents but they were not the same. This Motion had the effect of overriding the 4th Standing Order under which the House carried on its business. When that Standing Order was first moved it stood in a form in which it was open to the same objection that this Motion was open to, and the argument was so strong on that occasion that the Government gave way. That was in April, 1902, and it was pointed out that an autumn session had lasted on one occasion, well remembered by many hon. Members, until nearly the middle of March, and the following session began a few days after. There was almost no recess at all. It was obvious that it would have been absurd to suspend the rights of private members, to give no opportunity for the discussion of public affairs, and to confine themselves to Government business for so long a period. That argument was pressed with very much force, and the right hon. Gentleman opposite offered a large concession to meet that particular case by promising to insert "until December," but the House was not content with that Amendment, and insisted on putting in "until Michaelmas," and those words now stood in the Resolution. No one would desire to revive, in an autumn sitting of the House, the whole rights of private Members as enjoyed in the earlier part of the session, but there should be some opportunity for discussing public affairs. The autumn sitting should not be absolutely confined to Government business, but should include debates on matters that seemed to be of first-class importance. He would not extend his remarks by pointing out what the subjects were; they had been mentioned in the course of the debates during the past two or three days. There were matters pending which might call for the sudden attention of the House of Commons, and it was not sufficient to rely on the ordinary practice of giving the regular Opposition a day for debating a Vote of Censure. These were matters on which the House of Commons should be free to express an opinion apart from the action of the Opposition expressed in a formal Vote of Censure. It seemed to him the case was so strong that some attempt ought to be made by the Government to meet it. At all events they should now, on this the last day but one of the present part of the session, decide it for themselves. This power ought not to be given to the Government until October came. Why should they tie their hands now as to what they should do when they met again in October? In 1902 the right hon. Gentleman opposite gave notice in August of the Motion which he intended to move in October, if the circumstances remained the same. They were separating at an earlier date this year than was the case on the two former occasions. In 1902, when the House met in October, the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who was then Leader of the House, made a Motion somewhat similar to that which they were now discussing, though not so drastic, and it was accompanied by a pledge that the House would not sit past Christmas, and he named a date in December when probably the House would rise. Though in 1902 the House did not meet till 16th October—rather later than the date at which it was proposed they should meet this year—they had full opportunity when the right hon. Gentleman brought forward his Motion of properly debating the question whether all the time should be given to the Government. The only precedent for the Motion now before the House was one which was set in the present Parliament by the late Prime Minister in 1906 on the last day of the sitting in August. Most of the Members of the House had gone away without knowing the terms of the Motion which was to be submitted. On that occasion Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman gave a private assurance that the House would not sit past Christmas. He (Sir C. Dilke) moved to leave out all the words after "12th October next." That would enable the House when it met in October to raise the whole question in exactly the same way.

MR. BOWLES seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'next,' to the end of the Question."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. ASQUITH said the sole question was whether this Resolution should be put as a whole or whether it should be put in two instalments. Personally, he did not see why the House should not decide at once both matters raised by the Resolution. He did not believe that anybody would suggest—he gathered his right hon. friend did not suggest—that they should keep alive the whole of the rights of private Members during the autumn session, but as regarded the opportunities given to private Members to raise matters of importance, he would point out that the Resolution scrupulously preserved the right of moving the adjournment of the House on a definite matter of urgent public importance on all other than allotted days. He would be prepared to insert in the Resolution words limiting the length of the autumn session, say, to a date before Christmas, but he could not accept his right hon. friend's Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought this suggestion would meet some part of the complaint of the right hon. Baronet opposite. He had two objections to the course the Government had pursued. The first was that he thought it very unfortunate that they should propose a Resolution of this kind without any notice. That was quite new and quite unnecessary. The Government had long known that they were going to have an autumn session, and that they were going to meet in October, and it was rather a violation of the practice of the House that they should only know what was going to be done in a matter of this importance to the general conduct of business on the very morning when the question had to be decided. It was too late to put that matter right now, but he earnestly hoped that the Government Whips, or whoever was responsible, would see that there were no more of these unnecessary breaches of precedent. The other objection related to the liberty of the House to deal with other than Government business during the autumn session. As he pointed out yesterday, this was the very first time in Parliamentary history that Parliament was asked to meet in the middle of October without any liberty at all to discuss matters of public importance. He did not deny that on the first and second nights of the session, when the Children Bill and some other non-controversial Bills were on the Order Paper, it would be possible for any Member to move the adjournment of the House. But when those were over, they were going to have a great block of public business. Twenty-three days were to be entirely concerned with one Bill, and whenever that Bill was put down, then the whole of the rights and privileges of the House as regarded the discussion of matters other than Government business were absolutely suspended. The House had never made any conditions of that kind. It was quite abnormal, quite improper. And he did not know whether it was going to end there. He was confident, knowing the ways of the Government, that they would try to pass more Bills, and would move another Closure Resolution, and the whole of the rights of the House in respect of business other than Government business would be taken away. He hoped the Government would even now consider whether they could not give some relaxation to the rigidity of this rule.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he wished to ask the Prime Minister a question in regard to some Orders still on the Paper. The Government had taken away a good deal of the time of private Members, but they had atoned for so doing in the last few weeks by giving facilities for certain non-contentious Bills being passed through all their stages with the general consent of the House. He thought the same procedure should be maintained in the autumn sitting. He had had the honour of presiding over a Committee which had dealt with a number of Bills which, he believed, all sections of the House would be willing to have passed into law. There were five or six practically non-contentious Bills on the Order Book, and it seemed to him that it would be a great scandal if, after hon. Members had taken the trouble of balloting on these Bills, and after the Bills had passed through the Standing Committee and through the Report stage in the House, they were not to be allowed to pass in the same way as several Bills which had been passed during the last fortnight. He would point out that if these derelicts were left on the sea of legislation they would remain blocking the way, and occupying time which might otherwise be given to other useful measures introduced by private Members, or occupying time which might be given to Government business. He thought it would be good tactics to pass these Bills.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) joined in the appeal to the Prime Minister to consider whether he could not, consistently with the well-known objects of the Government, give private Members a little more liberty in the autumn session. The Motion said: "That at the conclusion of Government business on each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put." That practically deleted from the Order Paper all private Members' Bills. He thought they were all agreed that it was not only desirable but absolutely necessary that some words should be devised to preserve to private Members the right of raising any pressing question on the Motion for the adjournment of the House. If the right hon. Gentleman could accept that suggestion, he would go far to meet the objection to the Motion in its present form. There were questions which were not of sufficient public importance to justify Mr. Speaker in granting leave to move the adjournment of the House, but which might very properly be raised on the Motion for the adjournment of the House at the close of business.

LORD R. CECIL suggested that the last clause of the Motion, "and that on Fridays the House, unless it otherwise resolves, shall at its rising stand adjourned until the following Monday," should be omitted. That would give an opportunity once a week of raising questions of the kind to which the hon. Member for Leicester had referred. On a former occasion the Prime Minister was asked whether private Members were to have any rights in the autumn session, and the right hon. Gentleman replied that that would be a matter to be decided in the autumn session. They might have misunderstood what the right hon. Gentleman said, but if that was so, it emphasised all the more the necessity of having this Motion in a form which would enable them to raise these matters in the autumn session.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) supported the appeal to the Prime Minister to consider during the recess whether the latter part of the Motion should not be amended so as to preserve some of the rights of private Members. So far as the Irish Party were concerned, they had always contended for the rights of private Members. There was no doubt that the whole tendency nowadays was for Parliament to become more and more merely a record of the wishes of the Executive Government for the time being. He found himself for once in his life in hearty accord with the Leader of the Opposition. He was glad to find the right hon. Gentleman at last standing up for the rights of private Members. It was not often that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the front benches were found showing anxiety and tenderness for those rights. The two front benches always made common cause in that matter, because ex-leaders who were in opposition thought that some day they would be back on the Treasury bench. What he quarrelled particularly about with the Leader of the Opposition was that he was the means of destroying one of the most valuable rights private Members ever possessed, namely, the right to interrupt public business at any time. The right hon. Gentleman practically abolished that right. He gave instead the right to move the adjournment of the House at nine o'clock at night when few Members were present, and when speeches on most important questions might be addressed to empty benches. A division might be taken when hon. Gentlemen found it convenient to return from a dinner party, and then they went into the lobbies without having heard a word of the debate. He hoped that a protest would be made against this deprivation of the rights of private Members, and that some measures would be taken for the restoration to them of that most valuable privilege. As the hon. Member for East Northampton had said, several important Bills had passed through Grand Committee, and now awaited the Report stage, and some only the Third Reading; but under this Motion as proposed by the Prime Minister all chance of passing them would be absolutely destroyed. His hon. friend behind him had introduced an important Bill for the repeal of the Coercion Act in Ireland. It passed through Grand Committee upstairs without any opposition in something like two minutes and a half. The Bill met with general acceptance in the House, but under the Prime Minister's Motion it would be massacred in the autumn session. Among other Bills was one which would specially appeal to the Prime Minister, viz., the Bill to give votes to women. The Second Reading of that Bill had been passed at an early period of the session, but it had been hung up waiting for an opportune time for its further progress. The strong and deep interest which the Prime Minister and his colleagues had taken in this measure should make them the last men in the world to deny the House the right of deciding the question in the autumn session. On the general question he appealed to private Members to shake themselves free of the malign influence of th front benches and to record their votes in favour of the preservation of some at least of the rights and privileges of private Members.

*MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.) said he interpreted the friendly nod of the Prime Minister in answer to the appeal of his hon. friend the Member for Leicester, to mean that the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to make a concession in the Resolution under consideration. He had no wish in any way to add to what the hon. Member for Leicester had said in support of the contention of the Leader of the Opposition; but he would make this further appeal to the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman had given a promise to the Leader of the Opposition that in the event of the responsible Leaders of the Opposition wishing to move a vote of censure on the Government, he would provide an opportunity for the discussion of such a Motion. The unfortunate circumstances under which they, in that part of the House, were placed was that some of the subjects they thought most important and most fitting to be made the subject of a Vote of Censure on the Government, the Leader of the Opposition was not concerned with, because he did not share their views, or wish to support a Vote of Censure which they might move. For example, they might take the subject of the unemployed. On those benches there was an overwhelming desire to discuss the issue of unemployment, but they had no reasonable opportunity for doing so. The other evening discussion dodged round motor cars, tuberculosis, unemployed, and a great number of other subjects; but there was no possibility of getting a direct vote on unemployment. He maintained that the Labour Party had a right to put that issue before the House and the country from their own point of view. The Leader of the Opposition did not feel at one with them on that matter; the right hon. Gentleman had a perfect right to his opinion, but the Labour Party claimed the right to have their opinion also. What he had just said, he was convinced, had the full support of a large mass of the population of the country, and he appealed to the Prime Minister in the full knowledge of that to give their Party the same privilege of moving a vote of censure on the Government when they asked it as the regular Opposition had.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS appealed to the Prime Minister for some consideration being given to the Local Authorities (Education) Bill which would provide for the teaching of agriculture in schools. That Bill passed unanimously its Second Reading some time ago; it was non-contentious; and he asked the right hon. Gentleman to allow it to be starred. There was another Bill which he thought had been hardly treated. He meant the Small Holdings Amendment Bill, which he held should be starred so as to be considered in the autumn session.

*MR. ASQUITH said he was anxious to make this Resolution as practically consistent with the general convenience of the House as was possible to carry out its main object. The terms of the Resolution followed verbatim a similar Motion proposed a few years ago by the Leader of the Opposition. The points raised divided themselves into two groups. First, in reference to private Members' Bills, he thought the Government had shown every consideration to those which had secured anything like general assent, and he was prepared to do the same with other Bills standing on a similar footing—that was to say, if they had a general measure of acceptance and the same absence of serious controversy. He was afraid that could not be said of the Bill mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley, nor could he include the repeal of the Crimes Act for Ireland in the description; he would be glad if it could receive universal assent; but it certainly could not be said to be non-controversial. As regarded Bills that did fall within that category, the Government would extend similar facilities to those they had extended to others in the earlier part of the session. As to the point raised by the right hon. Baronet, the right to raise important matters on a Motion for adjournment, he would be prepared without changing the phraseology of the Resolution, to undertake that, when it was represented to the Government that there was, on the part of any body of Members, a serious demand of the kind with substantial support, the adjournment should be moved before the remaining Government Orders were reached at half-past Eleven, so that the time might be occupied with the discussion of that Motion.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said that so far as he was concerned that would meet his point.

MR. ASQUITH said that it might stand as a promise.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. A. E. W. MASON (Coventry) said he would like to call the attention of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies and of the House generally, to a Paper which had perhaps been overlooked in their discussions, but of the value and importance of which there could be no doubt whatever. He referred to the report of Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, Deputy-Minister of Labour in the Government of the Dominion of Canada, on his mission to this country in connection with Asiatic labour. He need not refer in particular to the details of the mission. Mr. Mackenzie King came over here in March, on the initiative of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to consult with the British authorities on the great and important subject of Asiatic immigration; and owing to the co-operation between the India Office and the Colonial Office, and the Colony represented by Mr. Mackenzie King, a settlement was arrived at. That Report was of great value, if only for the extreme cordiality of its tone and frank recognition by Canada of obligations of citizenship within the Empire. But the Report was still more valuable, not only as a settlement of a particular incident, but as a statement of a great problem which would have to be faced in the years to come, and which, if not treated with the greatest discretion and sagacity, would undoubtedly become a very great and constant danger and even a menace to the integrity of the Empire at large. In this Paper he was inclined to believe the principle and policy of Asiatic immigration was laid down for the first time, and was capable of a much wider application than in the particular instance of Canada. The hon. Members for Leeds and York rather swept the problem out of the way by stating that we must take it as a sure thing that the Colonies would not accept Asiatic immigration. That was only stating half of the problem; in this Paper they found the whole problem stated by Mr. Mackenzie King as follows—

> "The variegated character of the British Empire is in no particular, perhaps, more fully exemplified than in the circumstance that within its confines are to be found all the features which the problem of Oriental immigration presents."

Thus, they had two sides to the question; they had the Colonial side and the Asiatic side, and he believed that the Paper to which he had referred would be often quoted in the House as the beginning of a settlement of the problem. They were quite clear on one side of the problem. The Colonies had the right, universally recognised nowadays, to restrict Asiatic immigration according to their own wishes and desires. The Colonial restriction was the result of their economic policy; the entry of Asiatics into their territory was liable to lower the standard of living; while, on the other hand, there was a growing disinclination in this country to interfere at all with internal Colonial Government. But we had to consider not merely the question of the Colonies restricting Asiatic immigration, but also the problem of Asiatics trying to find their way into those countries and being treated under circumstances which involved suffering, and, as they conceived, humiliation and degradation on their part. He would like to urge particularly in dealing with this question of Asiatic immigration that our policy in England should be to teach the native Indians that they had a right arising from British citizenship. It was essential that the native Indian should be aware that the Imperial policy in so far as he was concerned, was a policy of great solicitude for his welfare, and that that should be brought home to him by his contact with the Indian Administration. That was a question to which the most serious thought and consideration must be given. The problem was bound to grow, as the desire of emigration on the part of Asiatics, especially in India, was bound to grow. Take the over-crowded frontier towns on the North-West of India. Within the year 1906, 48,000 Afghans migrated into the frontier districts, which were already over-populated. When he was out there not long ago on a frontier trip, he found that not a man was at home; all had gone to Bombay seeking work in the mills, or serving on board ship, and sending their earnings home. That was certain to be more and more the case as long as the British power remained in India; and he was one of those who believed that the British power in India was the one safeguard against rebellion and war. What was true of the North-West frontier was also true of other parts of India where the desire to spread abroad was getting greater and greater. We could not shut our eyes to this problem. We could not say to the Colonists that we had solved the whole problem; but he believed that in this Paper by Mr. Mackenzie King there was the germ—much more, the principle—of a definite policy which was capable of great extension, and which, if extended, might save us from great danger. Here was to be found an arrangement arrived at by means of co-operation between the India Office, the Colonial Office, and the Indian Government. There were men in India who were deluded as to the prosperity that awaited them if they emigrated, and the whole affair had been settled with the co-operation of the British and Canadian Governments. But if that co-operation had taken place before the emigration had begun, the whole trouble, and a rather dangerous subject, would have been avoided. He thought they should get some co-operation between the Government and the India Office, in which case a great step would be taken towards the solution of this very difficult question. He believed that in the new machinery which had been set up by the Government they had a means by which this co-operation could be obtained. What was required was some sort of Imperial Intelligence Department. What was called the Conference Secretariat might be used and extended for this purpose. He believed that if that office could be enlarged so that it should form a sort of clearing house for information, an intelligence department through which information might be disseminated throughout the Empire, the dangers which had arisen in the past and which awaited us in the future, unless this matter was grappled with, would be avoided. We had, as he had said, the machinery, and he urged the Under-Secretary to take into his consideration the necessity of insuring that in a short time all the necessary information should be sent to the Governments concerned, so that these troubles might be put an end to. He thought this was a most important question, and well worthy of a few moments' attention on the part of the Government. In the Conference Department they had the opportunity and would be able to tell whether in any part there was or was not any opportunity for Asiatic labour. There was also another consideration, and that was the terms on which Asiatic labour should go to any Colony. If the Department could arrange those terms, they would arrive at a certain harmony between the various British Dependencies and others parts of the Empire which did not exist at present, but which certainly must be insured if this vast Empire of ours was to be kept flourishing.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby) said he was sure no Member of the House would quarrel with his hon. friend for having brought this matter forward, and that the House would not wish a matter of such overwhelming importance to be left where it was without some statement from the Government; for it was true that the whole future of the Empire depended on the steps now taken, and that it was quite easy to shatter the Empire by taking a false step. The matter was brought to a stage of acute difficulty only a few months ago, and, in consequence, they had this Report, which the hon. Gentleman had referred. He wished to say at once on behalf of the Government that they appreciated most warmly the manner in which the Canadian Government had met them in this most difficult matter. They also appreciated warmly the manner in which Mr. Mackenzie King had conducted the negotiations ; for he had shown that, however difficult a matter might be, when a man of attainments, sincerely desirous of preserving the unity of the Empire, was concerned in its discussion, a common agreement for the common good might result. That was the justification for the hon. Member's bringing this matter forward. Although Mr. Mackenzie King's Report showed that he himself realised that the diplomatic considerations involved were so delicate that one must speak with restraint, it was, nevertheless, important that there should be the fullest discussion on the matter and that it should be looked fairly in the face, and his right hon. friend the Prime Minister shared that view. The difficulties arose in consequence of the immigration into Canada, not only of Indians, but other Asiatics, and especially Japanese and Chinese. He would not dwell on the Japanese immigration, because the Japanese Government had agreed to restrict emigration as far as possible, and had shown the most friendly desire to co-operate with the Canadian Government and our own Government. But, on the general question, might he appeal to the House not to adopt any superior attitude in this matter—not to say, as people were tempted to say, "Surely all men in the Empire are equal," and not to hold too closely to the principle of "*Civis Romanus Sum*,' and say: "Being a citizen of the Empire, I can go where I please," and that any attempt to exclude a citizen of the Empire was unjust and must be resented by the Imperial Government. It was easy to utter those very proper sentiments, because we had no corresponding dangers menacing us in this country. Not only had we no menace of the kind, but objections were raised at the slightest symptom of Asiatic immigration. He had heard a statement from his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade that he was proposing to take action in regard to the increase of Chinese seamen in British ships in the coasting trade of this country. He did not say we ought not to take these objections, but he said we ought, and therefore we ought not to take up a superior attitude against the Colonies who found themselves confronted with a far more urgent danger. His hon. friend was quite right. He had told them what happened on the frontiers of India, where happily owing to British rule the people were turning to peaceful pursuits and the population was increasing. The outward extension of Asiatics was not likely to diminish, but there were indications in the Colonial Office and, he understood, also in the India Office, that there was plenty of work in India for able-bodied men to do, and that the tendency towards extension was confined only to certain areas. Having given that word of caution or comfort, whichever hon. Members might think it to be, he must admit that the matter was of urgent importance. The burden of the cry of those who said that we must take a stronger attitude to induce our Colonies to accept the immigration of any of our fellow-subjects was *Civis Romanus sum.* A citizen of the British Empire, it was said, ought to be able to go where he pleased. Of course a difficulty was caused. When we had some great function here, and a citizen of the Empire from India shook our statesmen by the hand, immediately afterwards citizens of the Empire from Australia and Canada went through the same ceremony. On the other hand, Euclid's statement that things which were equal to the same thing are equal to one another was not always capable of application to political matters, and could not be carried to its logical conclusion, because there were reasons, racial and economic, which made people of a particular race determined not to admit persons of another race or another and lower stage of civilisation. Notwithstanding the temporary abandonment of the doctrine of *Civis Romanus sum*, there was reason why they need not regard it as a complete disaster. He would remind the House of a better Latin saying: *Homo sum ; humani nihil a me alienum puto.* In English he would say: "God made all men in his own image ; and therefore all men are my kith and kin." That was a wider doctrine than the doctrine that in matters of civil liberty the citizens of the Empire should have a privilege over the citizens of the world.

Even that wider doctrine could not be applied, first of all because of climatic conditions. Mr. Mackenzie King's Report was conclusive on that point. He said—

> "It was clearly recognised in regard to emigration from India to Canada that the native of India is not a person suited to this country; that, accustomed as many of them are to the conditions of a tropical climate, and possessing manners and customs so unlike those of our own people, their inability to adapt themselves readily to surroundings entirely different could not but entail an amount of privation and suffering which renders the discontinuance of such emigration most desirable in the interests of the Indians themselves."

He believed that to be absolutely true. The immigration into Canada that took place resulted in great suffering to the Indian immigrants. They were not suited to the places they settled in, and this also applied to those who went to British Columbia. He had seen all the papers, confidential and other, and he could assure the House that Indian immigration into Canada had been a failure from the point of view of the immigrants themselves. Then there was the economic difficulty—the trade union difficulty—caused by the determination of the men in the country not to have their wages cut or a race introduced which could work for less because on account of its physique it could live on less, and because on account of its habits it did not require such a high development of comfort. That was a point which must never be lost sight of. Great white communities could not be expected to allow their economic standard to be lowered in this way by a vast immigration of those who could live on next to nothing, work longer hours, and who required none of those accessories of life to which the white population had been used for centuries. But the most important difficulty was racial antipathy. It was all very well to say that all men were equal and brothers; there were many people who would not assent to that doctrine. It was the duty of philosophers and Christians to remove racial antipathy before statesmen and politicians introduced an alien element. To take the opposite course and enforce the principle that a citizen of the Empire should be able to go all over the British Empire before a favourable state of feeling had been created could only cause infinite suffering to both the races concerned. A striking, almost tragic, illustration of this fact was to be found in the present situation in the Southern States of America, where the presence of an alien race had caused acute suffering to both black and white races. What policy ought they to pursue? He spoke on behalf of the Government and could not be expected to speak with that precision which one could do if one was speaking at large without reference to views which must have relation to all parts of the world as well as those which they were now discussing. The first principle was that while they trusted that the self-governing colonies would realise to the full the immense difficulties that must be brought upon the Empire by a policy of cruel exclusion against the 300,000,000 of Asiatics who formed an integral part of the Empire, they must agree to the demand that those colonies might exclude whom they pleased. They admitted that if a self-governing colony decided that they must exclude a certain class of persons, the Home Government could not interfere. Why was there anything contrary to the best doctrines in that assumption? He would ask those who considered it a cruel doctrine to reflect on the words of Herbert Spencer. Herbert Spencer said—

> "I am entirely in favour of the policy of excluding Asiatics from America or restricting them within the narrowest limits, and for this reason—if they come in large numbers either they will mix with the population or they will not. In the latter event they will ultimately become, if not slaves, practically in the position of slaves. If they do mix they will form a bad hybrid. In either event difficulties must arise, and in the long run immense social disorganisation."

Though the Government had no wish or intention of interfering with our self-governing Colonies in regard to the policy of exclusion, certain principles could be laid down to which he thought the whole Empire would agree. If persons were admitted they must be given civil rights. "Free" or "not at all" seemed to him the sound principle for the British Empire. He would not trench on controversial ground. Some people might say that this raised the whole problem of Asiatic immigration into the Transvaal. He thought not, for those who were in favour of that course always stated that it was a temporary expedient to overcome an emergency caused by the war. If a people were admitted at all, there should be a common standard of liberty and all should be potential citizens. There was the other plan of making the best of both worlds —admitting people and then sending them back after using their labour, but nobody agreed with that. He therefore thought that they must agree to the principle that if anybody was admitted under the British flag, he must be admitted as a potential citizen. The third principle they might lay down was that those who were already there must be treated well, fairly, and generously. He had before him two great Blue-books dealing with the situation of the Indians in the Transvaal. He did not pretend that the Government viewed without concern what might happen to those Indians if the policy of exclusion was carried to the length of the dismissal of those who were there. It was a strong thing to ask that any subject of the King should be deprived of his living through no fault of his own. It was undesirable to make a mystery of a matter, but he might say that on this matter negotiations were proceeding and telegrams passing probably even as he spoke, so that he could not make a statement on that portion of it, but he thought they might agree that if the self-governing Colonies asked that they might exclude the fellow-subjects of the King because certain reasons made it imperative that wages should not be cut down, because the climatic conditions would make them unhappy, or because racial antipathy might cause riots, at least we might say that they should treat with the utmost generosity those subjects of the King who were there already. From that Report it would be seen that in Canada they had met us in a friendly spirit, and he could only say that in all the conversations which took place there was one note only, and that was that Canada was determined to make things as easy as possible for the home country in dealing with that difficult problem. The Government had confidence that the Governments of Australia, Natal, the Transvaal, the Cape, and New Zealand would show the same spirit as Canada had shown, realising that ours was a great heritage, and that it could only be held together by mutual forbearance on all sides. His hon. friend had suggested that we might bring this mutual forbearance a little nearer and make it a little more real if we were to ask what he called the Conference Secretariat, which, he thought, was a better name than the Imperial Secretariat, to take up this matter. He thought it was necessary for us to make the Imperial Secretariat a reality, to make it, as it were, the great clearing-house for the Empire, where all the different laws might come and be considered and reported upon to the other Colonies by the Secretariat, so that it might be possible for every part of the Empire to know what the other parts were doing. He thought that should be done, and he would represent to the Secretary of State the desirability of doing it. He could only say in conclusion that if this matter was difficult, he did not think it was unsolvable or that there was anything to prevent, before very long, complete co-operation.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said that they must have listened to the speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman with great interest and pleasure, because the Under-Secretary had recognised the principle which, if this Empire was to hold together, must be maintained by the central Government here in London as well as by the Colonies themselves, and that was that the Colonies must have the fullest of control over their own immigration. He wanted to draw a distinction between the native question, the coloured labour question, as found in the native races resident in, say, South Africa, and those who came from different parts of the Empire. As the Under-Secretary very aptly said, when there came a question of lascars or the employment of Chinese on British ships running from here to the Southern Seas, there were protests in that House from all parts. We were extremely jealous not only of our standard of labour but of the standard of wages and of any invasion of the native rights in labour of the citizens of this country. The Under-Secretary had said there were three reasons why the Canadians objected to Indian immigration, but there was something deeper than either of those three things. It was a credit to the thought and the feeling of patriotism of the race. They did not want to incorporate into their country the effects of the old plantation life, which meant simply that the white man would not himself do the lowest forms of work so long as the black man did it. The real reason why the Australians and the Canadians objected to Asiatic immigration was this—the fear that it would produce the effects produced in the Southern States, the West Indies, and everywhere where Polynesian and Oriental labour had been introduced. Unless the structure of their national life was built up from the lowest forms of labour performed by the white man from the beginning, they knew that that national life must be rotten in the end. If they were to have a national life at all the white citizen should do all the work, from the digging of the ditches and the trenches to the highest, or else the civilisation would be unsound. That lay behind the action of Australia and Canada. The Under-Secretary smiled, no doubt thinking of South Africa, because of course it might seem strange that he should make that statement, but his position regarding the importation of Oriental labour into South Africa had always been that it was only to tide over a very difficult time of reconstruction of finance and commerce there. He had felt that it was a bad thing for South Africa to-day to be obliged to import coloured labour from outside. It complicated her own great native question if she imported 45 per cent. to 48 per cent. He sympathised deeply with the position taken up by the Under-Secretary, and he believed that what he had said that day would have its echo in every corner of the Empire, because he had recognised the constitutional position and the national position which our Colonies had taken up. If the Government had pursued the same policy regarding immigration in the New Hebrides a different result would have followed. He commended the Government on taking the view of appealing to the Colonies for mutual counsel, and asking that they should send representatives to confer with the Imperial Government. That was the real basis of a true Imperial Parliament, and from just such interchange would come the great solution of our Imperial questions. If this Government and future Governments and other Colonies did what Canada had done, we were on the highway to placing our Colonial policy on the ground where we had placed our foreign policy, where private Members would hesitate to intrude, and would trust the Government of the day, believing that its policy was continuous.

*Mr. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury) asked if the Under-Secretary was in a position to make any statement with regard to the Imperial Government's paying the salary of Dinizulu, whether he had been committed for trial, and on what charge he would be tried. He put those questions because Dinizulu was a British subject for whom the Imperial Government had incurred special obligations, and Dinizulu had the right to have them fulfilled, even although self-government had been granted to the white people in Natal.

Colonel SEELY said he would read a telegram which had just arrived, and which, concluding as it did an unfortunate misunderstanding between the Government of this country and Natal, he would very much like to give. The telegram began—

> "Ministers have asked me to communicate the following minute: 'With reference to the concluding portion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies' telegram No. 2 of the 23rd inst., Ministers have this morning been advised by your Excellency that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to make payment to-morrow on account of Dinizulu's salary. Ministers understand from Secretary of State for the Colonies' telegram referred to that His Majesty's Government has been influenced in respect of payment of Dinizulu's salary by belief that his defence will be prejudiced by lack of funds. Ministers are equally anxious with His Majesty's Government to avoid such a contingency, and whilst maintaining that their contention is correct on question of suspension of salary they are prepared, if approached by Dinizulu, to provide sum of money to assist him in his defence.'"

He need hardly say that his noble friend proposed to telegraph back saying that he welcomed that telegram, and that he assumed that the sum they proposed to pay would be at least equal to the salary which we should have paid, the important thing being that money should be forthcoming for the defence of this native chief. The actual merits of the case remained as before, but they were a subject for friendly discussion later on. For the moment they were paying the money for the defence of Dinizulu, and the Government welcomed this conclusion to an unfortunate difficulty and trusted that no such difficulty would occur again. He regretted he had not got the other information asked for, but as soon as it came he would have it communicated to the Press.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he wished to ask the Government to define the position they held in regard to the hop industry. At the beginning of the session the Prime Minister, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, promised to receive a deputation on the subject, and in reply to a speech which he made in connection with the Address to the Crown he suggested an inquiry instead of receiving a deputation. The inquiry was held, it had take the whole session to conduct that inquiry, and now they had the Committee's Report before them. Therefore he thought he had some claim to ask the Government to proceed in the autumn session with the legislation indicated in the conclusions arrived at by the inquiry, for if they had not had the inquiry they could have had the matter dealt with this session. He would like to refer to a speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer a few days ago, in which he seemed to have been led rather far by the conclusions which the Hop Commitee had arrived at. He personally very much regretted the decision of the Government to take no steps to deal with what he believed was the real root of the difficulty, viz., the competition from America. He did not think the Committee really dealt with that point, and the Government who had thought it necessary to support a Committee in reference to the Meat Trust might well have given more attention to the question of whether there was not a Hop Trust also trying to destroy this native industry in our midst. The right hon. Gentleman, in his speech the other day, seemed to have been influenced by the fact that there were 3,000,000 less barrels of beer drunk now than before, and that therefore there must be less hops used, but the whole argument of the hop growers was that the special difficulties under which they were suffering had arisen within very recent years, in the last two or three years. The statistics in the Report showed that in the last three years there had been no diminution at all in the number of barrels consumed, the figures being 34,400,000, 34,000,000, and 34,300,000, The right hon. Gentleman had also laid stress on the fact that much less hops were used in each barrel of beer, but in the last three years that had remained practically the same, viz., 1·83 lb., 1·86 lb., and 1·85 lb., and there fore those arguments did not apply to the present condition of things, which was what the growers complained of. If they turned to the question of the relative supply of home hops to the foreign production, they would see that during the last three years the percentage of home production to the total supply had really got to the smallest figure except that of 1905, when there was a crop far in excess even of the total consumption. The figures for the last three years were 55·96 per cent., 52·59 per cent., and this year it had fallen very much below that figure, and yet the Committee suggested that 70 per cent. in their opinion was the actual relation which they might depend upon of home-grown to foreign hops. Therefore, all these statistics, if dealt with for the period to which the growers desired to call the attention of the Government, showed that the points on which the right hon. Gentleman relied, trusting to the Report, did not really apply to the present condition of things. The hop growers were most urgently asking the Government to find some remedy, and if they could not go so far as to carry out some remedy which would really deal with the question they must content themselves with something less. On the only occasion when the question of a duty was brought to a division before the Committee, only four of the eleven members of the Committee voted against the duty; three voted for it, and there were three absent, and those three who were absent were the hon. Member for Rye, who had already proposed a duty in his own Report, the hon. Member for Faversham, who, although intimately connected with the hop-growing district, did not attend the meetings in connection with the Report at all, and the hon. Member for Falmouth, who made a strong speech in favour of dealing with foreign competition in introducing a deputation to the right hon. Gentleman the other day; therefore every member absent was more or less in favour of dealing with this question. He could see that the Government were in a difficulty in dealing with the question. It was difficult to separate it from the general question of tariff reform. He had always urged that it should be dealt with separately, as a matter of dumping and unfair competition, but it was extremely difficult for the Government to deal with it, and he was not surprised that they were not willing to deal with it in that way ; and if that was so, he thought they had some right to ask the Government to promise them that in the autumn they should have legislation dealing with two other main points of the Report. He was grateful for the right hon. Gentleman's sympathetic words the other day in answer to a deputation, and his object in raising the question now was to raise the hopes of the growers with the belief that they would have some relief for their difficulties in the autumn. On the question of hop substitutes, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would confirm the Answer he gave to a Question the other day and make it clear that the Government intended legislating seriously, and not merely to bring in a Bill which, if there was any opposition, would be dropped. He believed that in the main there would be no controversy raised on that subject. He knew the hon. Gentleman below him, who was connected with the brewery trade, might say there were some preservatives which had nothing to do with hops, but what they desired was that all substitutes or supplements which took the place of hops should be barred, for in the opinion of the Committee their use should be prohibited. In regard to the question of marking, he hoped the Government would assure them that that question also would be dealt with during the autumn session in the same Bill. As marking had always been a peculiar characteristic of the hop trade, there could be no very strong arguments for alleging that the foreign hops should be free from that which applied so strongly to the home production. They had been told that the American trade was now depressed, but when they remembered that the trade in Oregon increased from 304 acres in 1800 to 3,000 acres in 1890, and to 15,000 in 1900, they could see that the increase had been so enormous that the depression now in no way dealt with the difficulties they were contending against. They must remember that neither substitutes nor marking would satisfactorily deal with Oregon hops, and it still lay with the Government to find some measure for relieving the industry in that respect. He would like to ask the hon. Gentleman representing the Board of Agriculture whether he could give him an assurance that further information should be obtained for them, that in the foreign countries they should have agriculture experts who would give them the information the growers required, and that in the internal arrangements of the Board of Agriculture itself more attention would be paid to giving information as to the best qualities of hops and other details, such as were recommended by the Committee in the last paragraph of the Report. Something might be done administratively, and he thought more could be done legislatively, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would calm the minds of the hop growers throughout the country by enabling him to assure them that the Government appreciated their case, and that in the autumn session some legislation of a remedial character would be given them.

Mr. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester) said the hon. Member for Ashford had pointed out that he had put a question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day asking him whether he could see his way to introducing a measure prohibiting the use of hop substitutes in the manufacture of beer in the United Kingdom, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his reply had declared himself to be highly favourable to the introduction of a Bill in the autumn on some such lines as that, if he could be sure that it would not be received in an antagonistic spirit by any considerable section of the House, and would meet with general support. He did not know what knowledge the hon. Member for Ashford might have, but he himself was inclined to believe that a proposition of that kind, if presented to the House in a certain form, might well meet with very strong and warm support. The other claims which were made were, he thought, wholly untenable. They could not possibly ask that this one industry should have preferential treatment by the imposition of a duty on foreign competitive supplies coming to this country. Every other industry, that of the barley grower, for instance, would want similar treatment, and the whole vicious programme would be opened up. There was no earthly reason why their friends in Kent, hard as their case might be, should come before that House and demand to be specially treated. He was not so much concerned about marking, but he was afraid that a mistake was being made by its Kentish advocates, for they had proof that this marking was in many cases an advertisement for the foreign growers. He would point out to the hon. Member for Ashford that the trouble complained of all over the two counties to which the hon. Gentleman referred was one of which we had not the sole enjoyment in this country. The Hop Report told them that this terrible business of grubbing, which sounded so awful in the ears of agriculturists, was not unknown in Oregon or Washington. In this voluminous Report he had not been able to put his finger on the exact figures, but he thought he was correct in saying that no less than 30 per cent. of the hop area of Oregon had been grubbed up within a recent period because they, like ourselves, were finding that the world's markets were for some reason or other not so eager to purchase their products as they had been. That had happened constantly; and if there was a depression in one great market, in all probability that depression would be felt in other countries and amongst other people. It was apparently so in this case, and in the Colonies those who grew hops were making complaint among their own people. As they had got the sympathetic ear of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he would like him to deal not only with hop substitutes but with substitutes for malt extracts. He did not propose that they should go on the lines of a pure beer Bill, but he had been told, in reply to a Question, that the right hon. Gentleman did not think that the matter of substitutes for malt extracts was on the same footing as substitutes for hops. How the Chancellor of the Exchequer arrived at that conclusion he did not know, but he was bound to say that he thought the right hon. Gentleman had some reason in his active mind which had not leaked out in the carefully considered printed Answer which he had given him the other day. If the right hon. Gentleman found it difficult to deal with the matter on the same lines as hop substitutes, might he suggest that the Bill, with regard to all hop substitutes, should take this form, namely, that as other articles, such as coffee and butter, were by law to be declared what they really were when they were mixed—the one with chicory, for example, and the other with some ingredient other than pure butter—so a man, when he bought a glass of beer, should have declared to him the composition of the liquor, where it consisted of substitutes, so that he might know when he was buying a product of the doctor's shop or of the laboratory, instead of a product of the fields of his own or other countries. It seemed to him that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might well go on with such a Bill; it would not in the least interfere with the principle of free trade; for if the chemist brewed a better beer—and he was glad to see one of the great experts present—than the brewer placed on the market, at any rate he was sure that the farmers and agriculturists of the country generally, and of Kent and other counties, would be only too glad to welcome the placing of this particular product on the market under conditions not less severe than those to which many other traders had to submit in reference to other products.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) said he so far agreed with the hon. Member's case in regard to hop substitutes that he believed he could brew better beer from malt and hops only than from any combination of substitutes. He did not know whether that was the view of other brewers, and he did not think he ought to pursue the subject without consulting them. As regarded the question of hops, he found himself in entire agreement with the views of the hon. Member who opened the debate. The hon. Member very properly brought before the House the very urgent condition of the hop industry. That was abundantly proved before the Select Committee by all the witnesses who represented the hop industry, whether as growers, importers or factors. There was no doubt that during the last two or three years the hop trade generally had been through a period of exceptional stress and difficulty, and he believed they had a very urgent case indeed for consideration. He was sure the Chancellor of the Exchequer, from what he had said to deputations, would not take that step which they considered to be the only step which would really be effective in placing the English hop industry upon a sounder and more stable footing. Every grower and merchant, with very few exceptions, had urged on the Committee that the only remedy was a duty upon foreign imported hops. An import duty would undoubtedly place the English grower on a sounder and more stable footing in competition with hops which were grown abroad and imported into this country. It appeared to him that one of the main arguments in support of this view was the fact that hops in many cases abroad were grown in climates which enjoyed a great proportion of sunshine and were more regular than the climate at home. When we had a bad season, which was unfortunately not very seldom, it was certain that there would be foreign hops of higher quality grown under more favourable conditions. That appeared to be the strongest argument, and if the English grower was to continue to grow hops, as they all desired that he should—every brewer wanted as many good English hops as he could get—the English grower must have some assurance of stability in prices in order that he might not make great losses, which undoubtedly had occurred in the last season. That, however, was not a practical question at present, as the Government firmly turned their faces against suggestions in that direction. He entirely supported the proposal for the prohibition of hop substitutes, but the hop-growers, in resolutions which they had recently passed, had gone a little further than that, and had expressed the opinion that preservatives, which were necessarily used also, took the place of hops. That view was put before the Committee, but the witnesses who advanced it were not able to maintain it. They failed to produce any evidence to support it, and the expert witnesses expressed an opinion exactly contrary to theirs. This was a very much larger and wider question than the House realised. Preservatives were used in nearly every liquor sold in the country, and in jams and preserved fruits. With regard to the marking of hops, he had not much expectation that it would afford any substantial relief. It had been rightly said by the hon. Member for Cirencester that it might very easily become a two-edged sword, and it would undoubtedly in some cases give greater prestige and a greater guarantee of the market quality of foreign hops. But it would tend to put an end to the system which they had evidence existed in some cases of the mixing of foreign hops of an inferior kind with those of a rather better grade, and selling them as the growth of a particular district in this country. There was no evidence before the Committee, nor was it his experience, that this was a practice largely resorted to, but there was evidence that in some cases it did occur, and marking of hops would undoubtedly tend to do away with it. The marking of hops, however, was a rather more complicated question than might appear. Foreign countries had their own system of marking hops. For instance, those most in demand on the Continent and in America were grown in small allotments. No one grower had a sufficient number of hops to send to the market, and they were taken into a town and there marked with an official seal. That was not on all fours with the system which prevailed in this country. He was in entire agreement with the hop-growers that on the whole it was desirable that foreign hops should be marked as far as possible in the same way as was now required by law in this country, and on these lines he was perfectly prepared to support a measure. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take early steps to deal with this question. The Board of Agriculture could undoubtedly do a great deal. The hon. Member for Ashford had urged upon the consideration of the Board of Agriculture the question of collecting statistical information. Then there was the question of carrying on upon an organised scale the growing of hops. The cultivation of hops was a scientific industry which they had not been able to go into as thoroughly as they should have done. The Board of Agriculture ought to undertake experiments and organise investigations into the question of which were the best soils for growing hops in England. If they established agricultural research institutions they could have those experiments carried out by experts. He made that suggestion because he was convinced from his own experience that a great deal might be done by obtaining fuller information and having carefully worked out experiments on practical as well as scientific lines in regard to hop-growing in this country.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE pointed out that this question had been brought before him recently by a deputation who put their case to him ably, lucidly, and temperately, and who fully realised the limits beyond which the Government could not be expected to go in dealing with the difficulties of the hop industry. He thought he might say that on the whole they were satisfied with the undertaking the Government had given. The hon. Member who introduced this subject had challenged one or two statements he had made to that deputation, and he wished to say a few words in reply to his criticism. He pointed out to that deputation that, as a result of a careful investigation made by a Committee of the House which had been inquiring into the matter, so far from there being an increase in the importation of foreign hops, there had been a considerable decrease in the last few years, and, therefore, the difficulty did not arise from the importation of foreign hops. The figures of the importation of foreign hops showed a very considerable decline in the importation——

MR. LAURENCE HARDY said he did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman had before him the figures circulated in answer to a Question put to him in May last, because those figures showed that there had been an increase.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if the hon. Member had taken a range of thirty years for his survey he would have found that the great evil was not in the increased importation of hops from foreign countries, which had, in fact, decreased and was a diminishing evil if it was an evil at all. The hon. Member said they should look at the figures for the last three years, but surely that was not sufficient. They were bound to have fluctuations in the market, and they might have a very good year in hops in one particular year followed by a bad year. The hop industry was bound to import more foreign hops in a bad year than when the hop industry in this country was in a flourishing state. Consequently a great deal depended upon fluctuations, and it was a fairer test to take twenty or thirty years, and taking a period of that kind showed a very considerable decline in the importation of foreign hops. Thirty years ago the average importation of hops into this country was 215,000 cwts., but the average for the last ten years was only 186,000 cwts., showing a decrease of nearly 30,000 cwts. Consequently if the hop industry was suffering it was not due to any increase in the importation of foreign hops. He pointed out to the deputation that it had been clearly established that the present condition of the industry was due to the fact that there had been a smaller consumption of beer, amounting to 3,000,000 barrels in the course of the last seven years.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY: Not in the last three years.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was not the last three years that established the drift of any trade. They had to take a much wider view. The hon. Member had taken too narrow a view of beer, and he ought to look at it from a broader point of view. The difficulty was mainly due to a smaller consumption of beer. The hon.

Member should approach the subject from a freer and broader point of view. If they rushed into legislation on this subject they might make a mistake. The hon. Member was not conservative enough to his mind. He did not like the revolutionary tendency of the hon. Member. He was much too violent and extreme a man to his way of thinking. The hon. Member asked for sweeping legislation because in three years there had been changes in the trade. The changes were due to several causes. There had been a reduction in the production of beer to the extent of 3,000,000 barrels in the course of seven years. That was due to a change in the habits of the people, a change not to be deplored, and, if less beer was required, there must be less use of hops. Then again less hops had in recent years been used in brewing. But the people could not be compelled to drink more beer or brewers to use more hops. There was another factor which the hon. Member had ignored, the use of cold storage. In the old days when there was a good hop season all that were required by the brewers were used and the remainder destroyed, but now when there was a good season the brewer bought large quantities because the price was low, and he could lay up what he did not then require in cold stores and had a reserve upon which he could draw. This cold-storage system the hon. Member did not approve of; probably he would like to go back to the old days when these fantastic ideas were unknown. But he could not do it; these were progressive days, and we must adapt ourselves to them. It might be a comfort to our own producers to know that, if they suffered, foreign competitors suffered also. In Oregon things were so bad that it was resolved to grub up 30 per cent. of the hop plantations. The American cultivator was ready to do this, and he, finding one cultivation was not remunerative, used his land for another; he did not ask for the artificial manure of legislation. Of 16,000 acres under hops in Oregon 5,000 were converted to something else in a single year; and out of 5,000 in Washington, 2,000 had been converted to something else in a single year. That was due to the smartness of the American farmer. He would point out incidentally that hop land paid about £3 per acre, whereas the same land used for another purpose would only pay 30s. per acre. While in Kent the acreage of land under hops had decreased, in Worcestershire and Herefordshire the land under hops had increased in the last thirty years. Worcestershire and Herefordshire were formidable competitors of Kent for the time being, but the hon. Member for Kent did not want a 50s. duty on hops from the West of England. The hon. Member had made something out of the fact that the duty suggested in the Committee was only thrown out by a majority of one. There were three absentees, and he tried to suggest that they would have voted for a duty. The hon. Member for Rye would have voted in favour of a duty. It was not correct, however, to say that his hon. friend who introduced the deputation to him was in favour of a duty, for he had distinctly stated that he was against it. The hon. Member for Faversham went into the Committee with a predilection in favour of a duty on hops—a predilection to which no doubt he was assisted by representations made to him—and after listening to the overwhelming evidence against it he found it was absolutely impossible to support that proposition. He had already written to the papers to say that he approved thoroughly of the recommendations of the Committee. Now he came to the position in which the Government stood in the matter. The Committee had reported against hop substitutes. He was quite prepared to act on that recommendation. The hon. Member for Rutland himself acknowledged that deleterious substitutes were used in certain cases.

Mr. GRETTON: In one case.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Very well; they did not want a matter of that sort to be imported when it had the incidental effect of being detrimental and injurious to a British industry. The Government were, therefore, prepared to act upon the recommendation of the Committee in that respect, and that the same obligation of marking hops should be imposed on the foreigner as was imposed by law on the British hop-grower. That was not at all inconsistent with the principles of free trade. At the same time his experience at the Board of Trade was that on the whole the British trader suffered who insisted on the marking of foreign goods. In many cases it had been merely an advertisement for the foreign goods.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): That is not the case when the marking is in general terms.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the suggestion was to mark the foreign hops absolutely with the producer's name, and the advertisement would be still greater in that case. He would seriously invite the hop-growers of Kent to reconsider the matter and see whether they would really benefit by it. They knew their own business best; and it was a business matter after all. It could not be an injustice if they were deliberately of opinion, after careful reflection, that it would be an advantage to their industry to impose the same obligation on the foreigner as on the British producer. He now came to the question as to whether the Government proposed to deal with the subject effectively. The other day in answer to a Question he stated that they certainly proposed to give effect to the unanimous recommendations of the Committee, but that that depended upon the opposition which the Bill would meet with. The hon. Member met his statement with the objection that if the passage of such a Bill was made conditional upon the absence of opposition they might get no Bill at all. He wanted to point out to the hon. Member that the Government could not devote much time in the autumn session to a Bill of this kind, although he did not see why the Bill should occupy much time. It was perfectly clear that the hop-growers were unanimous on the two points referred to, the Committee was unanimous, and the House was practically unanimous. He felt it was in the power of the Opposition to enable the Government to deal with this matter before the session was over, and with their assistance and approval he hoped to do so. He had already given instructions to have a Bill drafted. It would be necessary to bring in a general Revenue Bill, and whether the Bill he promised would be a separate Bill of two or three clauses, or would be incorporated in the Revenue Bill he had yet to consider, because he had to consult with his experts and with the authorities of the House. He had not wished to give merely a sympathetic answer to the hon. Member for Ashford, but a promise, and he meant to redeem that promise with the assistance of the Opposition.

*MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley) said he wished to draw attention to a matter of the utmost importance to the rural districts of the country, viz., the working of the Small Holdings Act. The Act had aroused the greatest possible interest, and the highest possible hope in the rural districts. In the course of a few months 20,000 applications had been made for land, most of them perfectly substantial and sound. But they represented only a small part of the enormous number of people who were waiting to see how the Act worked before they put in applications. At present very little had been done except to inquire into the applications. The amount of land which had been actually granted was very insignificant, and the amount of land proposed to be dealt with under all the schemes that had been submitted came to a very small fraction of the total demand. He was not prepared to say that the delay could not be justified. He believed there were a great many reasons for it. He knew that the county council of Oxfordshire were doing a great deal of work under the Act, and that there was much to be said for the present policy of the Commissioners in not bringing pressure to bear on the county councils too soon because, obviously, they must wait and see how the Act was going to work before the Commissioners stepped in. But if the delay was justifiable it made the argument all the stronger for saying that they must make quite sure that sooner or later the Act was going to succeed. What he wanted to know was whether the Small Holdings Commissioners at the present time were really

Member should approach the subject from a freer and broader point of view. If they rushed into legislation on this subject they might make a mistake. The hon. Member was not conservative enough to his mind. He did not like the revolutionary tendency of the hon. Member. He was much too violent and extreme a man to his way of thinking. The hon. Member asked for sweeping legislation because in three years there had been changes in the trade. The changes were due to several causes. There had been a reduction in the production of beer to the extent of 3,000,000 barrels in the course of seven years. That was due to a change in the habits of the people, a change not to be deplored, and, if less beer was required, there must be less use of hops. Then again less hops had in recent years been used in brewing. But the people could not be compelled to drink more beer or brewers to use more hops. There was another factor which the hon. Member had ignored, the use of cold storage. In the old days when there was a good hop season all that were required by the brewers were used and the remainder destroyed, but now when there was a good season the brewer bought large quantities because the price was low, and he could lay up what he did not then require in cold stores and had a reserve upon which he could draw. This cold-storage system the hon. Member did not approve of; probably he would like to go back to the old days when these fantastic ideas were unknown. But he could not do it; these were progressive days, and we must adapt ourselves to them. It might be a comfort to our own producers to know that, if they suffered, foreign competitors suffered also. In Oregon things were so bad that it was resolved to grub up 30 per cent. of the hop plantations. The American cultivator was ready to do this, and he, finding one cultivation was not remunerative, used his land for another; he did not ask for the artificial manure of legislation. Of 16,000 acres under hops in Oregon 5,000 were converted to something else in a single year; and out of 5,000 in Washington, 2,000 had been converted to something else in a single year. That was due to the smartness of the American farmer. He would point out incidentally that hop land paid about £3 per acre, whereas the same land used for another purpose would only pay 30s. per acre. While in Kent the acreage of land under hops had decreased, in Worcestershire and Herefordshire the land under hops had increased in the last thirty years. Worcestershire and Herefordshire were formidable competitors of Kent for the time being, but the hon. Member for Kent did not want a 50s. duty on hops from the West of England. The hon. Member had made something out of the fact that the duty suggested in the Committee was only thrown out by a majority of one. There were three absentees, and he tried to suggest that they would have voted for a duty. The hon. Member for Rye would have voted in favour of a duty. It was not correct, however, to say that his hon. friend who introduced the deputation to him was in favour of a duty, for he had distinctly stated that he was against it. The hon. Member for Faversham went into the Committee with a predilection in favour of a duty on hops—a predilection to which no doubt he was assisted by representations made to him—and after listening to the overwhelming evidence against it he found it was absolutely impossible to support that proposition. He had already written to the papers to say that he approved thoroughly of the recommendations of the Committee. Now he came to the position in which the Government stood in the matter. The Committee had reported against hop substitutes. He was quite prepared to act on that recommendation. The hon. Member for Rutland himself acknowledged that deleterious substitutes were used in certain cases.

MR. GRETTON: In one case.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Very well; they did not want a matter of that sort to be imported when it had the incidental effect of being detrimental and injurious to a British industry. The Government were, therefore, prepared to act upon the recommendation of the Committee in that respect, and that the same obligation of marking hops should be imposed on the foreigner as was imposed by law on the British hop-grower. That was not at all inconsistent with the principles of free trade. At the same time his experience at the Board of Trade was that on the whole the British trader suffered who insisted on the marking of foreign goods. In many cases it had been merely an advertisement for the foreign goods.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): That is not the case when the marking is in general terms.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the suggestion was to mark the foreign hops absolutely with the producer's name, and the advertisement would be still greater in that case. He would seriously invite the hop-growers of Kent to reconsider the matter and see whether they would really benefit by it. They knew their own business best; and it was a business matter after all. It could not be an injustice if they were deliberately of opinion, after careful reflection, that it would be an advantage to their industry to impose the same obligation on the foreigner as on the British producer. He now came to the question as to whether the Government proposed to deal with the subject effectively. The other day in answer to a Question he stated that they certainly proposed to give effect to the unanimous recommendations of the Committee, but that that depended upon the opposition which the Bill would meet with. The hon. Member met his statement with the objection that if the passage of such a Bill was made conditional upon the absence of opposition they might get no Bill at all. He wanted to point out to the hon. Member that the Government could not devote much time in the autumn session to a Bill of this kind, although he did not see why the Bill should occupy much time. It was perfectly clear that the hop-growers were unanimous on the two points referred to, the Committee was unanimous, and the House was practically unanimous. He felt it was in the power of the Opposition to enable the Government to deal with this matter before the session was over, and with their assistance and approval he hoped to do so. He had already given instructions to have a Bill drafted. It would be necessary to bring in a general Revenue Bill, and whether the Bill he promised would be a separate Bill of two or three clauses, or would be incorporated in the Revenue Bill he had yet to consider, because he had to consult with his experts and with the authorities of the House. He had not wished to give merely a sympathetic answer to the hon. Member for Ashford, but a promise, and he meant to redeem that promise with the assistance of the Opposition.

*MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley) said he wished to draw attention to a matter of the utmost importance to the rural districts of the country, viz., the working of the Small Holdings Act. The Act had aroused the greatest possible interest, and the highest possible hope in the rural districts. In the course of a few months 20,000 applications had been made for land, most of them perfectly substantial and sound. But they represented only a small part of the enormous number of people who were waiting to see how the Act worked before they put in applications. At present very little had been done except to inquire into the applications. The amount of land which had been actually granted was very insignificant, and the amount of land proposed to be dealt with under all the schemes that had been submitted came to a very small fraction of the total demand. He was not prepared to say that the delay could not be justified. He believed there were a great many reasons for it. He knew that the county council of Oxfordshire were doing a great deal of work under the Act, and that there was much to be said for the present policy of the Commissioners in not bringing pressure to bear on the county councils too soon because, obviously, they must wait and see how the Act was going to work before the Commissioners stepped in. But if the delay was justifiable it made the argument all the stronger for saying that they must make quite sure that sooner or later the Act was going to succeed. What he wanted to know was whether the Small Holdings Commissioners at the present time were really doing all that was necessary to guarantee success. Were they carrying out their present duties in such a way as to ensure that every suitable applicant would be able to get the land which he required? He did not mean the actual piece of land that a man asked for, but whether the Commissioners were carrying out their duties in such a way as to ensure that a man would get the amount of land he required. He thought not, and he would give his reasons for so thinking. Under Clause 2 of this Act the Commissioners were required to ascertain for themselves the extent of the demand and the means by which that demand could be reasonably satisfied. That was the substance of the second section of the Act. If it had any meaning at all it meant that the Commissioners ought to know not merely the sum total of the applications, but the amount of land required by, and the name of each applicant. At the present time it was true to say that out of the 20,000 applications that had been sent in the Board of Agriculture had no detailed knowledge of more than 2,000; that so far as the remainder were concerned they had only the information supplied by the various county councils that 18,000 applications had been received. He did not think that with regard to any of the whole 20,000 applications they could at the moment say what was the name of each applicant, the amount of land he required, or the date of his application. They certainly could not say so with regard to 18,000 of them, and yet that information ought to be in the possession of the Board of Agriculture, because until they had got a proper record of the applications it was impossible to tell what was the extent of the demand. They had been told that the county councils had this information and that they were always able and willing to give the information to the Board of Agriculture, if it was applied for. That might be so, but there was no real guarantee whatever that the county councils had got the information in the right form. He did not know whether the county councils preserved particulars of all the applications they received, including applications rejected by them, and the reasons for such rejections. He thought the Board of Agriculture would be in a far stronger position if they had in their own possession the actual record of the demand made. The Committee were told that that would entail a great amount of work and much duplication. Surely more Commissioners ought if necessary to be appointed to see that the Act was properly carried out. If there was a proper register of all the applications the delay at present occurring would not greatly matter, because they could say to each applicant: "Although there is at present a difficulty in getting the land you want, sooner or later it will be provided. Your application is on the books of the Board of Agriculture, and if your claim is good you will get the land." That in itself would do good, because many of these applicants had not much faith in county councils, and if they knew that their application was recorded in the books of the Board of Agriculture they would be more inclined to hold on. It would also be a check upon the county councils. After all, sooner or later, the Commissioners would have to take action. There would be many cases with which the county council would not be able to grapple. Therefore he wanted to see the Commissioners prepare the ground now so that there would be a proper Court of Appeal, and he did not think they could do that unless they started with a proper register. Then with regard to experimental holdings. Under Clause 16 the Commissioners had power to acquire land, divide it up into small holdings and demonstrate the fact that small holdings could be a success. Under Clause 39 they were empowered to initiate schemes of co-operation for the small holdings they had established in this way. It was a remarkable fact that nothing had been done to put those clauses into operation. The argument was that it was unnecessary to demonstrate the feasibility of the matter, but it was never superfluous to show any successful experiment, and if they could get colonies of small holdings established by the Board of Agriculture with a really good system of co-operation, with good credit banks under the direct supervision of the Board, so far from that being a discouragement to the county councils it would form a most instructive and valuable inducement to them to put the Act more fully into operation than they did at present. It was idle to argue that because experimental holdings were started in a county there would be difficulty in enforcing the other provisions of the Small Holdings Act. It seemed to him that it would put the Board of Agriculture in a much better position for saying to the county councils: "We require you to carry out schemes, and to start small holdings," if they themselves had shown the way. It was of the utmost importance that the Board of Agriculture should reconsider their policy on those two points if they really wished to make the Act a success.

*MR. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton) said that no one who had listened to the debate could have failed to realise the importance of the subject to those who lived in agricultural districts, and the great misgivings they had on the subject, and all those interested in the Small Holdings Act ought to be grateful to his hon. friend who had played so large a part in directing Parliamentary attention to the working of the Act. He himself represented a part of a county where the Act was working, he thought, remarkably well. Ten thousand acres of land had been applied for. A large number of local inquiries had been held by a small committee, and even with the most energetic application of the provisions of the Act, there must inevitably be a very great delay in the working of it. In scattered districts the applications required a large amount of time and travelling, and a scheme had then to be put forward, and the committee had to get the county council to consent to put forward a scheme. Therefore, he did not feel despondent about Cambridgeshire, where three farms had already been bought, and where the county council was putting itself with great determination to satisfy the demands, although it realised that if the existing demand was to be satisfied before Michaelmas, 1910, it would be necessary to acquire land at the rate of 500 acres per month. He could not speak too highly of the patriotism of the committee which had set an example to the whole country. The demand for small holdings was necessarily greatest where experiments showed that small holdings were a success, and the problem which the county council had to face was the application for nearly all the land in a parish where it was already farmed by small holders from whom they could not even if they would take land. He wished there had been a provision adequately to compensate sitting tenants, but that was "*chose jugee*." It showed that the way to get a demand for small holdings was to prove in particular parishes how well they worked, and it also showed the great need for not hesitating any longer to put into force those portions of the Act which entitled the Board of Agriculture to start experimental small holdings. As regards other counties he would remind the representative of the Board that one great obstacle in the way of the successful working of the Act was the timidity on the part of those for whom the Act was designed. The Board should make it obvious to possible applicants that even if they feared to make application to the county council, at any rate to the Board of Agriculture they might fearlessly make their applications and be greeted sympathetically. He would give an experience of his own with regard to a scheme for small holdings before the Act came into force. Certain of his friends desired to start a scheme. Public meetings were held, and applicants were asked to stay behind and give in their names if they would take small holdings, but no applicant ever stayed behind. A canvass from door to door of possible applicants was undertaken, by people interested in the scheme, but no applications were received. It looked almost hopeless to start small holdings in that neighbourhood, but when, in enthusiasm, the gentlemen interested took the land and got it ready, in a very few weeks there were more applications for small holdings than could possibly be satisfied, and the explanation was that no man was going to mark himself as being discontented with his lot until the land he was going to till was there under his eyes. His object in quoting that was that these were exceptional cases. It was the case that there was distrust of small holdings in some districts, particularly where the people had not been shown their feasibility or utility. But everybody must acknowledge that in some districts there were great objections to small holdings. Many men dwelling in the country did not want to see them, and many speeches were made against them, and a large amount of the delay in the working of the Act was caused by the objection to the establishment of small holdings, and on the other hand, by fear on the part of possible applicants that a desire for small holdings might militate against them. Under those circumstances he would implore the Board of Agriculture to go out of its way to advertise throughout the country its earnest desire, which all knew the President of the Board of Agriculture had, to ensure the good working of this Act, and to demonstrate to the people who were going to apply for small holdings the best methods of cultivating the land. He further thanked the Government for consenting to pay half the expenses incurred, in inquiries, but hoped they would eventually pay the whole cost, for the rates must be carefully safeguarded if the Act was to be a success.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.) said he could assure the hon. Members for Henley and Cambridge that their fears were really groundless. If they had been able to make inquiries, as the Board of Agriculture had been making and were continuing to make into the working of the Act by the various county councils, they would be quite satisfied that in the great majority of cases the county councils were doing their very utmost to put the Act into force, and that they had done an immense amount of work and almost as much as could be expected of them in the short time which had been at their disposal since the passing of the Act. Reference had been made by his hon. friend to the number of applications. Some 19,000 applications had been received for somewhat over 300,000 acres of land. When the Report asked for by his hon. friend was printed and circulated, his hon. friend would know a great deal more of the details, and it would, he believed, make it clear that the Board had done very useful work. He regretted with his hon. friend that the Report was not in the hands of hon. Members at the present moment. But that was not any fault of the Board of Agriculture. They had brought up the Return to 30th June last, and the Report was now in the hands of the printers. It did not rest with the Board of Agriculture as to how soon it would be circulated, but with the Stationery Office, and he hoped there might be no great delay but that the Report would be shortly in the hands of hon. Members.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): Has there not been great delay in getting it from the printers?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said not more than usual. Like the two hon. Members who had just spoken, he was an enthusiast in the matter of small holdings; and, like them, not only did he represent a county division, but he also lived in the county he represented, and took a great interest in the working of local administration. Taking into consideration the short time the Act had been in force, and other considerations, he contended that the county councils had done their very utmost and there was no doubt they were most anxious to put the Act into force. It was only a question of giving the county councils time. It would be seen in the Report when published that 2,000 acres of land had been either bought or leased by county councils up to 30th June, but his hon. friends would be interested to know that since then a further 1,000 acres or more had been applied for under schemes. Sooner or later every applicant would be able to get land, provided he was suitable and qualified to take a small holding, having the necessary capital, and ready, perhaps at some inconvenience to himself, to move out of his particular district, and not insist that he must have land provided for him at his back door or even within a mile or two of his home. Every applicant had, of course, a right of appeal to the Board of Agriculture. There were numerous applicants who were dissatisfied and had appealed to the Board of Agriculture, and in every case the Board had investigated the case and seen that justice was done. There was a case the other day which showed that county councils were not always to blame. In the county of Dorset a very good farm consisting of 1,100 acres was offered. It was inspected by one of the inspectors of the Board of Agriculture, and held to be entirely suitable. The council were prepared to take the farm at £450 a year. There were a good farmhouse and buildings and a good water supply. When the county council offered it to the applicants there were twenty-two in number, but when the inquiry was held only one of the applicants was willing to take one of the small holdings of thirty or forty acres, the farm being considered too far away from the place where they lived. He also assured his hon. friend that the Commissioners were doing their duty admirably, and there was no reason to complain of the way they were carrying out the Act. They were, indeed, most anxious to see that the Act should be carried out. He had already informed his hon. friend in answer to a Question that the noble Lord the President of the Board of Agriculture did not think it was necessary to go to the expense and the trouble of having a separate register kept of every single applicant. His noble friend thought it was quite sufficient to leave the details in charge of the county council, who could get at any time the name and occupation of any man in the county. At the same time, his noble friend had reports giving a certain amount of details as to the applicants and their professions, but what, of course, the Board relied upon principally was that at any moment they could call upon the county council to give information as regarded not only the total number of applicants in any particular district, but any particular application. It was not necessary to appoint more Commissioners, because the county councils must carry out the obligations placed upon them in respect of the details of the Act. It was the essence of the Act that the county councils should carry out the whole of the details, reserving power to act to the President of the Board of Agriculture. He could assure the House that Lord Carrington would not be afraid to act if the county councils refused to carry out their duties; but at the present moment there was nothing to lead him to suppose that the county councils did not intend to carry out their duties or were not carrying them out at the present time. As regarded the question of putting Section 16 into force, there again it was perfectly clear to everyone that the President of the Board of Agriculture would be unable to put that section into force, because he would be only able to do so if the Board, after inquiry, thought it advisable to do so with a view to the establishment of small holdings in any county. But, up to the present, the President of the Board of Agriculture was quite satisfied, and did not think it necessary to put the section into force. With regard to what the hon. Member for Cambridgeshire had said in the matter of the Board setting up experimental farms showing the best means and modes of cultivation, he had great sympathy with the idea, not only as regarded small holdings but as regarded large holdings. It was, however, impossible for the Board to set up these experimental farms under the Act, and he could assure his hon. friend and the House generally that the Board, from the President down to the Commissioners, were doing everything in their power to facilitate the easy working of the Act and the acquisition of land by suitable applicants, and he was sure that if his hon. friends were only patient they would see in a very short time a very large number of men established in small holdings.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said he was sorry to intervene at that hour, especially when he knew that the thoughts of Ministers and Members were far from there; but the fault was not his. He intended on the Home Office Vote to raise one or two questions, but owing to the limited time given to that very important Department he was unable to raise the question, and because of that inability he was compelled to keep the Home Secretary there that afternoon. The first question he wished to raise was with reference to the Isle of Man. Some six months ago the right hon. Gentleman received a deputation from the island——

***MR. SPEAKER**: I am very doubtful if the Isle of Man is under the jurisdiction of the Home Secretary.

MR. SEDDON: I have here the report of the deputation to the right hon. Gentleman.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will develop his arguments.

Mr. SEDDON said he only wanted an assurance from the Home Secretary. The deputation, the right hon. Gentleman would remember, waited upon him in February of this year. According to the report, the Home Secretary's attitude was sympathetic throughout, and the right hon. Gentleman intimated that he was convinced of the desirability of reform. The deputation asked that a more democratic state of affairs should be brought about that would approximate more to the democratic character of the Isle of Man, and that the Governor should be appointed for a term of years and not for life. They also asked that the Legislative Chamber should be partly elected and partly nominated.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That would surely require legislation. That could not be done upon the *ipse dixit* of the Home Secretary, but must be done by a Bill.

Mr. SEDDON said he was extremely sorry, but it was quite evident that the deputation thought the Home Secretary had the power of giving them the relief they sought. However, he would not pursue the subject further, except to ask whether it was true that the Island Authority had sent a secret document on the subject to the Home Secretary, as was freely rumoured in the Island. All he wanted was a statement from the right hon. Gentleman that no such document had been received, and that when the question was treated it would be treated on its merits. He turned to the other question, which was of great importance. It was the question of dock regulations. Two years ago when a certain Bill was before the House certain gentlemen interested in the shipping trade used their influence and made representations to certain Members, including himself, to remove their opposition to the Light Dues Bill. On that Bill he put down a blocking Motion, so that the shipowners should meet the representatives of the dockers in friendly conference with reference to a Memorandum sent out in 1904. On that occasion one or two of the shipowners met one or two representatives of the dock workers, and a friendly arrangement was understood to exist that the former at some time in the immediate future would meet the dock workers in conference with reference to putting these regulations into operation. The regulations he referred to were issued in 1904, and three years grace was given. The three years had elapsed, and last January the regulations were supposed to come into operation. The particular regulations to which he desired to call the attention of the Home Secretary were those referring to the loading and unloading of ships. In Paragraph 6 of the Memorandum it was stated quite clearly what were the functions and duties of shipowners. It was stated that either ladders should be attached to the hatchways, where they should be vertical, or there should be handrails. His complaint was that these regulations were honoured in the breach. He was informed that two shipping firms in Liverpool had tried to carry out the regulations, but none of the others had. The dock inspector reported and reported, but nothing further was done, and now, instead of the other shipowners carrying out the regulations, they were using their influence to compel the two shipping companies who were using ladders to take them away, because the Home Office was not concerned in carrying out the regulations in the Memorandum. His complaint was that the inspectors were helpless and hopeless. They reported and reported, and that was the end of their operations. There was no hope of bringing about a change unless the inspectors were instructed to prosecute the shipowners for not carrying out the regulations. He held that any regulation or law that was not put into operation destroyed the moral influence of that House and the public respectively, and when he read in the paper such a statement as that made by a leading shipowner in the North of England, and not distantly removed from one of the members of the Cabinet—he referred to Sir Walter Runciman—he was not at all surprised that the shipowners had not carried out the regulations laid down by the Home Office. Sir Walter Runciman, speaking the other day, said that whenever the Government introduced legislation into commercial affairs they always made a mess of it. He had a list of various accidents which had occurred at the various docks in the country. He could give the right hon. Gentleman the names of ships that had been lying in the docks at Liverpool which had no means of access at all so far as the holds were concerned. He would give one only. The vessel was owned by the Dublin Steamship Company, and was named the "Kilkenny." Some time ago one of the dockers was engaged trimming coal. There was no means of access or egress. This man went down to trim coal which began to move. The man was in danger of being smothered, and one of the other dockers had to straddle across the hatchway and pull him up by a rope. His life was saved, but he was considerably bruised.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): Was that this year?

*MR. SEDDON thought it was last year, before the regulations came in force, but his complaint was that in the meantime no attempt had been made to secure greater safety for the dockers. He asked the right hon. Gentleman through his inspectors in Liverpool and other ports to get sufficient information to enable him to prosecute shipowners who were wilfully ignoring these regulations, which were in the interest of life and limb of those engaged in docking. If the right hon. Gentleman was unable to take that course, then let him call a conference of shipowners and dockers, or let him receive a deputation of dockers' representatives, and he would have such an unanswerable case presented that from humanitarian motives alone he would enforce the regulations and compel the shipowners to carry out their obligations in the interests of the dockers.

*MR. GLADSTONE said it was true that he received a deputation from the Isle of Man. He agreed generally with the case in favour of the reform of certain institutions and gave a generally sympathetic reply. If the matter had not proceeded further it was entirely on account of want of time. The constitution of the Isle of Man, which was interesting and historic, raised all sorts of difficult questions on a small scale, which were by no means easy to manage. He could not say to what extent legislation would be necessary to make any alteration, but it was his impression that certain changes in the constitution could be made without reference to Parliament. With regard to the specific question asked by the hon. Member, there was no foundation for the statement that any communication had been made to the Home Office. With regard to the question of docks he thought he could show his hon. friend that the case was not so bad. The regulations had in fact been enforced in a great many cases, but there were great difficulties. He did not gather that the hon. Member made any complaint with regard to shore work but limited his remarks to ships. He gave the case of the steamship "Kilkenny," but so much of the regulations affecting the vessel as require structural alterations only came into force in January this year. He could not say, therefore, whether or no there was any failure to enforce the regulations in that particular case.

MR. SEDDON: I only gave the case because the ship at the present time is in the same position.

*MR. GLADSTONE agreed there was difficulty with regard to regulations so far as ships were concerned, and especially in the case of foreign ships. There had been two prosecutions in Liverpool this year, and during April the services of two inspectors were wholly devoted to the question of enforcing the regulations. They had a letter from Mr. Sexton not long ago making certain allegations, and they asked him to supply them with particulars of the cases he had in mind, but no answer had yet been received from him. As soon as the particulars were received from him they would be closely examined. The superintending inspector for the division was ready to meet Mr. Sexton at an early date in Liverpool so that he might personally investigate the question of enforcing the regulations. He did not know that he could say anything more at the present moment except that their inspectors had found considerable difficulty from the lack of assistance given by the workers. There had also been a noticeable falling off in complaints. In 1905 there were sixty-eight complaints; in 1906, twenty-five; and in 1907, only sixteen, of which seven referred to foreign vessels. That was an indication that a great deal had been done. The inspectors would be greatly assisted if the dockers concerned gave them more direct and immediate information. He hoped his statement would be satisfactory.

*Mr. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton) said he was loth to enter into the debate, but his intervention was justified by the importance of the question he had to lay before the Secretary for Scotland. He thought it was common knowledge that the state of trade at the present moment in this country was far from satisfactory, and he knew of no place which had suffered so acutely and where the industrial crisis was anything like so serious as it was at present in the West of Scotland. He desired particularly to point out that in the course of the next three or four weeks they would be face to face with a most serious state of affairs which, he ventured to hope, the Government would do something to relieve. He had lived in Glasgow for many years, but he knew of no time during the last twenty-five years, even in winter, when things were as bad as they were at present. The shipbuilding industry was practically at a standstill, and although they were fortunate in not having to depend entirely upon one industry, still all the industries were slack, and the extreme slackness in shipbuilding had hit every single industry on the Clyde and the western counties. If that was their problem in the summer time, what was it going to be in the winter? With regard to what had happened between the Scottish Local Government Board and the local distress committee, he pointed out that some months ago a local fund was opened for the alleviation of distress in order to aid the local committee in putting into operation the provisions of the Act of 1905. They raised locally £8,000, since which time they had contributed £4,000, which was more than the whole of the rest of the United Kingdom had raised. They had up to the present moment received in grants £9,600. In other words, they had raised locally almost £12,000, and received in grants under £10,000, compared with London, which raised £500, and received in grants £63,000, and Edinburgh, which raised £500 and received in grants £6,600. The Scottish Local Government Board on 1st February issued a circular letter to the distress committees in Scotland. In that letter it was pointed out very properly that the distress committees should not consider that their work was circumscribed and limited to the winter months. That was perfectly clear and fair, but what the circular did not state—and in this matter he did not wish to impute any blame to the Scottish Local Government Board—was that if the distress committees did not ask for the total sum they wanted before 31st March, no fresh grants could be given in the intervening months between 1st April and 1st August. Possibly all distress committees ought to know the provisions and rules under which the Treasury acted, but unfortunately the Glasgow Distress Committee were ignorant of the Treasury rules when they responded to the circular of the Scottish Local Government Board. They told the Board in clear and unambiguous language that they wished a certain sum to carry out their work up to 31st March and a little beyond. They did not ask for more, because they hoped the present collapse was temporary, and they did not desire to put forward a large lump sum until they were able to verify what the requirements would be in the next few months. He ventured to think that that was a reasonable and businesslike way of setting about the matter. Weeks passed, and some weeks after 31st March the distress committees appealed to the Scottish Local Government Board, and then they were told that not one penny piece further could be forthcoming before the end of August. He did not wish to enter into the matter of the somewhat strained relationship which then ensued between the committee and the Scottish Local Government Board. It was sufficient to say that eventually a very serious crisis was just averted. The Distress Committe threatened to resign, and that would have meant that 800 men would have been thrown on the streets of Glasgow. That crisis was, however, avoided because the Glasgow Corporation very generously came forward and provided funds in order to carry out the work and prevent those men being thrown on the streets. He knew that charges had been made against the Glasgow Distress Committee, but he fancied those charges had not been based on plain facts. They were told, for example, that they had been paying the men more wages than they received when in their regular employment. That was not the case. He had taken out the figures with considerable care, and he found that the average wages of these men in their previous employment were 21s. 7d. per week, whereas at the relief works at Palacerigg they were 13s. 2d. Then they were told that Palacerigg was attractive, and that it was a pleasant holiday for the men to go out there. Palacerigg was some 600 acres in extent, about fifteen miles from Glasgow, and was land which the distress committee had acquired for afforestation and reclamation. It was one of the bleakest and dreariest places in the whole of the West of Scotland, and after he had spent some hours there the other day he did not want to see the place again. Then they were told in addition that some of the men had been wastrels, that some of them had been seen going in and out of public-houses, and that some of them were shirkers. He had no doubt that was true to some extent, but in an aggregation of people out of work they were bound to find a certain proportion of men who were not proper recipients of this form of relief; but what he contended—and he had gone into the matter with some local knowledge and devoted some amount of time and care to the question—was that these men and the work they performed would bear favourable comparison with that of other distress committees. But they would be face to face again with the same crisis within the next fortnight or three weeks, when the additional contribution which the corporation had voted would be exhausted; and what they felt was that, having regard to the fact that they raised so much more money than any other place, it would be extremely difficult to get still further local subscriptions. They did not ask for favours; they only asked that they should be treated proportionately as other cities had been treated. He had always held the view that this system of giving doles and subscriptions in carrying out the Act of 1905 was a totally wrong system. It would be far better to place the whole thing on the rates, But they had to face accomplished facts, and he appealed to the Secretary for Scotland not to place them in the unfortunate position of either having to appeal for funds, which, he feared, would not be successful, or closing down those works and throwing 800 men on the streets of Glasgow to swell an already congested labour market. The Secretary for Scotland, if he exercised his influence over the Scottish Local Government Board, could help them much. He hoped he would exercise that influence, and do all he could for this great industrial community in the west, in order that this sad history of misconception and misunderstanding might not end in a local tragedy.

*MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire) supported the appeal of his hon. friend. In Glasgow and in many places round it there had been unemployment, but the local authorities and the people had done exceptionally well towards relieving it. It seemed rather hard in the circumstances that the distribution of the grants had been conducted along lines which were technical rather than sympathetic. He hoped that in the distribution of the grant for the current year some more generous lines would be followed. He quite recognised that this was rather in the nature of a palliative, and whatever sum of money was distributed, and however it was distributed, it would not touch the root of the evil. There was the strange phenomenon that while their large centres were overcrowded people were still flocking in from the country districts. The problem of the town was the problem of the country too. They would never settle the problem of the centres until they had settled the problem of the outlying districts. They wanted to settle more people on the land, and that could never be done until unused land could be obtained at a fair price. That question would never be solved until they went on the principle of rating land at its market value. They wanted to improve their farming and industries in various ways. Over and over again, in the county he represented, people had complained that they had to pay too much for the land, and as soon as they began to improve it by useful work their assessment and rates went up, and thereby development was checked, opportunities for employment narrowed, and the labour market in the towns became overcrowded. They wanted, as far as they could, more direct employment on the land, and in order to get that they must have such land reform which would give the cultivators that abiding interest in the land which alone would keep them on it. It was only by legislation strenuously directed along these lines that they could hope to deal effectively with the evils which they deplored. These evils affected not only men and women, but in a still graver degree the children of to-day, who would be the men and women of to-morrow, because the homes were not what they might be, the nourishment was not what it might be, and children were forced into the labour market at far too early an age. These were the evils they wanted to check, and they wanted to deal with the problem as a whole. Palliatives might be necessary for the time being, but they must deal with the causes of the evil. They all recognised that any Minister who had a grant to dispense was placed in exceptional difficulties, because all the applicants believed that their need was the greatest. These ministerial difficulties would continue until they went further than palliatives and dealt with the real root of the problem. When they did that he believed that they would find in many cases that these palliatives for unemployment would prove to be unnecessary.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said that anybody who had had experience of the work of distress committees or even voluntary agencies which had been dealing with this question must know that the distress committee of Glasgow had been carrying on their work during the past year with great anxiety and at the same time with great earnestness and diligence in the endeavour to cope with the evils with which they were appointed to deal. He was glad to take that opportunity of bearing his testimony to the way they had conducted their work. The hon. Member for the Bridgeton divison seemed to take a somewhat melancholy view of the public estimate of the work of that committee, and he had also spoken of the misunderstandings, misconceptions, and even charges made against their administration. It was not his (Mr. Sinclair's) duty that day to defend the work of that committee in detail, but he might say one word about the relations between the Local Government Board and that committee. He could not find in the transactions which had taken place in the last few months any substantial reason to think that as between these two authorities there was really any considerable measure of misunderstanding or misconception, or, indeed, ill-feeling of any kind. His hon. friend put the case in a nutshell when he mentioned that the prolonged distress, which had continued not only during last winter but down to the present time, had really taken everybody by surprise. It was never anticipated by the distress committee, and certainly not by the Local Government Board for Scotland and by the Government, that the depression of trade and want of employment which existed in the Clyde district was going to be so prolonged as it had been, and it was that fact which had added to the anxiety of all those concerned in this matter of administration—not only the distress committee, but also the Local Government Board. It was the fact that they had been taken more or less by surprise that had added considerably to the difficulties of the situation. It would not be the desire of his hon. friends that he should go into detail with regard to this subject now. It was a very simple story. The end of the financial year was 31st March, and no Government, unless it came to the House for authority, could expend money after the close of the financial year. The House had been very continuously occupied during the present session, and it was only two days ago that the House gave its sanction to the further grant included in the Supplementary Estimates—a further grant at the disposal of the Treasury for application to this purpose. His hon. friend and those interested in Glasgow would, therefore, be relieved to know that this fund was now with the Treasury, and the Government could now draw upon it. He could also tell the hon. Member that the application which had now been received from the Glasgow committee by the Local Government Board for Scotland had been forwarded by him to the Treasury for consideration—he hoped favourable consideration—in connection with this matter. He did not think he need add any more to the general discussion of the question, which was a very difficult one. The Unemployed Act, under which they were working, was not a permanent statute, and it was only a matter of time when its amendment must be considered by the House. When that time would come it was not for him to say, but statute or no statute, amended or unamended, this was a question of great complexity, which must be looked at from two points of view—from the point of view of a melancholy depression of trade and also in the more favourable light of things when trade was more brisk. It was a question of great importance, but as there were many varying views, he thought he would be consulting the convenience of the House if he deferred his further remarks to some other time.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he ought to apologise for intervening even for a moment with regard to a matter which was of some local interest. Unfortunately this was the only opportunity he had had this session of mentioning the matter, notwithstanding that it was of very considerable importance to his constituency. When Parliament sanctioned the Forth Bridge a statutory obligation was laid on the railway company to run a boat between Granton and Burntisland. The company concerned had failed to carry out to the fullest extent that statutory obligation, and great hardship was thus placed on an important portion of the community in the East of Scotland when people came to Granton with the intention of crossing the Forth and found that the boat did not run. He had brought the question on many occasions before the Board of Trade, and he only asked an assurance from a member of the Government that the railway company was to be compelled to carry out its statutory obligation.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) replied that he was desired by the President of the Board of Trade, who was unavoidably called away, to say that this matter was under consideration. His right hon. friend had received some communications from the company concerned, and he had full hope he would be able to send to the hon. Member in a few days a detailed reply which would give satisfaction with regard to the complaint he had made.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he wished to mention a case in regard to India. He had not even warned the Minister concerned, who had so many cases brought before him in this House which were not grievances and came from only one clamorous and not widely representative class. The grievance India had was that the grievances brought before the House were not her true grievances, but he was anxious that a grievance of loyal chiefs should be mentioned. He had no complaint to make of the action of the India Office in this matter; they gave him an answer that they were inquiring into it, and he was sure that they would do everything which was right. But it was of very great importance when those who were loyal to the British in India had anything to complain of that they should at least have their complaint mentioned in the House of Commons. The Kathi chiefs were afraid that the Government were interfering with their rules of succession, and were trying to enforce the rule of primogeniture, which they did not follow. He did not believe that that was the intention of the Government of India, and he was sure that the memorials which were under consideration would have every possible attention. But he wanted to mention the matter because, when he heard, as he did with the utmost indignation, sympathy expressed in the House with cowardly and seditious journalists who incited half-educated and ill-educated youths to crimes so foreign to the character of our admirable and amiable British-Indian fellow-subjects, he was anxious that at least in the case of friendly, loyal, and honourable chiefs, it should not be said that when they had anything of which to complain, it was not even mentioned in the House of Commons. He also desired to allude to a matter in which his constituents were greatly interested, and that was the question of the relations of the Board of Education with the Welsh Central Education Board. This time last year he questioned the late Education Minister, who did not stick to that desk but went to sea. His successor, he was glad to say, made a satisfactory announcement in the House concerning the point on which he then interrogated him, and satisfaction had been given, but only after a struggle. But there was still the question of the attitude towards the Welsh Central Board. Several speeches had been made on the subject, and everyone praised everyone else so profusely that it was astonishing why anybody thought it necessary to make any complaint at all. He had no objection to officials of any sort, he knew their merits and trusted them, but he knew their little ways, one of which was to be acquisitive, and to grasp everything that came within their reach. He wished to warn them, on behalf of the Welsh people, not to attempt to interfere with the Welsh Central Board, which did its work well, and was a body to the last degree democratic, and had given everybody satisfaction, even the Welsh people, who were as hungry for education as any Brahmin in India. He begged the Education Board to be exceedingly chary of giving the Welsh Central Board even any suspicion that they wished to interfere with them, to curtail their authority, or to boss them from Whitehall. He also expressed his satisfaction with the statement made by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies that day. He regarded it as the grossest hypocrisy to attempt to force on any self-governing Colony any system, which we would not stand in this country, and which he was certain they would not stand in the Colony. No one would dare propose that in Britain Asiatic immigrants should be admitted to compete wholesale with British labour. Why then did we pretend that the Colonists were harsh, unsympathetic, and tyrannical, for acting in precisely the same way as we should act ourselves? He heard with great regret the tone in which in certain quarters the actions of our fellow countrymen in Africa were criticised, and his last word, in what looked likely to be the last speech of that section of the Session, was that such action and the sympathy expressed, not with the relatives of our innocent and foully murdered fellow countrywomen, not with a grossly misrepresented administration, not with a slandered public service, but with cowardly and seditious procurers of assassins, filled him with the deepest indignation.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That this House, at its rising To-morrow, do adjourn until Monday, 12th October next; that for the remainder of the session Government Business have precedence at every Sitting; that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that on Fridays the House, unless it otherwise resolves, shall at its rising stand adjourned until the following Monday.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Reasons for disagreeing to several of the Lords Amendments reported, and agreed to.

To be communicated to the Lords.—(*Mr. Lloyd George.*)

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

Reasons for disagreeing to one of the Lords Amendments reported, and agreed to.

To be communicated to the Lords.—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to,—

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill,

Public Works Loans Bill, without Amendment:—

Friendly Societies Bill, with Amendments:—

Amendments to—

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to consolidate The Companies Act, 1862, and the Acts amending it." [Companies Consolidation Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Lunacy Acts, 1890 and 1891." [Lunacy Bill [Lords.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.

EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 31st July; *Mr. Churchill*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 292.]

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at nine minutes after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Saturday, 1st August, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Report of procedings at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888.

DENMARK (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF).

Translation of the law establishing a new customs tariff for Denmark, with comparison, as far as possible, of the rates of customs duty contained in the new tariff with the rates at present in force and the English equivalents of both.

STATISTICS.

Statistical Abstract for the principal and other foreign countries in each year from 1896 to 1905–1906 (as far as particulars can be stated). Thirty-Fourth Number.

TRADE.

Annual statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions, 1907. Supplement to Volumes I. and II. Abstract and detailed tables showing countries of consignment of imports and countries of ultimate destination of exports; with a prefatory memorandum.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Outline of the successive legislative and administrative conditions affecting the relation of the Board of Education to Agricultural Education.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Standing Order No. XXXIX considered (according to order), and suspended for this day's sitting.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Commons Regulations (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill: Moved, that Standing Order No. 102B be dispensed with (The Lord Steward (*E. Beauchamp*) (for the Earl Carrington)); agreed to; Committee negatived. Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended); Bill read 3^a, and passed.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments, agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Brought from the Commons. Read 1^a: Then (Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended), Bill read 2^a (The Lord Steward (*E. Beauchamp*)): Committee negatived; Bill read 3^a, and passed.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:

1. Consolidated Fund (Appropriation).
2. Finance.
3. Patents and Designs.
4. Fatal Accidents (Damages) (No. 2.).
5. Police (Superannuation).
6. Public Health (Markets in Rural Districts).
7. Post Office Savings Bank.
8. Tobacco Growing (Scotland).
9. Wild Birds.
10. Companies.
11. Polling Districts (County Councils).
12. Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs).
13. Cran Measures.
14. Evicted Tenants (Ireland).
15. Agricultural Holdings.
16. Public Works Loans.
17. Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland).
18. Small Holdings and Allotments.
19. Bee Pest (Ireland).
20. Friendly Societies.
21. Naval Marriages.
22. Expiring Law Continuance.
23. Old-Age Pensions.
24. Isle of Man (Customs Duties).
25. Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland).
26. Naval Lands (Volunteers).

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

27. Whale Fisheries (Ireland).
28. Cost in Criminal Cases.
29. Married Women's Property.
30. Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland).
31. University of Durham.
32. Grand Jury (Ireland) Act, 1836, Amendment.
33. Registration.
34. Coroners (Ireland).
35. Endowed Schools (Masters).
36. Irish Universities.
37. Telegraph (Construction).
38. Public Offices Sites (Extension).
39. Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation.
40 Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation.
41. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1).
42. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2).
43. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3).
44. Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation.
45. Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation.
46. Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation.
47. Land Drainage Provisional Order.
48. Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order.
49. Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation.
50. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1).
51. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2).
52. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3).
53. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4).
54. Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation.
55. Falkirk and District Water Order Confirmation.
56. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London).
57. Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation.
58. Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2).
59. Gas and Water Orders Confirmation.
60. Gas Orders Confirmation.
61. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1).
62. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2).
63. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3).
64. Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, &c.) Order Confirmation.
65. Marriages Provisional Order.
66. Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation.
67. Wye Fisheries Provisional Order.
68. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1).
69. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2).
70. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4).
71. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5).
72. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6).
73. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7.)
74. Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8).
75. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9).
76. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10).
77. Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11).
78. Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation.
79. Commons Regulations (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order.
80. Conway and Colwyn Bay Joint Water Board.
81. Lincoln Corporation.
82. North Eastern Railway.
83. North East London Railway.
84. Bury and District Joint Water Board.
85. Draycott Gas.
86. Cardiff Railway.
87. King's College London (Transfer).
88. Audenshaw Urban District Council.
89. Tawe Valley Gas.
90. Bristol Tramways.
91. Cambrian Railways.
92. North British and Mercantile Insurance Company.
93. Upton Town Hall.
94. Blaydon and Ryton Water (Transfer).
95. Bromley and Crays Gas.
96. Stockport Corporation.
97. Humber Commercial Railway and Dock.
98. Southwell District Gas.
99. Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer).
100. Seaham Harbour Dock.

101. Camborne Water.
102. Briton Ferry Urban District Council.
103. Bristol Corporation.
104. Leicester Corporation.
105. Rochester Bridge.
106. Doncaster Corporation.
107. Motherwell Burgh Extension, &c.
108. Swinton and Mexbrough Gas.
109. Merthyr Tydfil Corporation.
110. Garw and Ogmore Gas.
111. Barry Railway.
112. Metropolitan District Railway.
113. Taff Vale Railway.
114. Northern Assurance Company.
115. Commercial Union Assurance Company.
116. Leeds Corporation.
117. Pontypridd Water.
118. Bognor Gas Light and Coke Company.
119. South Wales Electrical Power Distribution.
120. Aire and Calder Navigation.
121. Glyncorrwg Urban District Council.
122. Wishaw Burgh Electricty, etc.
123. Wolverhampton Corporation.
124. Finchley Urban District Council.
125. Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway, Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford-upon-Avon Junction Railway, and East and West Junction Railway (Amalgamation).
126. London County Council (Tramways and Improvements).
127. London County Council (Money).
128. Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment).
129. Honourable Artillery Company.
130. Leith Burgh.
131. London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway.
132. Liverpool Corporation (General Powers).
133. Tyne Improvement.
134. Widnes Corporation.
135. Margate Corporation.
136. Manchester Corporation.
137. Burnley Corporation.
138. Ammanford Urban District Council Water.
139. Metropolitan Electric Tramways.
140. Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water.
141. Wath and Bolton Gas Board.
142. South West Surburban Water.
143. Blackburn Corporation.
144. Keighley Corporation.
145. Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway.
146. Thames River Steamboat Service Act 1904 (Amendment).
147. Holderness Water.
148. London United Tramways.
140. Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2).
150. Sligo and Arigna Railway.
151. Criccieth Water and Improvement.
152. Padiham Urban District Council.
153. Central Ireland Electric Power.
154. Gosport Gas.
155. London County Council (General Powers).
156. Ravensthorpe Urban District Council.
157. Crystal Palace Company.
158. River Wandle Protection.
159. Dover Graving Docks.
160. Tollemache Estate.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Twelve o'clock, to Monday, the 12th of October next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Saturday, 1st August, 1908.

The House met at Ten of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Cardiff, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

Petition from Musselburg, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against: From New Brislington (two); and Winscombe; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: From Cardiff (seventeen); Holyhead and Troedyrhiw; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FISHERY INVESTIGATION.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the

Scientific and Statistical Investigations now being carried on in relation to the Fishing Industry of the United Kingdom [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, &c., 1907–8.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th July; Mr. Walter Rea]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 293].

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under The Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Outline of the successive Legislative and Administrative Conditions affecting the relation of the Board of Education to Agricultural Education [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants in County Monaghan.

MR. LARDNER (Monaghan, N): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have been offered by the landlords any untenanted land in the county of Monaghan for the reinstatement of evicted tenants; and, if so, whether he will give the names of the landlords offering such lands and state the decision of the Commissioners in reference thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Proceedings have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners, and have reached various stages, for the sale of the following estates which comprise untenanted land, viz.: Dr. Steven's Charities, Lord Massereene and Ferrard, Trustees of C. E. Porter, Sir T. Jackson, M. S. Moutray, R. R. Fitzherbert, and S. K. Jackson. The untenanted land is not offered specially for the reinstatement of evicted tenants, but will be dealt with by the Commissioners for the purposes generally of Section 2 of the Act of 1903.

Open-Air Schools.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in the case of an open-air school held under the terms of Article 44 (g) of the Elementary School Code, the Board will require a medical certificate in respect of every child attending such school that the child is unable to receive proper benefit in an ordinary elementary school, or will such certificates be reserved to children attending an open-air school under the terms of the Defective and Epileptic Children's Act, and for children refused admission under Article 53 (b) (3) of the Code.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Such a certificate as is referred to will not be required in the case of open-air schools conducted under Article 44 (g) of the Code for 1908. Schools conducted under The Elementary Education (Defective and Epileptic Children) Act, 1899, are subject to the regulations for special schools.

Welsh School Case.

MR. YOXALL: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether it is proposed to issue a special edition of the School Code for Wales this year; and, if so, on what date will it be placed upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Yes, Sir. The Welsh Code was laid upon the Table on the 2nd July.

Recognition of Training Colleges.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether training colleges, in order to be recognised by the Board, have to fulfil the conditions set forth in Sections 7 (g), 7 (h), and 8 of the Training College Regulations, 1908, and, if not, whether he will state the names of those colleges which are recognised without fulfilling the conditions of the above sections.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I think the hon. Baronet must be under some misapprehension with regard to this matter. Section 8 of the Training College Regulations, as stated therein, is applicable to all training colleges, and the Board have no reason to believe that any college recognised by them fails to comply with it. Sections 7 (g) and 7 (h) are applicable only to colleges which are not recognised before the 1st August, 1907.

Structural Improvements of Denominational Schools in Single-School Areas.

MR. WILLIAM NICHOLSON (Hampshire, Petersfield): To ask the President of the Board of Education if, in view of the probable effect of the proposals of the Education Bill in single-school areas, the Education Department is prepared, pending definite legislation, to follow the precedent of last Session, by relieving trustees and managers of denominational schools in such areas from pressure in respect of expensive and structural improvements in their schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I cannot undertake to lay down any general rule. Each case will be considered on its merits having regard to the urgency and importance of the alterations required.

De Blaquiere Estate, County Clare.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the respective sizes of the holdings of Patrick Early Coohaun, John Holleran Coohaun, and James Nestor Coohaun, annuitants to the Government on the Rosingrave estate, adjoining the De Blaquiere estate, Tubber, county Clare; and whether it is proposed to increase their small holdings out of the untenanted lands on the De Blaquiere estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The persons referred to do not come within the provisions of Section 2 of the Act of 1903, and it is not proposed to increase their holdings out of the untenanted land on the De Blaquiere estate.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Michael Forde, of Fiddawn, Tubber, county Clare, holds 7 acres 1 rood 36 poles of land on the De Blaquiere estate, 15 acres 1 rood 10 poles on the Lahiff estate; and was he given 40 acres additional out of the untenanted lands on the De Blaquiere estate, and, if so, will he explain the circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Michael Forde, who holds an uneconomic holding on the estate, is being given portion of the untenanted land adjoining his holding.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Martin Burke, of Rathwilladown, Tubber, county Clare, has a holding of £13 worth of land on the De Blaquiere estate; whether, in addition, he holds a farm of thirty-five acres at Carrowcraheen, county Clare, about eighty acres in Ballyhogan, county Clare, about twenty acres at Blakemount, county Clare, about fifty acres at Cappanaparty, county Clare; and will he explain the circumstances under which this tenant was given a further increase of about thirty acres out of the De Blaquiere estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Martin Burke is tenant of eight acres on this estate, and has been allotted twenty-one acres of the untenanted land. He does not hold any other land as tenant.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Estate Commissioners purchased the estate of Mrs. De Blaquiere, Tubber, county Clare; whether the estate included the tolls and customs of the town of Tubber as well as about fifty acres of bog; and whether it is proposed to vest the bog and the tolls and customs in either trustees or the district council, in the interests of the people.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The tolls referred to were not included in the estate offered to the Commissioners. The bogs have been divided amongst the tenants.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the system of allocating the untenanted lands on the De Blaquiere estate, Tubber, county Clare, has given rise to dissatisfaction;

whether he is aware that Edward Forde, of Fiddaun, holds 7 acres 1 rood 6 poles of land at a valuation of £6 5s. on the De Blaquiere estate, 26 acres 3 roods 25 poles, valuation £7, on the Lahiff estate, and 61 acres 2 poles, valuation £12 12s., on the Rosingrave estate; whether, in addition, Mr. Forde holds a farm of about ninety acres at Ballyhogan, county Clare; and will he explain why, in view of the congestion which exists in the district, this man was given a further increase of land from thirty to forty acres.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Edward Forde holds a small farm at a rent of £4 14s. on the De Blaquiere estate and a farm on the Lahiff estate at a rent of £3 15s. His son has a farm on the Rosingrave estate of the valuation of £9 15s. Forde has been given a parcel of untenanted land adjoining his own at an annuity of £11 18s.

H.M.S. "Defence."

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty on what date was H.M.S. "Defence," of 14,600 tons, laid down; whether he can state by what date her trials will be completed; and whether any of the German ships laid down in 1904 or 1905 are still awaiting trials.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) H.M.S. "Defence" was laid down on the 22nd February, 1905. It is expected that her trials will be completed by the middle of next month. There are no German ships laid down in 1904 or 1905 still awaiting trials.

Naval Programmes.

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the German battleship "Nassau," of 17,710 tons, was laid down on 22nd July, 1907, and is to be commissioned in August, 1909; whether any of the vessels recently commissioned or about to be commissioned this year in England, viz.: "Defence," "Shannon," "Minotaur," "Lord Nelson," "Agamemnon," "Indomitable," "Invincible," and "Inflexible," can show as short a space of time from laying of keel to commissioning; and, if not, on what information does he found the official assurance that it will be possible for ships of our 1909 programme to be commissioned before the completion of the German ships to be laid down in 1908.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the negative, and the remainder accordingly does not arise.

H.M.S. "Indomitable."

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will state for what practical purpose are the engines of H.M.S. "Indomitable" being subjected to the strain of racing at full speed across the Atlantic; and whether it is sufficient to justify the expenditure of the coal involved.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The practical purpose served is that of an endurance test at high speed.

Naval Manœuvres.

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that Lord Tweedmouth's Memorandum of 23rd February, 1907, stated that the Fleets at Home will continue to be combined for war under the command of Lord Charles Beresford, and that therefore the Channel, Atlantic, and Home Fleets would carry out periodic peace exercises together under his command; whether, at the conclusion of the naval manœuvres, Lord Charles Beresford applied to the Admiralty that the Fleets might meet and carry out tactical exercises to gain experience of handling large fleets; whether he can state to what extent this request was complied with in accordance with Lord Tweedmouth's Memorandum; and whether the "Dreadnought" took part in these exercises so that the Commander-in-Chief designated to command the fleets in war might test the tactical powers of this ship for the first time.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I must decline to answer any Question relating to the manœuvres, the subject of which can only have been communicated to the hon. Member by a breach of confidence.

Milk Prosecutions.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the decision given by the Liverpool stipendary magistrate in the prosecution against the Condensed Milk Company of Ireland; and whether, with a view to safeguarding the interests of genuine Irish products, he will state what further steps, if any, will be taken in this matter by the Public Prosecutor.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) My hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. The proceedings were taken at the instance of the Board of Agriculture, who propose forthwith to confer with the Irish Department as to the steps to be taken in the position which has arisen.

Fish landed in Isle of Lewis.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that in 1898 100,413 cwts. of line-caught fish were landed in the island of Lewis by 666 boats, whilst in 1907 69,833 cwts. were landed by 451 boats, if he will state for each of these two years the number of steam liners and sail liners employed, and the quantity of fish caught by each of the two classes of boats.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am informed that the details desired by my hon. friend for the year 1898 are not available. In 1907 there were 14,714 cwts. landed by steamers and 55,119 by sailing boats.

Ribble Fisheries.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board has the power to substitute two fishery boards for one with regard to the River Ribble, one to have the jurisdiction over the portion of the Ribble and its tributaries which flow in Yorkshire, and the other to have jurisdiction over the portion of the Ribble that flows through Lancashire; and whether, if the Board of Fisheries has this power of administration, the President will in the interests of efficiency, act upon this suggestion.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board could only take action in the direction suggested by my hon. friend on an application by a board of conservators. If any such application is made it will receive careful consideration.

Action of Kildorrery Magistrates.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he has instituted a full inquiry into the action of the magistrates at Kildorrery petty sessions in refusing to grant information in the case of an assault endangering life preferred against William Stackpoole; and if he has decided to take further proceedings to bring this man to justice.

(*Answered by Mr Cherry.*) I have fully inquired into this case, and, upon a review of all the circumstances, have decided that the interests of justice do not require that further proceedings should be taken.

Birmingham Postal Servants and their Rates of Pay.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that certain head postmen, assistant-head postmen, and assistant inspectors of telegraph messengers at Birmingham have been given forms saying that if the work they are now doing is paid for at a higher rate, as is contemplated in a forthcoming revision, they will not be held to possess any claim to the new appointments; and whether men who have performed such duties for many years to the satisfaction of their superiors are to be considered to have no claim if it is decided to pay for these duties at a higher rate.

(*Answered by Mr Sydney Buxton.*) I will make inquiry into the matter.

Old-Age Pensions—Charities and Annuities.

SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, under the Old-Age Pensions Bill, charities that are already granting annuities to the deserving poor would be allowed to reduce those annuities so as to bring the recipients to the limit of income to be given by the Government, namely £26 per annum, so that they can claim the Government pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) There is nothing in the Bill which can affect the discretion which such charities may at present possess either to increase or diminish the amount of allowances made by them. The amount of yearly means which disqualifies for pension under the Bill is £31 10s., not £26 as stated in the Question.

Bombay Riots—Sentences.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to a case decided by the police magistrate of Bombay in which several persons have been sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment for throwing stones during the recent Bombay riots; and whether any special reason exists, such as previous convictions or the like, which would appear to justify such severe sentences.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) I have seen a statement to the effect mentioned in the Question in a telegram published in the newspapers of the 30th July. It is open to the persons convicted to appeal to the High Court.

Justification for Sentence for Sending Seditious Telegram.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to a case decided by the sessions judge of Allygurh in which a person was sentenced to seven years transportation for sending a telegram of a seditious nature; and whether any special reason exists, such as a warning neglected or previous conviction, which would appear to justify such a severe sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan*): I have no special information as to the circumstances of the case beyond what appeared in a telegram in the newspapers of the 30th July. It is open to the accused to appeal to the High Court against the sentence passed by the sessions judge.

Rioting in Bombay.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if he will state what was the cause of the recent rioting in Bombay, on how many days the police and military fired on the mob, and how many persons were killed and how many wounded during the rioting.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) As regards the first part of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer I gave to the hon. Member for Bolton on the 28th July. According to the latest information received by the Secretary of State, the police and military were compelled to fire on six days; among the rioters, fourteen persons were killed and thirty have been reported as wounded. Several police officers have also been wounded.

Deputy Lieutenants in Queen's County.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if there are any qualifications necessary for the appointment of deputy-lieutenants in Ireland, and, if any, can he state if they were complied with in recent appointments made in Queen's County; and whether instructions were recently sent by Dublin Castle to His Majesty's lieutenant of that county instructing him not to appoint Protestants as deputy-lieutenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The qualifications are prescribed in Section 33 of The Militia Act, 1882. Since the present Government came into office two appointments have been made to the deputy-lieutenancy of the Queen's County by His Majesty's lieutenant of the county with the approval of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. No information has been received which would raise any doubt as to the qualifications of the gentlemen so appointed. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

Distribution of Land in County Cavan.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the distribution of land purchased by the Estates Commissioners, any Unionist or Protestant farmer's son will be accepted as a tenant for any part of such land, or will the selection of tenants be left entirely in the hands of the United Irish League; whether he is aware that in the county Cavan there are several Protestant evicted tenants who have been refused reinstatement because they would not join the United Irish League; and whether he can state, with regard to the distribution of 500 acres in the county Westmeath of a farm called Catharinestown, if the Estates Commissioners will give any portion to Protestant agriculturists.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners do not accept or reject applicants for untenanted land because they are the sons of Unionist Protestant farmers, nor is the selection of tenants left entirely, or at all, in the hands of the United Irish League. No evicted tenants, Protestant or other, have been refused restoration because they would not join the United Irish League. No allotment will be given or refused, on the lands of Catherinestown or on any other lands, on grounds of religion or politics. The Estates Commissioners neither inquire, nor do they know, the religion or politics of any person to whom they give parcels of untenanted land.

Baths in Constabulary Depot, Dublin.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if there are only three small ordinary household baths available at the Royal Irish Constabulary Depot, Phœnix Park, for the accommodation of 500 men; if so, will he consider the advisability of more ample accommodation in this institution designed for physical training; if any members of the depot force have recently suffered in health due to insanitary causes, and have several beds recently had to be burned in the depot because of their dirty condition; and what steps, if any, will be taken to remedy the existing state of affairs.

(*Answered by Mr Birrell.*) I am informed that there are at present only three baths at the depot for the use of the men. There are several wash-houses. The erection of six extra baths with hot and cold water has been approved. No members of the depot force have recently suffered in health from insanitary causes. One bed was destroyed about three months ago because its occupant, a recruit who had only then joined, was suffering from skin disease.

Constabulary Recruits in Dublin.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many constabulary recruits are at present stationed at Richmond Barracks and the Phœnix Park Depot; who is responsible for the purchase of provisions for these men; what steps, if any, are taken to see that their money is spent to the best advantage; if the recruits have any voice in the expenditure of their pay; if contractors are invited to compete, and by what means; if a depot sergeant is paid £3 a month for spending the recruits' money, and is he relieved of all other duties; and by whom is this money paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) There are 340 recruits at the depot and 221 at the sub-depot. A sergeant is detailed to purchase the provisions and supervise the recruits' mess at each depot. Mess sergeants are relieved of all other duty and are paid £3 a month each. They act under the supervision of a district inspector, and the mess accounts are carefully examined by the commandant and the adjutant. The recruits have no voice in the purchase of the provisions. The Inspector-General informs me that the recruits' mess is managed in a thoroughly satisfactory manner. In some cases articles are provided by contract; for instance, tenders for the supply of milk are advertised for.

Royal Irish Constabulary Depot Canteen.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how much money, invested and otherwise, stands to the credit of the Royal Irish Constabulary Depot canteen; from what source have the profits mainly accrued, and whether the reserve constables have any actual voice in its disposal; whether the depot gymnasium was built out of the profits made in the canteen, and, if so, by whose direction; whether a cricket pavilion, used chiefly by constabulary officers and their friends, was also built out of the canteen fund; and if he will explain why such profits are not devoted to the cheapening of provisions consumed by the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed at the depot.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The total amount standing to the credit of the canteen fund is £779. The profits mainly accrue from the sale of liquor. There is a sub-committee, consisting of one head constable, one sergeant, one acting sergeant, and two reserve constables, and all special expenditure from the canteen profits is sanctioned by this committee. The depot gymnasium was built at the suggestion of the Inspector-General, and with the unanimous approval of the canteen committee. The cricket pavilion was built out of the same fund. It is used by all ranks at the depot for cricket, football, hockey, and athletic clubs. A small portion of the canteen profits is devoted to the cheapening of provisions.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the post of Director-General of Army Finance has been abolished, and, if so, can he state when, in what manner, and for what reason this abolition was effected, and what provision has been made for carrying on in future the duties hitherto performed by that officer.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Order in Council of the 10th August, 1904, defining the functions of the Director of Army Finance, and charging him with the duty, among others, of advising the administrative officers at the War Office and in commands on all questions of Army expenditure, has any effect in defining the functions of the newly-appointed and differently named official by whom the Director-General of Army Finance has now been replaced; if so, will he state whether that Order in Council now applies to the functions of this new official as fully in all respects as it did to those of the Director-General of Army Finance; and, if not, can he inform the House whether, and, if so, how it is proposed to secure that the powers and duties of the new official shall be in every respect the same as those hitherto administered by the Director-General of Army Finance.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. ACLAND, Yorkshire, Richmond): I can only refer the hon. Member to the printed reply which I gave on Thursday to the Question by the hon. and gallant Member for West Dorset. The hon. Member need have no fear that the powers of the officer who will succeed Sir Guy Fleetwood Wilson on his retirement will be in any way modified as regards his functions as accounting officer.

MR. BOWLES: Will the powers or duties of the new officer be modified in any way?

MR. ACLAND: As a matter of fact it is intended to modify the duties to some slight extent in regard to contracts purely. The contract questions will go to the Director-General of Contracts, as there is no reason why contract matter should be sent to the Finance Officer.

MR. BOWLES: Will the change be carried out by Order in Council?

MR. ACLAND: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Kitchener's Fighting Scouts.

MR. BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to two telegrams, dated respectively the 24th and 27th February, 1902, from Colonel Colenbrander, commanding Kitchener's Fighting Scouts in South Africa, to Lieutenant Webber, assuring him that all moneys expended by him in advances to men and personal expenses would be made good to him; whether he is aware that, on the faith of this explicit assurance, Lieutenant Webber expended considerable sums of his own money in the public service, no part of which has been refunded to him; and whether the War Office now repudiates the promise given by Colonel Colenbrander in respect of the refund of these payments.

MR. ACLAND: The telegrams referred to are only two out of many documents relating to the case of Mr. Webber which have received my personal consideration. The time during which Mr. Webber can have been expending money on the strength of the telegrams was less than a month in duration, and I have no evidence of the expenses he incurred during this time. I am afraid I can only repeat what has already been said to Mr. Webber, viz.: the service which he voluntarily rendered received a fair and reasonable recognition when he was granted a commission in the Remount Department. Much valuable assistance was rendered to His Majesty's Government during the war by others as well as Mr. Webber, but unpaid assistance thus voluntarily given and accepted cannot be considered as entitling those who gave it to claim a pecuniary reward years after the event.

Mr. BOWLES: Will the hon. Gentleman consider if the War Office cannot defray the expense incurred on the strength of the assurance?

Mr. ACLAND: I am afraid the War Office have no liability even for those expenses.

Alcohol Imports into Nigeria.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in dealing with the prohibition of the import of alcohol into southern Nigeria and the resulting loss of revenue to that Colony, he will consider the advisability of assimilating the taxation of Southern Nigeria to that of Northern Nigeria, where the principal source of revenue comes not from alcohol but from the land which is owned by the State.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Secretary of State has proposed to institute an inquiry into certain controverted facts connected with the consumption of spirituous liquor in Southern Nigeria, but the question of prohibiting the importation is not under consideration.

Mr. WEDGWOOD: Is there any intention of extending to Southern Nigeria the system of taxation which obtains in Northern Nigeria?

Colonel SEELY: I could not answer a specific question of that nature without notice.

Indemnity Acts—Precedent for Governors Withholding Assent.

Mr. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is any precedent previous to The Natal Indemnity Act, 1906, of a governor of a self-governing colony, duly authorised to give the Royal Assent to an Act of the Colonial legislature, deliberately withholding such assent until after the dissolution by him of the Colonial Parliament by which such Act was passed; and whether such procedure is sanctioned by the Colonial Office as legal and constitutional.

Colonel SEELY: Sir H. McCallum was authorised on the 13th of August, 1906, to assent if martial law were withdrawn. It was not withdrawn till 1st October, and he then assented. In so acting he appears to have been carrying out the instructions of the Secretary of State consistently with constitutional usage, and the question whether the Colonial Parliament was or was not in session could not affect the legality of his action. I am not aware of any particular precedent or that any precedent was necessary. No precedent to the contrary has ever been cited.

Mr. G. GREENWOOD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the fact that Her Majesty's Government in the year 1867 declined to advise the Crown to assent to a Bill of Indemnity for New Zealand, where martial law had been proclaimed pending actual warfare, on the ground that its terms were too widely drawn and would cover acts wantonly and recklessly committed; whether the terms of the present Indemnity Bill for Natal are in substance identical with those of the New Zealand Bill to which the Royal Assent was so refused; and whether His Majesty's Government will, following this precedent, decline to advise the Crown to assent to the Natal Bill in its present form.

Colonel SEELY. Yes, Sir, I am aware that an Indemnity Act was disallowed in 1867 on these grounds. The Natal Bill is perhaps open to a similar objection, but, as I have explained, were His Majesty's Government to instruct the Governor to decline to assent, martial law would be prolonged, and this is a result which it is generally agreed should if possible be avoided.

In answer to a further Question by the same hon. Member,

Colonel SEELY said: I think it is undesirable to in any way jeopardise the situation which happily now shows signs of improvement as between the two Governments.

Dinizulu.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has caused any part of his recent speech in the House of Commons on the position of Dinuzulu to be telegraphed officially to Natal, and, if so, which part.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir.

Motor Speeds in London.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has ever received any request from the London County Council to limit the rate of speed allowed to motor vehicles in London; and whether, in the absence of such a request, he has any power to act.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I do not find that any application under the Motor Car Act, 1903, has ever been received by the Local Government Board from the London County Council for regulations with regard to the speed of motor cars. In the absence of such an application, the Board have no power to act, except as regards any specified highway or part of a highway which does not exceed sixteen feet in width, or on which ordinary motor car traffic would, in their opinion, be especially dangerous. I should add that the powers of the County Council in this matter do not extend to the City of London.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland): Is the Local Government Board considering the desirability of giving the police power to settle the routes that these vehicles should take?

MR. JOHN BURNS: A private Bill has been introduced seeking to confer on the Commissioner of Police power to divert traffic. In my opinion the Commissioner of Police should have had that power long ago.

MR. MACKARNESS asked if the speed of motor-cars was limited to ten miles an hour in the Royal parks, while in crowded thoroughfares they travelled at a much higher speed.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he was aware of the fact. But the Royal parks could not be compared with the London streets.

MR. MACKARNESS: Is not the traffic much less in the Royal parks than in the main roads?

MR. JOHN BURNS replied that the Local Government Board had no jurisdiction over the Royal parks.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) asked if the Home Office had not some control over the Royal parks?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes, through the police.

Liverpool Prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the decision of Mr. Stewart in the Liverpool Summons Court, in the prosecution under The Merchandise Marks Act, instituted at the instance of the Treasury, against Sir Thomas Cleeve and Mr. A. A. Cleeve, and heard on Wednesday 22nd instant; whether he is aware that it was admitted that the defendants were selling foreign produce under a name calculated to lead the public to believe that it was Irish, and that the magistrate declined to convict; and whether, in view of the injury likely to result to sellers of Irish farm produce, he proposes to take any further action in the matter.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): My hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. The proceedings referred to were instituted at the instance of the Board of Agriculture, who propose forthwith to confer with the Irish Department as to the steps to be taken in the position which has arisen. The Board are not aware that the defendants made the admission cited in the Question.

Sutherlandshire Evictions—Burning of a Crofter's House.

*MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has any further information with regard to the alleged burning of a crofter's house in the parish of Creich, Sutherlandshire.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The Answer is in the negative; but as the Member for Ross-shire was informed by the Lord-Advocate the other day, inquiries are being made by the Crown Office.

*MR. MORTON: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will inquire if there was any necessity for what seems to be an inhuman and uncivilised practice of burning down the house with some of the tenant's effects in it; also whether the sheriff exceeded his duty in granting the warrant for burning the house, or whether the sheriff's officer exceeded his duty in firing the building without the sanction of the Local Board of Health.

MR. SINCLAIR: I hope the inquiry which is being made will elicit all the facts.

*MR. MORTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman send me a copy of the Report?

MR. SINCLAIR was understood to reply in the affirmative.

Tobacco Growing in Scotland.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will instruct the Local Government Board (Scotland) to circulate to farmers in Scotland particulars with regard to the cultivation of tobacco.

MR. SINCLAIR: The duty suggested by my hon. friend is not one which seems to lie in the sphere of administration by the Local Government Board.

MR. MORTON: Then to what Department should the Question be addressed?

MR. SINCLAIR: The matter is one which affects the Treasury in the first instance.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be read a third time."

*MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury) said that, in consequence of the unsatisfactory reply given by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies to his hon. friend the Member for Peterborough, in reference to the Natal Indemnity Act, he desired to say a few words of protest against the sanctioning by the Imperial Government of that Act. That Act was passed to cover in the widest terms all that had been done under martial law during the last seven months in Zululand, but it had never been pretended that there was any war or rebellion to justify the proclamation of martial law, or to call for its continuance. It had, in fact, been proclaimed and maintained directly in opposition to the views of the Imperial Government. The condition of things, therefore, under which that Government was asked to sanction the Act was quite unprecedented. But further than that, martial law had been used against a single individual, and for the purpose of prejudicing his defence against charges of the gravest kind never definitely formulated. Everyone knew the circumstances attending the arrest, imprisonment, and long secret examination of Dinizulu. He had at length, after seven months, been committed for trial, and upon being committed he was reported to have made a striking statement to the Court, a few sentences of which he (Mr. Mackarness) desired to call to the attention of the Prime Minister. Dinizulu said—

> "I emphatically say that I am innocent of the charges laid upon me. If the law called martial law had not been brought into operation in Zululand, and my lawyers prevented by it from going into Zululand, I am sure I should have proved and confirmed my innocence. The result of all this treatment of myself is that I have been shut up in gaol all these months without the opportunity given by the law of this land to all charged with crime like me of preparing their defence. At present I am ignorant of the names of those whom it is said I murdered, and also of the names of those whom it is said I incited others to murder. I now stand here about to be committed for trial on such charges."

He (Mr. Mackarness) appealed to the Prime Minister to consider what an evil precedent would be established if the Imperial Government lent its sanction to an Indemnity Act to cover martial law put to such purposes as those described in Dinizulu's statement. He was quite aware of the difficulties by which the Imperial Government were confronted, and their natural desire to avoid a state of friction with the Natal Government which all would deplore. But in that matter far-reaching issues were at stake, and, inasmuch as the Natal Legislature was still sitting, it was not too late to obtain some such modification of the Act as would bring it somewhat nearer, at least to the practice and rules which had been held in modern days to govern martial law.

Mr. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough) joined in the protest against the terms in which the Bill of Indemnity was drawn. In the Question he had put to the Under-Secretary, he had referred to the New Zealand Bill of 1867. In New Zealand before 1867 there had been a serious war; but in Natal there had been no war at all and no rebellion to suppress, and, in fact, the Bill left out any reference to a rebellion, or it did not pretend there had been any rising; indeed there had been nothing of paramount necessity to justify martial law. In New Zealand martial law was naturally and rightly proclaimed, and in 1867 the New Zealand Government came with a Bill of Indemnity. The Bill was reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure, and the then Secretary of State, the Duke of Buckingham, refused to advise the Royal Assent on grounds set forth in a despatch of May 15, 1867. The despatch had not been published, but it could easily be unearthed at the Colonial Office. What were the grounds stated? In the first place,

> "That it is so worded as to indemnify, not only civil and military authorities and persons acting under them or under the authority of the Government, but to indemnify 'all and every other person whosoever' who shall have done or ordered, or directed any act, matter, or thing to be done, etc. Secondly, that, owing to the disjunctive form in which the second and third sections are drawn, the destruction of the property of a person suspected to be concerned in the insurrection would be covered by the indemnity given by the Act, even though such destruction may have been wanton and reckless and not inflicted or ordered in or about the suppressing or quelling of the insurrection. Thus, if a private individual acting under no authority has wantonly or recklessly destroyed or ordered the destruction of the property of a person whom he may have chosen to suspect to be concerned in the insurrection, he would be protected under the terms of this Act, though such destruction in no way directly or indirectly tended to quell the insurrection, and though the person whose property was destroyed should have proved that he was in no way directly or indirectly concerned in it."

The Duke of Buckingham concluded by expressing his opinion that—

> "The Act should be limited in its phraseology to an indemnity for acts ordered or approved by some responsible military or civil authority."

The objections in the despatch applied with force to the Natal Indemnity Bill. In its present form it would, if passed, set an evil precedent, and it was right that a protest should be raised having in view the extraordinary circumstances in which martial law had been maintained in Natal and Zululand with the one object of preventing Dinuzulu's solicitor from going into Zululand to collect evidence.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) asked if the Royal Assent had actually been given to the Indemnity Bill; would it be given automatically; did the Government really believe that the Bill would, if discussed, receive the approval of the House of Commons; and was it impossible to defer assent until Parliament had had an opportunity of discussing it.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby) said that, with regard to Parliamentary discussion, he thought the House had had exceptional opportunities for discussion. The Vote for the salary of the Colonial Secretary had been postponed until after the Bill was received and was in the hands of Members, who, he thought, had had the fullest opportunity for understanding, so far as it was possible to understand, the complicated circumstances before a decision was arrived at. He had told the House that the Government had decided to advise assent, and assent would be given, but he could assure his hon. friend they had been guided in this matter not only by the consideration that they wished to do that which the Government of a self-governing colony thought it would be wise to do, but also by the consideration whether sanction would make for justice or injustice. He had no hesitation in saying it would make for justice, and for this reason: any postponement would aggravate those difficulties to which allusion had been made in the way of the advisers of Dinizulu obtaining evidence in Zululand. If in any way the Act were delayed martial law would continue, and so long as it continued Dinizulu's agents could not obtain that evidence, or certainly not with that freedom they desired.

MR. G. GREENWOOD asked was it not within the power of the governor to issue a proclamation annulling the previous one.

COLONEL SEELY said they were advised that that would not be in accordance with constitutional procedure. It would, in fact, be an unconstitutional proceeding, and it certainly was not proposed to take that step. In conclusion, he had to say that the Government deprecated at this moment the use of any words which might tend to exacerbate feeling, and were most anxious not to disturb a situation which during the last twenty-four hours had become so much more favourable, and tended to show that the Natal Government were as anxious as were His Majesty's Government to do justice to the native races in South Africa and to secure for them complete fair play.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he did not want to strike a note of discord on what ought to be the happiest day of the year, but there hung over them a kind of shadow of trouble to come. He did not want the Local Government Board to be sitting down complacently waiting for something to turn up. He had asked the House for four or five years that in time of peace and comparative prosperity they should be looking ahead for possible danger. There hung the shadow of the unemployed over them. All he asked at the moment was that the Department should not use only the critical part of its organisation, which was excellent in its way. He knew no Department of the State which had such excellent critics as the Local Government Board. They were like dramatic or musical critics. They were equal to anything. They could condemn and find fault with everything, but they were under no obligation to suggest an improvement. That was a great advantage for a critic to hold, but when Ministers were at the service of the State, one had to look to them for help. He had often made the statement which might be a very foolish one, that Cabinet Ministers might make mistakes in various directions. Treaties might go wrong, and all sorts of things, but where human life was not concerned it did not matter very much, and it could be got over. But where this great Department had to deal with human life it was an entirely different thing. They wanted to save the homes of the people. They were not at that moment concerned with new homes but with the preservation of existing homes, and it was a nightmare that men should be willing to work and unable to find it. There was a latent organising capacity in the Department which had never yet been put into operation. Foolish and unthought-out schemes he admitted had been sent, but that did not relieve the Department of the responsibility of suggesting better plans They had all the information. He would not say they had all the knowledge—he did not suppose anyone would admit that anyone else had all knowledge—but they had opportunities to acquire knowledge. What he and his colleagues had pleaded for was that they might be able to find out trend of trade and the possibility of employment, and to have a schedule of possible work. Had every local authority been asked in time of peace what work it could do in time of depression without injury to ordinary industry, so as to help men to tide over the difficult time? They could not expect a shipwright or a boilermaker to get back to the land. The question was what work they could offer to tide him over the difficulty, but they were only told "suggest a plan and we will look at it." They could not go on suggesting plans. This great Department ought to suggest means to prevent men becoming degraded. The longer they left a man the less chance there was of lifting him up. The man could not help it. He got so low that he could not even stand up to a square meal at last—it would be too much for him—much less could they expect him to stand up to work. He did not want to send Ministers away on their holidays with the impression that things were awfully bad. That of course they who lived near slums had to put up with. They could not escape. They had no golf links or shooting. They had on their minds all the time the everlasting shadow of want and misery. He knew the House would forgive them if this was the last word to be spoken, when they implored the Department, with all its capacity for doing good, to put into operation some of its organising capacity to deal with the unemployed.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said he desired to support the appeal of his hon. friend. The

President of the Local Government Board had spoken in a spirit of strong optimism of the prospect of the coming winter. Unfortunately, these views were not shared by Prebendary Wakefield, the chairman of the Central Unemployed Body of London, who had recently said—

> "I view with very great apprehension the next winter. I think we shall find a state of things of a very serious nature."

In these circumstances, he desired to make a very strong appeal to the President of the Local Government Board, that steps might be taken in good time.

THE PRESIDENT OT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said his hon. friends the Members for Woolwich and Bethnal Green had addressed to him words of sympathetic appeal not to under-estimate the responsibilities of his office towards the subject which they had at heart, and which was shared in its proper proportion by every Member of the House. The hon. Member for Woolwich had suggested that his Department was capable of strong powers of criticism, and he believed was capable of powers of organisation. On this subject he must not forget that their hands had been tied considerably in the last two and a half years in dealing with this problem, by the fact that the Royal Commission specially constituted to consider this subject were traversing every one of the points and suggestions which the hon. Member thought he ought to snatch out of their purview. He did not intend to anticipate, probably in a wrong direction, some permanent remedy that it was their special function to provide. The Government had already been freely criticised because they had ventured to deal with one aspect of the poor law and poverty problem in a bold and generous and practical way, by granting old-age pensions, and they had no right, on the question of the treatment of the able-bodied poor, and the many phases of the Poor Law problem to which the hon. Member had referred, to anticipate the suggestions and remedies that might be proposed by the Commission that would report, he trusted, in October or November. But, in the meantime, the hon. Member had not done his Department justice, because concurrently with the consideration by the Royal Commission of this vast problem, which no single Act of Parliament could settle, the Department had met local authorities in many cases by anticipation in the handling of the problem. Every scheme of work had been generously interpreted, every claim for money had been promptly met, and he was surprised that a man who shared with him the buoyant optimism of the cream of the working classes should be to-day in the position of a doleful Jeremiah, and he regretted that the hon. Member for Bethnal Green should so readily fall into the elusive trap that was being set in advance of the winter by tariff reformers, who were purposely and deliberately exaggerating the difficulties of the unemployed problem by giving figures and statistics, and creating alarm and panic which was political and not economic or social in its object or intention. He could assure the hon. Members that they could rely on the Department doing its best to grapple with this particular problem during the winter. When they met again next February, after the autumn session, the preparations they had made for the winter would be more than approved when the results of their activities were reviewed by Parliament. They would do their duty promptly and sympathetically.

MR. PICKERSGILL: May I ask if Prebendary Wakefield is a tariff reformer?

MR. JOHN BURNS said he did not give that interpretation to the Rev. Russell Wakefield's speech which the hon. Member did.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he desired to complain once more of the treatment of Scotland in the matter of the unemployed grant. Probably the Government were not bound legally to give an equivalent grant, but they were morally bound to do so, and Scotland had never had her equivalent grant share of that £200,000 yet. There were not many places in Scotland, but there were some, especially in Glasgow, that wanted it. He would like to appeal to the Prime Minister whether he would not see that Scotland was treated fairly in regard to the distribution of public money. He did not want to stop hon. Members from going away—they might do less mischief at home than here—but they ought to put public duty before holidays. He wanted to complain strongly of the want of opportunity that was given them to discuss the Estimates. It had always been understood by what they called the constitution that it was the first duty of the House of Commons to criticise the expenditure of public money, but under the present procedure, and especially under the present Government, they had had no opportunity of considering a large number of the Votes at all. For instance, there were a number of Scottish Votes, on which they did not want so much to consider party political matters as the social affairs of the country, but which had not been considered during the last three sessions. He did not say the Government was responsible for the guillotine, but he expected from a Liberal Government that independent Members should have an opportunity of considering these matters so as to let the Departments know what their constituents wanted. It was almost a farce to say that this House had any control over the national finance at all. The Government ought to give them more opportunities of discussing the Estimates. He knew they were not going to get any such opportunities in the Autumn Session, but he hoped next session more facilities would be given them for discussing these matters. He would like the Government to drop a very unfortunate practice. They knew that they could get all their Votes after the allotted days under the guillotine, and consequently any Votes they did not desire to be criticised could be carefully kept from the purview of the House, and that was the practice he desired the Government to drop. There were many Votes which they ought to have the opportunity of considering which never came before the House at all. On the face of it it looked as though the Government kept back some of those Votes, such as Army Vote 12, because they were afraid of discussion, and that was doing a great wrong to the country and to the House. In future, more especially as the Prime Minister represented a Scottish constituency, he trusted that the Government would give them some further opportunities of considering the local affairs of what was the most important part of the United Kingdom. There were a number of matters upon which it would have been much more convenient if he had the Prime Minister's opinion before he visited his constituency, for then he would be able to tell them the Government view, but if the Prime Minister did not give them his views till early in October, it would be too late for him (Mr. Morton) to discuss the matter with his constituents this year. In regard to the land question in Scotland the Lord Chancellor had made a speech in another place in which he declared the Small Landholders' Bill (Scotland) to be defunct, and promised to consider whether the English Act of last year could be applied to Scotland. That speech, if made at all, should have been made by the Prime Minister, who was their leader. He (Mr. Morton) was anxious to assist the Prime Minister as far as possible, but if the right hon. Gentleman would not give him his advice in time to make any use of it what was the good of having a Prime Minister? The Government had given too much attention to the consideration of rich trusts and companies, and if the same consideration had been given to Scottish affairs it would have been all the better for the people of Scotland. He hoped the Prime Minister would give him some assurance that they would have more opportunities for the discussion of Scottish Estimates next session. He would also like some information in regard to the Land Bill. He trusted the Government would give the points he had raised their best consideration.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they do not insist on their Amendments to the Old Age Pensions Bill to which this House has disagreed.

That they do not insist on their Amendment to the Irish Universities Bill to which this House has disagreed, and agree to the Amendment made by the Commons to the Amendment made by the Lords without Amendment.

That they have agreed to,—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to—Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went;—and, having returned;—

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal assent to a number of Acts (*see* page 2074).

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 10th July, adjourned the House, without Question put, till Monday, 12th October.

Adjourned at Twenty-three minutes after Twelve o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXCIII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) House of Lords.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Agricultural Holdings [H.L.]	*Earl Carrington*	Common Amendments Considered 30th July (1677) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Bee Pest (Ireland)	*Lord Denman*	Read 2^a 22nd July (57) Committee 29th July (1393) Report } 30th July Read 3^a and passed } (1676) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Commons [H.L.]	*Earl Carrington*	Report 27th July (740) Read 3^a and passed 28th July (1165)
*Companies (Consolidation)	*Lord Chancellor*	Committee 27th July (735) Report 29th July (1427) Read 3^a and passed 30th July (1676) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)	*Earl Beauchamp*	All Stages } 1st Aug. (2074) Royal Assent }
Coroners (Ireland)		Report 27th July (740) Read 3^a and passed 28th July (1165) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
*Costs in Criminal Cases	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 2^a 23rd July (274) Committee } 27th July (741) Report } Read 3^a and passed 29th July 1446) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Cran Measures [H.L.]	*Earl Carrington*	Read 2^a 22nd July (51) Committee Report Read 3^a and passed } 23rd July (275) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
Endowed Schools (Masters)	*Earl Beauchamp*	Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
*Evicted Tenants (Ireland)	*Earl of Crewe*	Commons Amendments Considered 30th July (1680) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Expiring Laws Continuance	*Earl of Crewe*	Read 1^a 28th July (1072) Read 2^a 29th July (1433) Committee Report } 30th July (1676) Read 3^a and passed 31st July (1910) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
Fatal Accidents (Damages)		Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Finance	*Earl of Crewe*	Read 1^a 27th July (708) Read 2^a 29th July (1398) Read 3^a 30th July (1676) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Friendly Societies	*Lord Denman*	Read 2^a 23rd July (255) Committee Report } 29th July (1426) Read 3^a and passed 31st July (1910) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment	*Lord Denman*	Read 1^a 25th July (597) Read 2^a 28th July (1166) Committee Report } 29th July (1446) Read 3^a 30th July (1677) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
*Irish Universities	*Earl of Crewe*	Read 1^a 25th July (597) Read 2^a 27th July (741) Committee Report Read 3^a and passed } 30th July (1637) Commons Amendments Considered 31st July (1939) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
*Isle of Man (Customs Duties)	*Lord Denman*	Read 2^a 27th July (727) Committee Report } 28th July (1164) Read 3^a and passed 29th July (1444) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Law of Distress Amendment	*Lord Courtney of Penwith*	Committee 23rd July (258)
*Lunacy [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1^a 22nd July (3) Read 2^a 29th July (1444) Committee Report Read 3^a and passed } 30th July (1676)
Married Women's Property	*Earl of Stradbroke*	Read 1^a 22nd July (3) Second Reading (adjourned) 27th July (736) Read 2^a 28th July (1165) Committee Report } 29th July (1446) Read 3^a and passed 30th July (1677) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
Matrimonial Causes [H.L.]	*Earl Russell*	Second Reading defeated 22nd July (4)
Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) [H.L.]	*Lord Avebury*	Report 27th July (740) Read 3^a and passed 28th July (1165)
*Naval Lands (Volunteers)	*Earl of Granard*	Read 1^a 25th July (597) Read 2^a 29th July (1445) Committee Report Read 3^a and passed } 30th July (1677) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Naval Marriages	*Earl of Granard*	Read 1^a 28th July (1072) Read 2^a 29th July (1433) Committee Report Read 3^a and passed } 30th July (1676) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
Old-Age Pensions	*Viscount Wolverhampton*	Committee 28th July (1073) Report 29th July (1438) Read 3^a and passed 30th July (1637) Commons Amendments Considered 31st July (1910) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
Patents and Designs		Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074
*Poisons and Pharmacy [H.L.]	*Earl of Crewe*	Read 3^a and passed 22nd Jul (58)
Police Superannuation	*Lord Newton*	Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs)	*Viscount Midleton*	Read 2^a 22nd July (57) Committee Report } 27th July (729) Read 3^a and passed 28th July (1165) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland)	*Lord Marchamley*	Read 2^a 27th July (737) Committee Report } 28th July (1166) Read 3^a and passed 29th July (1446) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
Polling Districts (County Councils)		Read 2^a 22nd July (58) Committee Report } 27th July (729) Read 3^a and passed 28th July (1165) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Post Office Savings Bank	*Earl of Granard*	Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Public Health (Markets in Rural Districts)	*Lord Allendale*	Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Public Offices Sites (Extension)	*Earl of Granard*	Committee Report Read 3^o and passed } 28th July (1072) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
*Public Works Loans	*Earl of Crewe*	Read 1^a 29th July (1374) Read 2^a 30th July (1677) Read 3^a and passed 31st July (1910) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
Registration		Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
*Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland)	*Lord Denman*	Read 2^a 27th July (728) Committee Report } 28th July (1164) Read 3^a and passed 29th July (1444) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Small Holdings and Allotments		Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
*Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland)	*Lord Chancellor*	Report 22nd July (58) Read 3^a and passed 23rd July (273) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Telegraph Construction	*Earl of Granard*	Read 2ª 23rd July (261) Committee 27th July (733) Report Read 3ª and passed } 30th July (1676) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
Tobacco Growing (Scotland)	*Earl of Camperdown*	Read 3ª and passed 27th July (740) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)
University of Durham	*Viscount Ridley*	Read 1ª 25th July (597) Read 2ª 27th July (739) Committee Report } 28th July (1166) Read 3ª and passed 29th July (1446) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
*Whale Fisheries (Ireland)	*Lord Denman*	Read 2ª 27th July (728) Committee Report } 28th July (1164) Read 3ª and passed 29th July (1445) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2075)
Wild Birds	*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*	Committee Report } 23rd July (265) Read 3ª and passed 27th July (740) Royal Assent 1st Aug. (2074)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Agricultural Holdings [H.L.]	*Sir E. Strachey*	Read 2º 22nd July (244) Committee 27th July (1059) Report Read 3º and passed } 28th July (1354)
Assizes & Quarter Sessions [H.L.]	*Mr. O. Williams*	Read 1º 24th July (511)
*Commons [H.L.]	*Sir E. Strachey*	Read 1º 30th July (1775)
Companies [H.L.]	*Sir H. Kearley*	Committee Report Read 3º and passed } 27th July (993)
*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)	*Mr. Lloyd-George*	Read 1º 29th July (1628) Read 2º 30th July (1781) (1885) Committee Report } 31st July (1968) Read 3º and passed 1st Aug. (2097)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Cran Measures [H.L.]	*Sir E. Strachey*	Read 1° 23rd July (368) Read 2° 25th July (700) Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 28th July (1368)
*Criminal Appeal Amendment [H.L.]	*Sir W. Robson*	Read 1° 22nd July (112) Read 2° 30th July (1904)
*Crofters Commons Grazings Regulation	*Mr. Sinclair*	Read 1° 30th July (1774)
*East India Loans	*Mr. Buchanan*	Read 1° 30th July (1903)
*Endowed Schools (Masters)	*Mr. Runciman*	Read 2° 28th July (1362) Committee 29th July (1629) Report Read 3° and passed } 30th July (1904)
*Evicted Tenants (Ireland) [H.L.]	*Mr. Birrell*	Read 2° 22nd July (241) Committee 27th July (989) Report Read 3° and passed } 28th July (1354)
*Expiring Laws Continuance	*Mr. Hobhouse*	Read 2° 24th July (596) Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 27th July (1011)
Factory and Workshop Act (1901) Amendment (No. 2)	*Mr. Steadman*	Read 1° 27th July (890)
*Finance	*Mr. Lloyd-George*	Read 3° and passed 25th July (663)
*Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment	*Mr. T. W. Russell*	Committee 22nd July (228) Report Read 3° and passed } 23rd July (495)
Grocer's Licences (Abolition)	*Mr. Robinson*	Read 1° 29th July (1513)
Importation of Plumage Prohibition [H.L.]	*Lord R. Cecil*	Read 1° 22nd July (113)
*Irish Universities	*Mr. Birrell*	Report 23rd July (368) Report 24th July (512) Read 3° and passed 25th July (616) Lords Amendments Considered 31st July (2000)
*Local Government (Scotland)	*Mr. Sinclair*	Read 1° 30th July (1774)
Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) [H.L.]	*Sir W. Holland*	Read 1° 29th July (1513)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Naval Lands (Volunteers)	*Mr. McKenna*	Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 23rd July (494)
*Naval Marriages	*Mr. McKenna*	Read 2° 23rd July (494) Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 27th July (1058)
*Old-Age Pensions	*Mr. Lloyd-George*	Lords Amendments Considered 31st July (1970)
*Post Office Sites	*Mr. Sydney Buxton*	Read 2° 29th July (1631)
*Public Works Loans	*Mr. Hobhouse*	Read 2° 22nd July (245) Committee 27th July (1003) Report Read 3° and passed } 28th July (1354)
*Registration [H.L.]	*Sir W. Robson*	Report Read 3° and passed } 23rd July (494)
*Small Holdings Allotments [H.L.]	*Sir E. Strachey*	Read 2° 25th July (700) Committee 28th July (1355) Report Read 3° and passed } 29th July (1628)
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland)	*Marquess of Hamilton*	Lords Amendments Considered 29th July (1632)
Transfer of Goods	*Mr. J. D. White*	Read 1° 30th July (1774)
*Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention	*Mr. Sinclair*	Read 1° 30th July (1774)
University of Durham	*Mr. Hills*	Report Read 3° and passed } 24th July (596)
*White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition	*Mr. Gladstone*	Read 1° 30th July (1774)
*Whale Fisheries (Ireland)	*Mr. Cherry*	Lords Amendments Considered 31st July (2014)

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

JULY 22—AUGUST 1.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdare
School Teachers, Dismissal of.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 28*, 1176.

Aberdeen
Naval Volunteer Reserve Division for.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30*, 1731.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]
Annesley Estate—Case of W. Aherne, *July 29*, 1473.
Fermoy Courthouse, Control of, *July 28*, 1188.
Fleury Estate—Case of J. Sisk, *July 31*, 1964.
Grehan Estate—Case of J. Therry and Son, *July 23*, 360.
Kildorrery Petty Sessions—Case of W. Stackpoole, *Aug. 1*, 2086.
Kingston Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 24*, 509.
Madden Estate—Case of D. Dorgan, *July 22*, 74.
Nason Estate—Case of Mrs. M. Eagan, *July 22*, 73.

Acland, Mr. F. D.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* (Yorkshire, Richmond]
Director of Finance, Office of, *Aug. 1*, 2091, 2092.

Acland, Mr. F. D.—*cont.*
Estimates—Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiencies, *July 27*, 1068.
Militia Ballot Act, Position of, *July 27*, 1023.
Officers' Promotion, Effect of Special Reserve on, *July 27*, 930, 935.
Special Reserve
  Bounty Conditions of granting, *July 27*, 928, 929.
  Drafts in time of War, *July 27*, 926-928.
  Training Arrangements, *July 27*, 928
Territorial Force
  Engineer Officers, Pay of, *July 23*, 326.
  Jury Service, Exemption from, *July 27*, 930.
War Office—Case of Mr. Webber, *Aug. 1*, 2092, 2093.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir A. [Somerset, Wellington]
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1012.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Con.*, *July 27*, 1006.

Adkins, Mr. W. R. [Lancashire, S.E., Middleton]
County and Borough Councils—Financial Relations, *July 31*, 1958.

[*cont.*

Adkins, Mr. W. R.—*cont.*
Licensing Bill, Clause 1, Interpretation of, *July 29*, 1511.

Admiralty
First Lord—Right Hon. R. McKenna.
Financial Secretary—Dr. T. J. Macnamara.
Chain Contracts.
Q. Mr. J. Johnson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28*, 1212.
China and Earthenware Contracts.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22*, 74.
Contracts—Wages paid by Messrs. Rolf.
Q. Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27*, 820.
Press, System of giving Information to.
Os. Earl Winterton, *July 30*, 1890; Mr. McKenna, 1892; Mr. Hay, 1892.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27*, 822.
Quantity Surveyors, Payments to.
Qs. Mr. Guinness; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28*, 1207; *July 30*, 1740.
Rough Carpentering, Men employed on.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 31*, 1950.
Shipbuilding Contractors and Foreign Contracts.
Qs. Mr. Herbert, Mr. Younger; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28*, 1204.
Wireless Telegraphy, *see that title.*

Aerial Navigation
War Office Expenditure (1903–8).
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 1481.

Africa
Liquor Traffic among Native Races.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 28*, 1292–1295, 1330; Colonel Seely, 1329–1331; Mr. L. Jones, 1330.

Africa, East
[*For Particular Places see their Names, as* Uganda, *etc.*]
Labour
Employment Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Viscount Helmsley; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 67.
Rules.
Qs. Sir C. Hill, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 868.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 1492.
Land Tenure Legislation.
Qs. Sir C. Hill, Mr. Rees; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 868.
Ordinances—Placing in Library.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 67.

Africa, East—*cont.*
Portuguese Native Labour Recruitment Regulations.
Qs. Mr. Staveley-Hill, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 23*, 328, 329.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 869.
Railway Construction, Grants for.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 838.
Rules in Cd. 4122.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Col. Seely, *July 22*, 57.
Steamship Communication with.
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 29*, 1458.

Africa, South
[*For Particular Colonies, etc., see their Names, as* Transvaal.]
Administrative Policy.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1247; Colonel Seely, 1267–1269, 1273.
Compensation Fund, Administration of.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 869.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1223.
Financial Administration under Crown Colony Government.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1250.
Garrison
Cost of.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 322.
Reduction.
Q. Mr. A. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 66.
Manhood Suffrage, Results of Lowering.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1248; Colonel Seely, 1268; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1277.
Native Education Report.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 839.

Africa, West
[*For Particular Provinces, etc., see their Names, as* Nigeria.]
Principe and San Thomé Labour Regulations.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 27*, 878.

Agricultural Credit Banks
Foreign Systems.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 29*, 1462.

Agricultural Holdings Bill
c. 2R.* *July 22*, 244.
Com., July 27, 1059.
Con. and 3R.* *July 28*, 1354.
l. Commons Amendmts., *Con., July 30*, 1677.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Agricultural Rates Act
Poultry Farms, Application to.
Q. Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 27*, 843.

Agriculture
Labourers' Wages, Hours of Work, etc.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24*, 505.
Statistics (1907) Presented, *July 31*, 1909, 1943.

Agriculture and Fisheries Board
President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Vice-President—Rt. Hon. T. W. Russell.
Official Information, Circular against Divulging.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 28*, 1240.
Veterinary Branch Salaries.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 28*, 1241.

Aileen Estate
Case of J. Cassidy.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1768.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. (Argyll)
Army, Foreign Service—Officers' Houses, *July 27*, 859.
Land Purchase—Financial Proposals, *July 29*, 1511.
Limavady and Dungiven Railway, Grant to, *July 27*, 817.
Public Works Loans (Remission) Bill Expenses Resolution, *July 23*, 487, 491.

Aire and Calder Navigation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Aldgate
Tramway to Bow—Danger of Stud System.
Q. Sir J. Benn; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 89.

All-British Steamship Route
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 28*, 1237.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 30*, 1773.

Allen, Mr. A. A. [Christchurch]
Bournemouth Post Office
Allocation of Duties, *July 31*, 1952.
Classification, *July 24*, 501.
Hoxton—use of Douglas Hall, *July 29*, 1496.

Allendale, Lord
Married Women's Property Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 737.
Motors
Dust Nuisance, *July 29*, 1386.
Horus, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 29*, 1384.
Legislation, necessity for, *July 29*, 1383.
Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1384–1386.

Ambergate
Reservoir Works—Wages paid.
Qs. Mr. J. Ward; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 27*, 878.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
Irish Congestion Commission, Cost of, *July 30*, 1694.

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill
c. Con.,* *July 22*, 59.
3R.* *July 27*, 806.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 28*, 1069.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Ancient Monuments
(England and Wales)—Scope of Commission.
Q. Mr. Silcock; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 24*, 505.

Anæsthetics
Deaths from (1901–8)
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1698.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 31*, 1952.

Annesley Estate
Case of W. Aherne.
Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1473.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill, 2R. *July 28*, 1363; *Com.*, *July 29*, 1630, 1631.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 376–378, 442, 461, 462; *July 24*, 541–544.

Ardglass
Cattle-driving Prosecutions.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 98.

Argentina
British Trade with, Increase in.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 25*, 685, 686; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 685; Mr. J. M. Henderson, 700.
Trade Report, presented, *July 30*, 1635.

Armagh

Offences in County—Return ordered, *July 28*, 1170.

Post Office Appointments.
Q. Mr. P. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24*, 499.

Armaments

Expenditure on, Limitation of.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 25*, 690.

Army

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. B. Haldane.

Parliamentary Secretary—Lord Lucas.

Financial Secretary—Mr. F. D. Acland.

Cavalry for Scotland.
Os. Earl of Rosebury, Lord Lucas, *July 27*, 724.

Clutterbrick and Pepys, Captains, Transfer of.
Q. Sir C. Rashe; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 323.

Colonial and Foreign Garrison Reductions.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 860.

Director of Finance, Office of.
Q. Colonel R. Williams; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 1736.
Qs. Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Acland, *Aug. 1*, 2091.

Engineer Services—Removal Expenses of Surveyors.
Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 837.

Foreign Manœuvres, Attendance of Officers at.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane; *July 27*, 865.

Foreign Service—Officers' Houses.
Q. Mr. Verney, Mr. Ainsworth; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 858.

Fourth Notts and Derby Regiment, Headquarters of.
Qs. Mr. Starkey; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 1482.

Government Policy.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 28*, 1243.

Infantry Units—Shortage below Establishment.
Os. Viscount Hardinge, *July 22*, 53; Lord Lucas, 55.

Inquiries Held since 1800—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 1456.

Return Ordered, *July 30*, 1693.

King's Liverpool Regiment, Promotion in.
Q. Mr. Crosfield; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 1457.

Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*

Army—*cont.*

Officers

Promotion, Effect of Special Reserve on.
Os. Mr. Guy Baring, *July 27*, 910; Captain Morrison-Bell, 919, 934–936; Mr. Acland, 930, 935.

Supply of.
Os. Captain Morrison-Bell, *July 27*, 920.

Training Corps.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 861.

Universities and Public Schools, Recruiting from.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 895, 896; Mr. C. Warner, 908; Mr. Hunt, 923.

Recruits—Pay of.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 861.

Reductions Effected.
Os. Viscount Midleton, *July 22*, 25, 27; Mr. Ashley, *July 27*, 899–904; Mr. Haldane, 903; Captain Morrison-Bell, 918; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 921.

Reserve, Strength of.
Os. Mr. Ashley, *July 27*, 902; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 921, 922; Mr. Haldane, 921, 923.

Royal Engineers Special Reserve—Age for Enlistment.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 862.

Sandhurst Royal Military College Cadetships.
Q. Mr. C. Salter; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 837.

Special Reserve

Age Limit.
Os. Mr. Ashley, *July 27*, 900, **901**; Captain Faber, 912; Mr. W. Nicholson, 914.

Bounty, Conditions of Granting.
Os. Mr. W. Nicholson, *July 27*, 913, 929; Mr. Acland, 928, **929**.

Conditions of Service.
Os. Mr. W. Nicholson, *July 27*, **913**.

Drafts in Time of War.
Os. Mr. Acland, *July 27*, 926–928; Mr. Ashley, 927.

Equipment of.
Os. Viscount Hardinge, *July 22*, 54; Lord Lucas, 55.

Foreign Service Organisation.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 27*, 922; Mr. Haldane, 923; Mr Carlile, 931.

Army –*cont.*
Special Reserve—*cont.*
Officers, Proposals as to.
Os. Lord Lucas, *July 22*, 56; Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 895, 916; Mr. C. Warner, 908; Mr. Guy Baring, 910; Mr. W. Nicholson, 914.
Q. Mr. Godfrey Baring; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 1458.
High Sheriffs, Liability for Service as.
Os. Mr. Hunt, *July 27*, 923.
Transfers from the Militia.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 895, 897.
Organisation of.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 890–893, 898; Mr. Ashley, 898, 899, 904, 905; Mr. C. Warner, 906; Mr. Guy Baring, 911; Lord J. Joicey-Cecil, 917; Mr. Carlile, 931–934.
Physique of Recruits.
Os. Mr. Hunt, *July 27*, 923, 924.
Recruiting Returns.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 894; Mr. Ashley, 900; Mr. C. Warner, 707.
Rifles, New, Date of Supplying.
Os. Mr. C. Warner, *July 27*, 907; Captain Morrison-Bell, 920.
Training Arrangements.
Os. Mr. Ashley, *July 27*, 905; Mr. C. Warner, 907; Captain Faber, 911; Mr. Acland, 928.
Transfers from the Militia.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 894.
Strength—Return, proposed.
Os. Viscount Midleton, *July 22*, 27; Earl of Crewe, 31; Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 29*, 1437; Earl Beauchamp, 1438.
Return ordered, *July 29*, 1437.
Territorial Force
Appeals by Commanding Officers of Volunteers, etc., for Support to Scheme.
Q. Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 856.
Civil Power, Aid to.
Q. Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 856.
Cyclist Battalions and Companies.
Qs. Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 866.
Engineer Officers, Pay of.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Acland, *July 23*, 326.
Government Assistance.
Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 1482.
Horses, Provision of.
Os. Mr. Hunt, *July 27*, 924.
Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 1482.

Army—*cont.*
Territorial Force—*cont.*
Inns of Court Volunteers, Position of.
Qs. Viscount Valentia; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 863.
Instructors pay
Qs. Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*. 862.
Jury Service
Os. Mr. Acland, *July 27*, 930.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 859.
Q. Colonel McCalmont; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 1736.
Medical Service—Report presented, *July 23*, 254, 297.
Organisation and Value as a Fighting Force
Os. Lord Lucas, *July 22*, 18; Lord Zouche of Haryngworth, 24, 29; Viscount Midleton, 26; Lord Saye and Sele, 28; Viscount Hardinge, 28; Earl of Crewe, 28–30; Lord Haversham, 32.
Quartermaster-Sergeants, Position of.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 74.
Q. Mr. Guy Wilson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 1702.
Special Reserve, *see that title.*
Uniform Contracts.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr Haldane, *July 28*, 1189.
Wagon and Harness Supply.
Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 302.
War Office, *see that title.*
Wilson, Captain Bryce, Case of.
Qs. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 1733.

Army Estimates
Accounts Department—£580,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1354; *Rep.* July 29*, 1519.
Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiences Resolution (Mr. Hobhouse), *July 27*, 1064–1066; *July 28*, 1365.
Os. Mr. Carlile, Mr. J. Ward, *July 27*, 1067; Mr. Acland, Mr. W. Rutherford, 1068.
Armaments and Engineer Stores—£1,490,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1354; *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.
Educational Establishments—£142,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1353, *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.
Medical Establishments, Pay, etc.—£451,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1353; *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.
Miscellaneous Effective Services—£73,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1354; *Rep.* July 29*, 1519.

[*cont.*

Army Estimates—*cont.*
- Ordnance Department and General Stores—£498,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1353 ; *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.
- Ordnance Factories—£100, *Com.* July 28*, 1354 ; *Rep.* July 29*, 1519.
- Pay of Special Reserve and Militia—£840,000, *Com., July 27*, 890.
- Quartering, Transport and Remounts—£1,839,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1353 ; *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.
- Supplies and Clothing—£3,912,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1353 ; *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.
- Territorial Forces—£2,005,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1353 ; *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.
- Votes closured, *July 29*, 1627.
- Works and Buildings——£2,515,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1354 ; *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.

Ashbourne, Lord
- Deputy-Lieutenants, Qualifications required of, on Appointment, *July 27*, 727.
- Irish Universities Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 756–762 ; *Com., July 30*, 1649, 1656, 1665, 1675.
- Married Women's Property Bill, *July 27*, 737.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com., July 28*, 1109, 1110 ; Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments, *July 31*, 1930.
- Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 738, 739.
- Proclaimed Counties—Imposition of extra Police Rate, etc., *July 23*, 288.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. (Lancashire, Blackpool)
- Africa, East—Labour Rules, *July 27*, 868 *July 29*, 1492.
- Army
  - Colonial and Foreign Garrison Reductions, *July 27*, 860.
  - Foreign Manœuvres, Attendance of Officers at, *July 27*, 865, 866.
  - Officers Training Corps, *July 27*, 861, 862.
  - Recruits Pay of, *July 27*, 861.
  - Reductions Effected, *July 27*, 899–904.
  - Reserve, Strength of, *July 27*, 903.
  - Royal Engineers Special Reserve—Age for Enlistment, *July 27*, 862.
  - Special Reserve
    - Age Limit, *July 27*, 900, 901.
    - Drafts in time of War, Provision of, *July 27*, 927.
    - Organisation of, *July 27*, 898, 899, 904, 905.
    - Recruiting Returns, *July 27*, 900.
    - Training Arrangements, *July 27*, 905.

Ashley, Mr. W. W.—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Territorial Force
    - Instructors' Pay, *July 27*, 863.
    - Jury Service, *July 27*, 860.
- Ballinorley School, Closing of, *July 30*, 1770, 1771.
- Egypt—Education System, *July 30*, 1752.
- Empire Day, Official Recognition of, *July 27*, 865.
- Morocco—Case of Mr. Clark-Kennedy, *July 28*, 1229.
- Navy
  - Shipbuilding Programme—Comparison with Germany, *July 29*, 1478, 1479.
  - Torpedo-boat Destroyers — German Programme, *July 28*, 1209.
- Persia, Situation in, *July 23*, 334.
- St. Vincent—Carib Canal, *July 28*, 1222.
- Suez Canal Dues, Dissatisfaction with, *July 23*, 330.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Fifeshire, E.]
- All-British Steamship Route, Scheme for, *July 30*, 1773.
- Ancient Monuments in England and Wales—Scope of Commission, *July 24*, 506.
- Army
  - Government Policy, *July 28*, 1243.
  - Inquiries held since 1800—Return proposed, *July 29*, 1456.
- Autumn Session
  - Business Arrangements, *July 31*, 2015, 2018, 2024.
  - Friday Sittings, *July 31*, 1968.
- Bills
  - Form of presenting and printing, *July 29*, 1477 ; *July 30*, 1737.
  - Private—Suspension of Standing Order 8, *July 30*, 1777, 1780.
- Business of the House, Course of, *July 23*, 367 ; *July 29*, 1512.
- Cattle Importation Restrictions—Legislative Proposals, *July 28*, 1242.
- Condition of Ireland, Opportunity for discussing, *July 25*, 616.
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1792–1796.
- Consols, Price of, *July 30*, 1792.
- Defence of the Empire—Adequacy of present Arrangements, *July 30*, 1793.
- Estimates, Supplementary, Discussion of, *July 23*, 366.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Date of Taking, *July 23*, 366.
- Fisheries—Scientific and Statical Investigation Report, *July 30*, 1737.

[*cont.*

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
Land Law (Ireland) Acts—Amendment Proposals, *July 28*, 1242, 1243.
Land Purchase—Financial Proposals, *July 29*, 1511.
Land Valuation Bill, Proposals as to, *July 22*, 112.
Licensing Bill
Allocation of Time to, *July 23*, 366; *July 31*, 2015.
Clause 1, Interpretation of, *July 29*, 1511, 1512.
Local Authorities (Education) Bill—Starring by the Government, proposed, *July 31*, 2024.
Lords-Lieutenant—Scottish Appointments, *July 29*, 1465.
Moray Firth, Trawling Negotiations, *July 28*, 1242.
Natal Indemnity Bill, Terms of, *July 28*, 1242.
Natural History Museum—Directorship Vacancy, *July 24*, 506.
Navy
Inquiries Held since 1800—Return proposed, *July 29*, 1456.
Rosyth Works, Expediting of, *July 30*, 1737.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1979, 1981.
Parliamentary Procedure — Blocking Motions, *July 30*, 1794.
Scottish Land Question—Legislative Proposals, *July 30*, 1773, 1774.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1357, 1359, 1360.
Supply
Curtailment of Discussion by Closure, *July 30*, 1794.
Irish Estimates, Procedure as to, *July 30*, 1795.
War Office, Ministers other than Secretary of State for War Attending at, *July 23*, 365.
Welsh Church Commission Report, *July 31*, 1966.

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill
c. 1R.* *July 24*, 511.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
Home Office Vote, Time Allowed for Discussion, *July 29*, 1592.
Police
Complaints against, *July 29*, 1594–1597.
Metropolitan Commission Report, *July 29*, 1592, 1598.
Remuneration, Scale of, *July 29*, 1597.

Atkinson, Lord
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1102, 1103, 1144, 1146, 1152, 1154, 1162, 1163, *Rep. July 29*, 1441; Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments, *July 31*, 1929, 1933.
Proclaimed Counties — Imposition of Extra Police Rate, etc., *July 23*, 287.

Attorney-General—*Sir W. S. Robson.*

Attorney-General for Ireland—*Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry*

Audenshaw Urban District Council Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Australian Commonwealth
Coat of Arms.
Qs. Mr. R. Duncan; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 364; *July 27*, 813.

Autumn Session
Business, Arrangements for.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *July 31*, 2015, 2018, 2024; Sir C. Dilke, 2016–2018; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 2018, 2019; Sir F. Channing, 2020; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 2020; Lord R. Cecil, 2021; Mr. J. MacVeagh, 2021–2023; Mr. Jowett, 2023.
Friday Sittings.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 31*, 1968.

Avebury, Lord
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1098, 1100, 1102, 1104, 1105, 1114, 1118.
Shop Hours Act, Closing Orders under—Return proposed, *July 22*, 13, 14.

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Bagdad Railway
Progress made with, etc.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 27*, 987; Sir E. Grey, 988.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
Natal—Dinizulu Case, *July 28*, 1325.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1006.
Woolwich Common, War Office Right over, *July 27*, 865.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [City of London]
Agrarian Outrages—Statistics, *July 30*, 1787.
Army
Reductions effected, *July 27*, 921.
Reserve, Strength of, *July 27*, 921, 922.
Special Reserve — Foreign Service Organisation, *July 27*, 922.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
Autumn Session—Business Arrangements, *July 31*, 2018, 2019.
Boycotting Statistics, *July 30*, 1748.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 23*, 367.
Cattle-driving Cases — Prosecution of Offenders, *July 30*, 1788, 1789.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1781–1791.
Consols, Price of, *July 30*, 1791.
Constabulary—Extra Charges levied in connection with disturbances, *July 30*, 1789.
Defence of the Empire — Adequacy of present Arrangements, *July 30*, 1791.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 418; 3R., *July 24*, 631–640, 642.
Licensing Bill, Discussion of, *July 31*, 2015.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts. *Con.*, *July 31*, 1971, 1972, 1975, 1980, 1982, 1985, 1987, 1990, 1994, 1996.
Parliamentary Procedure
  Blocking Motions, *July 30*, 1783.
  Closure Resolutions, Increase in, *July 30*, 1783.
Supply
  Curtailment of Discussion by Closure, *July 30*, 1782, 1784.
  Irish Estimates, Procedure as to, *July 30*, 1786, 1790.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill—Standing Order XXXIX., *July 31*, 1905–1908.
Crofters, Arrears in Payment of Instalments by, etc., *July 22*, 40–43.
Dover Graving Docks Bill—Sessional Order as to Second Reading, *July 27*, 703; *July 29*, 1369.
Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill—Sessional Order as to Second Reading, *July 27*, 701.
Motors—Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1392.
Old-Age Pensions Bill—Third Reading in House of Lords, *July 29*, 1444.
Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—Suspension of Standing Orders 92 and 93, *July 30*, 1634.
Standing Orders—Amendment of certain Orders in House of Lords, *July 29*, 1370.
Telegraph (Construction) Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 263.

Ballinalack
Case of J. Carolan.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 106.

Ballinorley
School, closing of.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1767.
Q. Mr. McHugh, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1769.

Ballintoy Pier
Repair.
Q. Mr. Glendinning; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 24*, 506.

Ballymahon
Case of G. Daly.
Q. Mr. J. Phillips; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1198.

Ballymoney
Post Office Accommodation.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31*, 1952.

Ballynahinch
Extra Police on 13th inst.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 832.

Ballyvourneen
Case of Mrs. Reardon.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1505.

Banbury, Sir F. [City of London]
Army—Territorial Force Engineer Officers, Pay of, *July 23*, 326.
Civil Service Estimates—Supplementary Votes, *July 31*, 1961.
France
  Customs Tariff on certain British Imports, *July 27*, 985.
  Elastic Tissues—Import Duty on, *July 27*, 813.
Public Works Loans Bill, 2R., *July 22*, 245, 248.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Com.* *July 28*, 1356, 1360.

Bankruptcy
Annual Report Presented, *July 24*, 499, *July 27*, 707.
Rules (1908), Presented, *July 24*, 500; *July 27*, 707.

Baring, Mr. G. [Isle of Wight]
Special Reserve Officers, Position of, *July 29*, 1458.

Baring, Mr. G. V. [Winchester]
Army
  Officers' Promotion, effect of Special Reserve on, *July 27*, 910.
  Special Reserve.
    Officers, Conditions of Service for, *July 27*, 910.
    Organisation of, *July 27*, 911.

Barmagh
Case of J. Graham.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; A. Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1768.

Barnes, Mr. G. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Old-age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 1999.
Unemployment Grant, Proposals for, *July 22*, 89.

Barra, Island of
Exodus of Crofters to Vatersay, *see* Vatersay and Barra.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
Education
Brown and Nolan's Reader, *July 29*, 1507.
Convent School Grants, *July 31*, 1965.
National School Teachers' Allowances, *July 31*, 1948.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con., July 23*, 382–385, 396, 401–407, 410, 411; *July 24*, 555, 588; 3R., *July 25*, 622–624.
Londonderry
Flax Seed supplied, *July 22*, 94.
Postal Staff, *July 25*, 609.

Barron Estate
Case of Murphy Family.
Q. Mr. Power; A. Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 304.

Barry, Mr. E. [Cork County, S.]
Meat Supply Inquiry, Proposals for, *July 27*, 885.

Barry Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Basutoland
National Council Proceedings, etc.—Report Presented, *July 24*, 499, *July 27*, 706.
Special Report.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; A. Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 839.

Beach, Mr. M. H. [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 2R., *July 22*, 245.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1018.
Meat Supply Inquiry, Proposals for, *July 29*, 1491.
Poor Rate Exemption Act, 1840—Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1019.

Beardesley Evans Estate
Purchase of
Qs. Mr. Flynn; As. Mr. Birrell, *July 32*, 95.

Beauchamp, Earl
Army Strength—Return proposed, *July 29*, 1438.
Education, Secondary, in Wales—Return as to Voluntary subscriptions, proposed, *July 29*, 1436.
Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No 1) Bill, Commons Amendments, *July 29*, 1372.
Police Commission Report.
Gamble (or Pearce) case of, *July 30*, 1685.
Mis-statements by Constables, *July 30*, 1685,
Proceedings against Officers found Guilty, *July 30*, 1685.
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Com. July 27*, 731.
Shop Hours Act, Closing Orders under—Return proposed, *July 22*, 13.
Women Suffragists
Political Offenders, Treatment as proposed, *July 29*, 1432.
Prosecution of, *July 29*, 1430.

Beaumont, Mr. H. [Sussex, Eastbourne]
County Boroughs—Applications Refused *July 23*, 343.
Eastbourne, Charter for, *July 30*, 1762.

Bechuanaland
Special Report
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; A. Colonel Seely, *July 827*, 839.

Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill
l. 2R., *July 22*, 57.
Com. July 29, 1393.
3R. *July 30*, 1676.
c. Lords Amendments, *Con.* July 31*, 2014.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Beer
Brewing Statistics (1820–1907)
Q. Mr. Courthope; A. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 30*, 1732.
Use of Malt Substitutes.
Q. Mr. Essex; A. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 1469.

Belcoo and Enniskillen Loan Fund
Position of
Q. Mr. F. Meehan; A. Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 849.

Belfast
Police Transfer Cases;
Qs. Mr. Sloan; As. Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 305, 307.
Queen's College—Annual Report presented, *July 31*, 1909, 1943.
Unemployed—Relief Proposals.
Q. Mr. Devlin; A. Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 303.

[*cont.*

Belfast—*cont.*
University Proposals, Local Opinion on.
Qs. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *July 23*, 355, 356.
Workhouse—Number of Inmates.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. Devlin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 357.

Belfast Lough
Sand-Lifting from Foreshore
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, 853.

Belgium
Antwerp—Detention of British Subjects.
Os. Sir W. Bull, *July 27*, 988.
Religious Instruction in Schools.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 29*, 1458.

Belhaven and Stenton, Lord
Compulsory Military Service, Possibility of Establishing, *July 22*, 31.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]
Army
Government Policy, *July 28*, 1243.
Inquiries held since 1800—Return proposed, *July 29*, 1456.
Factories—Spark Catchers on chimneys, *July 29*, 1455.
Militia, Abolition of, *July 27*, 936.
Navy
"Defence," date of Completing, *Aug. 1*, 2083.
Expenditure — Comparison with Germany, *July 28*, 1210, 1211.
"Indomitable" Speed Test, *Aug. 1*, 2084.
Inquiries Held since 1800—Return proposed, *July 29*, 1456.
Keyham Private Students, Commission Offered to, *July 23*, 312.
Manœuvres, *Aug. 1*, 2084.
"Good Hope" and "Argyll" case, *July 30*, 1741.
Mess Debts, Payment of, *July 29*, 1455.
Officers Eligible as Interpreters, *July 31*, 1949.
Paymasters—Promotion System, *July 28*, 1196.
Press Communications by Officers, *July 28*, 1211, 1212; *July 30*, 1745.
Shipbuilding Programme, *Aug. 1*, 2083.
Comparison with Germany, *July 29*, 1478, 1480, 1481,
New Armoured Cruiser, *July 27*, 821.
"Whiting," Crew of, etc., *July 31*, 1950.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R. [Salford, S.]
Nigeria, Southern—Liquor Traffic Inquiry, *July 22*, 82.

Belper, Lord
Telegraph (Construction) Bill, 2R. *July 23*, 264.

Benn, Mr. W. W. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
Census of Production Act, Forms under, *July 22*, 71.
Port of London Bill—Alterations Suggested, *July 23*, 342.

Benn, Sir J. W. [Devonport]
Aldgate Tramway to Bow—Danger to Stud System, *July 22*, 89.
London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1869–1872.

Bennett, Mr. E. N. [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]
Old-Age Pensions—Medical Relief of Pensioner, *July 27*, 829.

Beresford Estate
Case of G. Crowley.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 304.

Berkshire
Charities—Return Presented, *July 29*, 1450.

Bermondsey
Monnow Road School.
Qs. Mr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 1497.

Bermuda
Engineer Stores.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 28*, 1190.

Bertram, Mr. J. [Hertfordshire, Hitchin]
Council of Judges, Report of, *July 30*, 1696.

Bills
Form of Presenting and Printing.
Qs. Mr. J. D. White; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 1476; *July 30*, 1736.
Legislation by Reference—Committee to Inquire into Drafting of Bills.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 29*, 1426; Lord Loreburn, 1427.
Private—Suspension of Standing Order 8.
Os. Mr. S. Wortley, *July 30*, 1776; Mr. S. MacNeill, 1776; Mr. Asquith, 1777, 1780; Mr. W. Long, 1778–1780.
Private and Provisional Confirmation—Suspension of Standing Order Nos. 92 and 93.
Motion (Lord Balfour of Burleigh), *July 30*, 1624.

Birmingham
- Post Office Staff Pay.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Aug. 1*, 2086.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]
- Agrarian Outrages—Statistics, *July 30*, 1802.
- Aileen Estate—Case of J. Cassidy, *July 30*, 1768.
- Annesley Estate—Case of W. Aherne, *July 29*, 1473.
- Ardglass Cattle-Driving Prosecutions, *July 22*, 99, 100.
- Ballinalack—Case of J. Carolan, *July 22*, 106.
- Ballinorley School, Closing of, *July 30*, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772.
- Ballymahon—Case of G. Daly, *July 28*, 1198.
- Ballynahinch Extra Police on 13th inst., *July 27*, 832.
- Ballyvourneen—Case of Mrs. Reardon, *July 29*, 1505.
- Barmagh—Case of J. Graham, *July 30*, 1769.
- Barron Estate—Case of Murphy Family, *July 23*, 304.
- Beardesley Evans Estate, Purchase of, *July 22*, 95, 96.
- Belcoo and Enniskillen Loan Fund, Position of, *July 27*, 850.
- Belfast
  - Police Transfer Cases, *July 23*, 305, 307.
  - Unemployed—Relief Proposals, *July 23*, 308.
  - University Proposals, Local Opinion on, *July 23*, 355, 356.
  - Workhouse—Number of Inmates, *July 23*, 359.
- Beresford Estate—Case of G. Crowley, *July 23*, 304.
- Blacker-Douglas Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 29*, 1476; *July 30*, 1713.
- Blackrock Tramp Nuisance, *July 29*, 1472.
- Box—Rents of B. O'Reilly, T. Walsh, and P. Callan, *July 23*, 298.
- Boxwell Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 27*, 835.
- Brockagh—Case of E. Gillmore, *July 28*, 1186.
- Brookborough-Orange Arches on Public Road, *July 29*, 1506.
- Caledon Band Parade on 7th inst., *July 30*, 1708.
- Castle Archdale Estate—Case of J. Bacon, *July 30*, 1768.
- Castletown Cattle-drive, *July 23*, 359.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Cattle-drives
  - Cases in the North, *July 25*, 614.
  - Government Attitude, *July 22*, 100, 101.
  - Prosecution of Offenders, *July 30*, 1805.
- Cavan Evicted Tenants, Position of, *July 29*, 1472.
- Claremorris School, Use of, *July 28*, 1199.
- Clery Minors Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 29*, 1504.
- Clonrellick Land Purchase, *July 28*, 1198.
- Colthurst Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 28*, 1200.
- Condition of Ireland, *July 22*, 111; *July 30*, 1801–1808.
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1800–1808.
- Constabulary
  - Canteen Fund, *Aug. 1*, 2090.
  - Cosgrove, J., Case of, *July 25*, 611.
  - Extra Police, Charge for (1905–8); *July 24*, 510; *July 30*, 1807.
  - Legislative Proposals, *July 31*, 1965.
  - Phœnix Park Depot, Baths at, *Aug. 1*, 2089.
  - Recruits—Messing Arrangements, *Aug. 1*, 2090.
- Contempt of Court—Remission of Irish Sentences, *July 22*, 103, 104.
- Contempt of Courts Bill, Proposals as to, *July 22*, 107.
- Cooper Estate—Cases of J. McGrath and T. Barry, *July 28*, 1187.
- Cork
  - Condition of, *July 22*, 105.
  - Process Servers, Protection of, *July 27*, 835.
- Cork College—Nomination of Mr. E. Fitzgerald, *July 22*, 109.
- Cranagill Orange Order, Use of Highway by, *July 25*, 615, 616; *July 29*, 1502.
- Crimes Act, Re-imposition of, proposed, *July 30*, 1805.
- Croften Estate—Case of J. Reynolds, *July 30*, 1707.
- Croker Estate—Cases of Peacocke and Mrs. Hammersley, *July 29*, 1504.
- Crookenden and Casey Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 30*, 1694.
- Curraheen Schoolhouse, State of, *July 29*, 1470.
- De Blaquiere Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 23*, 358.
  - Uneconomic Holdings, *July 29*, 1506; *Aug. 1*, 2081, 2082, 2083.
- Dease Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 23*, 353.
- Derrycassan Estate, Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *July 23*, 364.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
  Dickson Estate, Disposal of, *July 29*, 1503.
  Donegal Assizes—Catholics on Grand Juries, *July 23*, 362.
  Drumlinny—Case of P. M'Guirk, *July 30*, 1695.
  Dublin Metropolitan Police—Case of Staff-Sergeant Scully, *July 31*, 1964.
  Education Board—Duties of Secretaries, *July 27*, 852.
    Brown and Nolan's Reader, *July 29*, 1507, 1508.
    Compulsory Attendance — Local Authorities adopting Act of 1892, *July 23*, 354.
    Convent School Grants, *July 31*, 1966
    Grants Additional, Conditions of giving, *July 23*, 307, 364; *July 27*, 832.
    Inspector, Complaints against, *July 28*, 1201; *July 31*, 1965.
    Intermediate
      Inspectorate, *July 30*, 1710.
      Rules, *July 27*, 836.
    National School Teachers
      Allowances, *July 31*, 1949.
      Assistant Teachers' Salaries, *July 23*, 352.
      Salary Increase, Proposals for, *July 28*, 1189.
    Small Schools, Decision as to, *July 31*, 1966.
  Ely Estate—Cases of B. M'Garrahan and McCullagh, *July 30*, 1697.
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 22*, 241; *Com. July 27*, 990, 991.
  Evictions
    Applications for Reinstatement, *July 22*, 96.
    Reinstatement Regulations, *Aug. 1*, 2089.
  Eyrecourt—Case of Hynes, *July 27*, 832.
  Falkner Estate, Sale of, *July 29*, 1472.
  Farrihy—Case of J. Haugh, *July 29*, 1501.
  Fermoy Courthouse, Control of, *July 28*, 1188.
  Fleury Estate—Case of J. Sisk, *July 31*, 1964.
  Follictt Estate—Case of M. Felby, *July 28*, 1178.
  Franks Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 30*, 1712.
  Fuge Estate Untenanted Land, *July 22*, 95.
  Galway, Condition of, *July 27*, 833.
  Ginnell, Mr.—Speech at Meeting in Ballinalack, *July 22*, 108.
  Glen Boat Cove Improvement Works, *July 29*, 1470.
  Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill, *Com. July 22*, 239.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
  Grazing Lands, Disputes as to, *July 30*, 1802-1804.
  Grehan Estate—Case of J. Therry and Son, *July 23*, 361.
  Harlech Estate—Case of Mrs. A. Reilly, *July 30*, 1706.
  Hastings Twiss Estate—Case of D. Barry, *July 23*, 303.
  Hort Estate Sale Proposals, *July 31*, 1962.
  Hynes Estate Sale Proposals, *July 31*, 1946.
  Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 375, 383, 384, 393, 394, 397, 407-411, 414, 416, 432-436, 444,-446, 453, 458, 461-464, 474; *July 24*, 513, 544-548, 557, 565, 568-570, 573, 574, 580, 589, 593, 594, 3R., 640-646; Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 2001.
    Draft Charters, Amended, Issue of, *July 22*, 106.
    Extern Students, *July 23*, 357.
    Grants, *July 25*, 614.
    Titles of new Universities, *July 22*, 111.
    Vatican Opinion, *July 25*, 615.
  Kanturk Process Server, Attack on, *July 22*, 104.
  Kearney Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 23*, 361.
  Kerry Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *July 23*, 351.
  Killarney Land Commission Sittings, *July 29*, 1475.
  King-Harman Estate Sale Proposals, *July 29*, 1471.
  Kingston Estate Sale Proposals, *July 24*, 510.
  Kinvarra Firing Outrage, on 12th inst., *July 22*, 98.
  Labourers (Ireland) Act—Stamp Duty, *July 23*, 363.
  Land Commission
    Boyd, Mr., Experience of, *July 23*, 354.
    Fair Rents—Originating Notices (1890-1903), *July 30*, 1772.
    Report, *July 27*, 834.
  Land Purchase Transactions, *July 27*, 834; *July 29*, 1503.
  Lane-Joynt Estate — Cases of Mrs. O'Shaughnessy and Mrs. Hayes, *July 22*, 73.
  Leslie Estate—Cases of D. McClean and P. McClushy, *July 27*, 852; *July 29*, 1474.
  Lewis Estate Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *July 23*, 358.
  Limerick Land Sale Negotiations, *July 28*, 1187.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Listowel Fair Rent Decisions, *July 31*, 1946.
- Listowel Estate, Disposal of, *July 30*, 1712.
- Local Government Board Auditors, *July 23*, 362, 363.
- Longwood—Speeches of Mr. P. McKenna and Mr. McGuire, *July 22*, 110.
- McGillicuddy Eager Estate — Evicted Tenants' Applications, *July 29*, 1471.
- Madden Estate—Case of D. Dorgan, *July 22*, 74.
- Maghery Catholic Excursion on 5th inst., *July 27*, 851.
- Marsham Estate—Case of M. Dunne, *July 30*, 1706.
- Milford Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 27*, 854.
- Mohill Seed Loan—Period for Repayment, *July 30*, 1706.
- Monaghan Evicted Tenants, *Aug. 1*, 2079.
- Monedarrah Grazing Land, Sale of, *July 23*, 352.
- Mountmellick Labourers' Cottages Scheme —Case of M. Delany, *July 27*, 852.
- Nason Estate—Case of Mrs. M. Eagan, *July 22*, 74.
- O'Connell Estate Sale Proposals, *July 29*, 1471.
- Oatquarter School Teacher's Salary, *July 23*, 306.
- Orange Demonstration, Disturbances during *July 25*, 614, 615.
- Outrages in which Firearms were used, *July 29*, 1505.
- Persons under Police Protection, *July 29*, 1504.
- Portadown
  - Catholics and Protestants in William Street, *July 30*, 1707.
  - Disturbance on 13th inst., *July 23*, 308, 309.
  - Process Servers, Protection of, *July 22*, 104, 105.
- Queen's County
  - Deputy-Lieutenants, *Aug. 1*, 2088.
  - Evicted Tenants, Position of, *July 30*, 1711.
- Quiltybo Schoolhouse, *July 23*, 310.
- Raheen—Case of Mrs. Sheehy, *July 22* 72.
- Rathcline—Case of B. and J. Mullooly, *July 23*, 353.
- Rathdowney Disturbance, *July 28*, 1200; *July 27*, 831.
- Rathkeale—Case of J. Reardon, *July 22*, 73.
- Reynall *v.* Taafe, Decision as to, *July 22*, 106.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Richardson Estate Sale Proposals, *July 23*, 354.
- Roads Boat Slip, Improvement of, *July 29*, 1470.
- Roscommon
  - Clerk to Board of Guardians, *July 24*, 511.
  - Condition of, *July 22*, 110.
- Royal University—Catholic Attendance, *July 23*, 357.
- Sligo, Condition of, *July 22*, 96, 97.
- Smith Estate—Case of J. D. McAuliffe, *July 29*, 1475.
- Tanderagee Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *July 27*, 854.
- Taylor Estate—Fishery Rights, *July 23*, 360.
- Tulrahan Farm, Price of, *July 23*, 364.
- Vermin, Legislative Measures for Suppressing, *July 25*, 614.
- Wallace Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 22*, 72.
- Warden Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 31*, 1946.
- West Estate—case of Peter D. Kelly, *July 27*, 849.
- Westmeath, Condition of, *July 22*, 111.
- Wexford Labourers' Cottages Schemes, *July 30*, 1710.
- White Estate—Case of Mrs. M. Callaghan, *July 29*, 1475.
- Winn Estate—Interest on Purchase money, *July 23*, 351.
- Workhouse Teachers, Position of, *July 29*, 1474.

Births
- Certificates—Cost of Copy.
  - *Q.* Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1705.
- Ireland—Annual Report Presented, *July 25*, 598; *July 27*, 706.

Bisley Camp
- Hawkers' Licences.
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 1468.

Blackburn Corporation Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *July 23*, 253.
- *c.* Lords Amendments, *Con.** *July 27*, 807.
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Blacker-Douglas Estate
- Sale Proposals.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1476; *July 30*, 1713.

Blackrock
- Tramp Nuisance.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1471.

Blaydon and Ryton Water (Transfer) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug.* 1, 2076.

Bleaching and Dye Works
Women, Conditions of Employment.
Os. Mr. Gill, *July 29*, 591.

Bognor Gas Light and Coke Company Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]
Cahirdaniel Postal Delays, *July 31*, 1951.
Castlequin Model Farm Scheme, *July 29*, 1464.
Curraheen Schoolhouse, State of, *July 29*, 1469.
Education—Brown and Nolan's Reader, *July 29*, 1506.
Glen Boat Cove Improvement Works, *July 29*, 1470.
Kenmare Train Service, *July 22*, 93, 94; *July 29*, 1463.
McGillicuddy Eager Estate — Evicted Tenants' Applications, *July 29*, 1470.
Milk Supply—Condensed Milk Company Case, *Aug. 1*, 2084.
O'Connell Estate Sale Proposals, *July 29*, 1471.
Roads Boat Slip, Improvement of, *July 29*, 1470.
Sneem—Postal Facilities in District, *July 29*, 1459.
Warden Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 31*, 1946.
Waterville Postal Delays, *July 31*, 1951.
Winn Estate—Interest on Purchase Money, *July 23*, 351.

Bolton
Post Office Staff.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson. *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31*, 1951.

Bonar Bridge
Case of J. Murray.
Q. Mr. Weir. *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *July 30*, 1731.

Books
Import Regulations.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 27*, 816.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]
Brentford—Case of Swallow, *July 30*, 1757.
Licensing Bill, Allocation of time to, *July 23*, 366.

Boulton, Mr. A. C. F. [Huntingdonshire, Ramsey]
Natal Affairs—Right to Criticise, *July 28*, 1323.

Boulton, Mr. A. C. F —*cont.*
Transvaal
Civil Servants' Grievances, *July 28*, 1324.
Loan of £5,000,000—Imperial Guarantee, *July 28*, 1323.

Bournemouth
Post Office
Allocation of Duties.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31*, 1952.
Classification
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24*, 501.

Bowerman, Mr. C. W. [Deptford]
Deptford Victualling Yard
Discharge System, *July 29*, 1481.
Labourers employed on Coopers' Work, *July 27*, 820.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, N.]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill—Constitution of Standing Committee C., *July 27*, 888.
Director of Army Finance, Office of, *Aug. 1*, 2091, 2092.
Government Departments' Expenditure (1905-9), *July 24*, 508.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1974, 1987, 1998.
Revenue raised by Taxes, *July 28*, 1193.
War Office Accounting Officer, Name of, *July 31*, 1959.
Webber, Mr., Case of, *Aug. 1*, 2092, 2093.
Willesden—Case of W. Barnard, *July 27*, 825.

Box
Rents of B. O'Reilly, T. Walsh and P. Callan.
Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 298.

Boxwell Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 834.

Bramsdon, Mr. T. A. [Portsmouth]
Anæthetics, Deaths from—Inquiry proposed, *July 31*, 1952.

Brass Foundries
Regulations, *see* Factories and Workshops.

Brassey, Lord
Dover Graving Docks Bill—Sessional Order as to Second Reading, *July 27*, 702.
Merchant Service—Training of Officers, *July 22*, 46–49.

Brazil
Trade Report presented, *July 30*, 1635.

Brecon
Meeting on 12th ult. Disturbance at.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards. *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 28*, 1190.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 29*, 1487.

Brentford
Case of Swallow.
Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1757.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1796–1800, 1829.
Education
Building Grants, *July 30*, 1796–1798.
Compulsory Attendance Committee, *July 22*, 91.
Half-Timers Committee, Constitution of, etc., *July 30*, 1798–1800, 1829.
Natal—Dinizulu Case, *Aug. 1*, 2094.

Bright, Mr. J. A. [Oldham]
Indian Churches, Use of, *July 22*, 227.

Bristol
Post Office Erection—Notices Posted by Contractor.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 27*, 840.
Q. Mr. H. Davies; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 28*, 1181.

Bristol, Bishop of
Matrimonial Causes Bill, 2R., *July 22*, 10.

Bristol Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Bristol Tramways Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

British Indians in the Colonies
Conference, proposed.
Os. Mr. M. Ferguson, *July 28*, 1306–1308; Mr. H. Greenwood, 1308; Colonel Seely, 1332.
Inter-Colonial and Imperial Agreement, proposed.
Os. Mr. A. E. W. Mason, *July 31*, 2027, 2028; Colonel Seely, 2028–2034; Sir G. Parker, 2034.
Position of.
Qs. Sir W. Bull, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Dr. Rutherford; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 85.
Report of Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King.
Os. Mr. A. E. W. Mason, *July 31*, 2025–2027; Colonel Seely, 2029, 2031.
Shapurji, Mr., Case of.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1222.

British Indians in the Colonies—*cont.*
Transvaal Arrests, etc.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 30*, 1750.

British Museum
Extension—Cause of Delay.
Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 28*, 1185.

Briton Ferry Urban District Council Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Brockagh
Case of E. Gillmore.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1186.

Brodie, Mr. H. C. [Surrey, Reigate]
Africa, South—Cost of Garrison, *July 23*, 322.
Women's Suffrage Movement—Prison Treatment, *July 23*, 338, 339.

Bromley and Crays Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Brookborough
Orange Arches on Public Road.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Lardner; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1505.

Bruni
British Authority.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1225.
Trade Statistics.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1226.

Buchanan, Rt. Hon. T. R.—*Under-Secretary for India* [Perthshire, E.]
Administrative Policy, *July 22*, 127, 213; *July 30*, 1746, 1747.
Afforestation of Waste Lands, *July 30*, 1746.
Allygurh Seditious Telegram Case, *Aug. 1*, 2087.
Army Expenditure, *July 22*, 116–118.
Bengal
Partition of, *July 22*, 127.
Press Regulation, Necessity for, *July 23*, 299.
Bombay
Disturbances, *July 28*, 1218; *July 29*, 1483, 1484; *Aug. 1*, 2087.
Factories, Commission Report, *July 28*, 1221.
Budget Surplus, *July 22*, 114, 115.
Calcutta
Bomb Conspiracy, *July 22*, 125.
Liquor Licences, *July 28*, 1215.
Liquor Shops, Hour of Closing, *July 28*, 1215.

Buchanan, Rt. Hon. T. R.—*cont.*
- Churches
  - Expenditure on Upkeep, *July 27*, 830.
  - Use of, by other Denominations, *July 22*, 225; *July 27*, 830.
- Condition of India, *July 22*, 113; *July 30*, 1745, 1746.
- Customs, Yield from, *July 22*, 123.
- Death Rate Statistics, *July 27*, 831; *July 30*, 1714.
- Debt-Charge, Position of, *July 22*, 122.
- Decentralisation Commission Report, *July 22*, 127, 128.
- Economic and Industrial Condition, *July 22*, 124.
- Education
  - Increased Expenditure on, *July 22*, 116, 213.
  - Reform of Present System, proposed, *July 22*, 214,
- Executive and Judicial Functions, Separation of, *July 28*, 1214.
- Excise Administration Statement, *July 28*, 1215.
- Exports and Imports—Statistics, *July 22*, 123.
- Famine
  - Effect on Expenditure, *July 22*, 118.
  - Loans to Local Authorities, *July 22*, 119, 120.
  - Relief Works—Suspension of Land Revenue, etc., *July 22*, 119, 121; *July 28*, 1220.
- Government Stores, Local Purchase of, *July 22*, 80.
- Jasden Succession, *July 22*, 80; *July 30*, 1715; *July 31*, 1967.
- Kankinara Bomb Outrage, *July 22*, 81.
- Kothandaramayya, Mr., Case of, *July 30*, 1714, 1715.
- Limbdi Succession, *July 22*, 80.
- Military Training of Civilians, *July 23*, 300.
- Mohmand Campaign, Conduct and Organisation of, *July 22*, 117.
- Mosques and Temples, Grant for Upkeep of, *July 27*, 830, 848.
- Muscat—Traffic in Arms, *July 28*, 1213, 1214.
- Muslim Attitude towards public unrest, etc., *July 28*, 1214.
- Opium Revenue, Diminution of, *July 22*, 115.
- Orissa Village Records, *July 28*, 1191.
- Plague Statistics, *July 22*, 124, 125.
- Police Reforms, Increased Expenditure due to, *July 22*, 116.
- Press Act, Enforcement of, *July 22*, 125.
- Prisoners, Treatment of, *July 28*, 1220.

Buchanan, Rt. Hon. T. R.—*cont.*
- Public Works Department—Pay of Engineers, *July 29*, 1484.
- Quetta-Nushki Trade Route, Traffic by, *July 28*, 1212.
- Railways, Revenue Derived from, *July 22*, 122.
- Revenue and Expenditure Accounts, *July 22*, 113, 114.
- Salt Duty, Loss of Revenue due to Reduction of, *July 22*, 114, 115.
- Sedition, Measures for Dealing with, *July 22*, 125.
  - Prosecutions (1907–8), *July 28*, 1219.
- Statement, *July 22*, 113–129.
- Sylhet Bomb Manufacture, *July 28*, 1213.
- Tilak, Mr., Case of, *July 28*, 1216, 1217, 1218; *July 29*, 1483; *July 30*, 1747, 1748.
- Tinnevelly—Cases of Chidambaram Pillay and Subramania Siva, *July 28*, 1220.
- Transportation Law, *July 28*, 1219.

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Building Societies
- [*See also Names of Societies.*]
- Fraudulent Concerns, Protection against.
  - *Q.* Mr. Seddon; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1759.

Building Trade
- State of
  - *Q.* Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 30*, 1729.

Bull, Sir W. J. [Hammersmith]
- Antwerp—Detention of British Subjects, *July 27*, 988.
- British Indians in the Colonies, Position of, *July 22*, 85.
- British Museum Extension—Cause of Delay, *July 28*, 1185.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
- London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1868.

Burke, Mr. E. H. [King's County, Tullamore]
- Irish Universities Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 2008.

Burnley Corporation Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *July 23*, 253.
- c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 24*, 497.
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
- Agricultural Rates Act—Application to Poultry Farms, *July 27*, 843.

[*cont.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Chapels and Churches, Rating of, *July 27*, 843.
Coast Erosion Inquiry—Progress made, *July 29*, 1569, 1574.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1*, 2103.
County Boroughs, Applications Refused, *July 23*, 344.
County and Borough Councils—Financial Relations, *July 31*, 1959.
Driffield Guardians' Vaccination Contract, *July 28*, 1239.
Eastbourne, Charter for, *July 30*, 1762.
Edenbridge—Case of D. Nicholls, *July 27*, 844; *July 29*, 1493.
Erith Unemployed Relief Works, *July 30*, 1761.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1017, 1026, 1032–1036, 1043, 1045, 1049.
Forestry, Afforestation facilities, *July 29*, 1560, 1574.
Gateshead Unemployment, Public Bodies dealing with, *July 31*, 1967
Government Departments, *Status* of—Progress made with Inquiry, *July 29*, 1561.
Labour Colonies—Hollesley Bay Experiment, *July 29*, 1570–1572.
Light Railways Act, 1896—Amendment of certain Clauses, proposed, *July 27*, 1026.
Local Government Board
    Loans to Municipalities, *July 29*, 1565–1567.
    Sinking Funds on Public Buildings—Period of Repayment, *July 29*, 1566.
London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894—Amount levied and distributed, *July 25*, 609.
Manchester Unemployment Grant, *July 30*, 1760.
Metropolitan Water Board, Clerks employed by, *July 23*, 344.
Motors
    Competitions on Public Highways, *July 28*, 1239.
    Dust Nuisance, Suggestions for obviating, *July 28*, 1240.
    Law as to, necessity for strengthening, *July 27*, 1032–1036; *July 29*, 1562, 1564.
    Police Traps, *July 30*, 1761, 1762.
    Scouts giving Warning against Police Traps, Necessity for dealing with, *July 29*, 1563.
    Sign-posts, Duties of Local Authorities in connection with, *July 29*, 1563.
    Speed Regulation, *Aug. 1*, 2095, 2096
        Automatic Restriction, *July 27*, 818.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Poor Relief, Annual Cost of, *July 31*, 1958.
Poor Rate Exemption Act, 1840—Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1018.
Poplar Poor Law Guardians, Allocation of Clothing Contracts by, *July 27*, 819.
Severn Foreshore, Ownership of, *July 28*, 1238.
Shoeburyness—Foreshore acquired by War Office, *July 28*, 1238.
Tramways—Men employed, *July 31*, 1945.
Tuberculosis
    Commission, Value of Work of, *July 29*, 1564.
    Notifications of, *July 23*, 315.
Unemployed Workmen Act—Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1043–1045, 1049.
Unemployment
    Administration of Act, *July 29*, 1567, 1575.
    Distress Committees, Work of, *July 29*, 1567, 1568.
    Urgency of and Suggestions for dealing with the Question, *July 29*, 1567, 1569, 1570; *July 31*, 2013.
    Women's Work Department of Central Body, Reports on, *July 29*, 1572, 1573.
Vaccination
    Cooper, Mr., Case of, *July 27*, 819.
    Exemption Certificates received in 1907, *July 23*, 344.
    Gallimore, J., Case of, *July 22*, 91, 92.
Windsor Motorists, Prosecution of, *July 27*, 818.

Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Business of the House
Course of.
    Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 367; Mr. W. Long, Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 1512.
Private Business—Suspension of Standing Order 8.
    Motion (Mr. Asquith), *July 30*, 1775.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
Education
    Registration Council Staff—Position on Abolition of Office, *July 27*, 825.
    Small Schools, Decision as to, *July 31*, 1966.

[*cont.*

Butcher, Mr. S. H.—*cont.*

Irish Universities Bill, *Con., July 23,* 383, 409, 430–432, 443, 452, 456, 473; *July 24,* 513, 533–537, 565, 567–569; 583, 3R., *July 25,* 646–650; Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31,* 2006.

Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts.' *Con., July 31,* 1991.

Butter

Nut Butter, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 29,* 1459.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]

Armagh Post Office Appointments, *July 24,* 501.

Auxiliaries, Rural, Pay of, *July 23,* 312.

Ballymoney Post Office Accommodation, *July 31,* 1952.

Birmingham Post Office Staff, Pay, *Aug. 1,* 2086.

Bolton Post Office Staff, *July 31,* 1951.

Bournemouth Post Office
- Allocation of Duties, *July 31,* 1952.
- Classification, *July 24,* 501.

Bradley, Miss, Case of, *July 22,* 69; *July 24,* 505.

Cahirdaniel Postal Delays, *July 31,* 1951.

China—Tientsin British Post Office, *July 24,* 504.

Classification of certain Towns, *July 28,* 1172.

Clothing Contracts, Allocation of, *July 27,* 886.

Contracts placed in Scotland, *July 31,* 1947.

Cork Post Office
- Overseer, Examination for, *July 29,* 1454.
- Surveyors, Allowances to, *July 28,* 11192.
- Telegraphic Delays, *July 29,* 1454.

Cost of Living in certain Towns, *July 23,* 312.

Creech Grange Postmistress, hours of, *July 28,* 1179.

Dunleer Subpostmastership Vacancy, *July 29,* 1453.

Hastings and St. Leonards Post Office Duties, *July 29,* 1459.

Londonderry Postal Staff, *July 25,* 609.

Mail Conveyance by Thames Steamboats, *July 28,* 1180.

Manchester Post Office Staff, *July 31,* 1951.

Maryborough Postman, Speech by, *July 29,* 1494.

Millport Telegraph Facilities, *July 29,* 1493.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*

Newcastle-under-Lyme Post Office Classication, *July 27,* 887.

Newspaper Postage Regulations, *July 31,* 1948.

Oldham Postmen's Wages, *July 30,* 1763.

Pensions, Payment of, *July 30,* 1764.

Port Talbot Postmen's Duties, *July 31,* 1948.

Portadown Disturbance on 13th inst., *July 24,* 505.

Provincial Superintending Engineers' Offices Staff, *July 27,* 810.

Putney Telephone Service, *July 30,* 1764.

Rushden Postmen, Pay of, *July 29,* 1494.

Saltcoats Postmen, Pay of, *July 22,* 65.

Savings Bank
- Female Clerks, Transfer of, *July 24,* 503.
- Irish Work, *July 24,* 502, 504.

Shetland Cable Breakdown, Cause of, *July 27,* 839; *July 28,* 1181.

Sligo Post Office Night Duty, *July 28,* 1180.

Small-Pox among Employees, *July 28,* 1180.

Sneem—Postal Facilities in District, *July 29,* 1459.

Sunday Duty, Payment for, *July 28,* 1173.

Telegraph Service—Porterage paid to Outsiders, *July 27,* 841.

Territorial Force, Leave of Officials, *July 25,* 610.

Wakefield Post Office Extension, *July 27,* 840.

Waterville Postal Delays, *July 31,* 1951.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]

All-British Steamship Route, Scheme for, *July 30,* 1773.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1,* 2100.

Creich—Burning of Houses, *July 29,* 1501.

Irish Universities Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31,* 2010.

Jamaica—Banana Trade, *July 28,* 1227.

Natal
- Dinizulu, Trial of, *July 22,* 88; *July 30,* 1749.
- Indemnity Act, *Aug. 1,* 2100.

Provincial Homes Investment Company, Operations of, *July 23,* 347.

Women's Suffrage Movement—Prison Treatment, *July 23,* 339.

Cabs

Railway Station Service.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 27,* 814.

[*cont.*

Cabs—*cont.*
Taximeter—Overcrowding
Qs. Mr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 72*, 812.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 29*, 1490.

Cahirdaniel
Postal Delays.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31*, 1951.

Caledon
Band Parade on 7th inst.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1707.

Caledonian Canal
Report Presented, *July 27*, 810.

Camborne Water Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Cambrian Railways Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M. [Dublin University]
National Assurance Company of Ireland—Case of Corrigan *v* Read, *July 29*, 1509, 1510.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill—Lords Amendts., *July 29*, 1632.

Camperdown, Earl of
Bills—Legislation by Reference, *July 29*, 1426.
Crofters, Arrears in Payment of Instalments by, etc., *July 22*, 32–38, 46.
Education, Secondary, in Wales—Return as to Voluntary Subscriptions, proposed, *July 29*, 1436.
Irish Universities Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 741, 743; *Com. July 30*, 1670; Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts., *July 31*, 1941.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1122, 1161, 1163; *Rep.*, *July 29*, 1439; Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts., *July 31*, 1928, 1934.
Third Reading in House of Lords, *July 29*, 1444.
Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Commons' Amendts., *July 29*, 1372.

Canada
Cattle Disease.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 23*, 345.
Immigration Regulations for Consumptive Persons.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1721.

Canada—*cont.*
Tariff Treaty with France.
Qs. Sir E. Sassoon; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 28*, 1229.

Cardiff Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Carlile, Mr. E. H. [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1059.
Army
Special Reserve
Foreign Service Organisation, *July 27*, 931.
Organisation of, *July 27*, 931–934.
Territorial Force
Cyclist Battalions and Companies, *July 27*, 866, 867.
Wagon and Harness Supply, *July 23*, 302.
Army Estimates—Application of Surpluses to Meet Deficiencies, *July 27*, 1067.
Land Purchase Stock
Applications for New Issues, *July 27*, 829.
Suggestions for Future Issue, *July 29*, 1510.
Lunacy Statistics, *July 30*, 1756.
Metropolitan Water Board, Clerks Employed by, *July 23*, 344.
Naval Marriages Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1056, 1057.
Siam, New Agreement with, *July 25*, 612.

Carr-Gomm, Mr. H. W. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
Port of London Bill—Alterations Suggested, *July 23*, 342.
Post Office Mail Conveyance by Thames Steamboats, *July 28*, 1180.
Waste Paper—Disposal of Prison Registers, *July 27*, 880.

Earl Carrington [*President of the Board of Agriculture*]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, Commons Amendts., *July 30*, 1677, 1679.
Cattle Importation Restrictions, Removal of, proposed, *July 23*, 293.
Commons Bill, 3R., *July 28*, 1165.
Cran Measures Bill, 2R., *July 22*, 51.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 412–414, 459, 471.

Castle Archdale Estate
Case of J. Bacon.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1768.

Castlequin
Model Farm Scheme.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 29,* 1464.

Castlereagh, Lord [Maidstone]
Naval Manœuvres — "Good Hope" and "Argyll" Case, *July 30,* 1741.

Castletown
Cattle-drive.
Q. Captain Craig ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23,* 359.

Cattle
Diseases, Contagious, Notification of.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 30,* 1728.
Diseases in America—Issue of Leaflet, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 28,* 1195.
Importation Restrictions
Foreign Representations.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 28,* 1228.
Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 28,* 1242.
Removal, proposed.
Os. Earl of Onslow, *July 23,* 292 ; Earl Carrington, 293.

Causton, Rt. Hon. R. K. [Southwark, W.]
Income-Tax Officers on Retired Pay, Form Issued to, *July 28,* 1185.

Cavan
Evicted Tenants Position of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29,* 1472.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]
Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill, 2r. *July 28,* 1363.
London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2r. *July 30,* 1861.

Cawley, Sir F. [Lancashire, Prestwich]
Provincial Homes Investment Company, Operations of, *July 23,* 346 ; *July 27,* 884.

Cayo
Rent Collection.
Q. Mr. L. Williams ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 27,* 826.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
Autumn Session—Business Arrangements, *July 31,* 2021.
Belgium—Religious Instruction in Schools, *July 29,* 1458.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2r., *July 30,* 1831–1833.
Schedule B., Amendment to out of Order, *July 31,* 1968–1970.

Cecil, Lord R.—*cont.*
Cran Measures Bill, *Com. July 28,* 1367.
Education—Building Grants, *July 30,* 1831–1833.
Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill, 2r., *July 28,* 1363.
Garforth School Dispute, *July 29,* 1498.
Germany—Religious Teaching in Prussian and Bavarian Schools, *July 29,* 1458.
Llangollen School Dispute, *July 29,* 1498.
Meat Supply—Beef Prices in 1907–8, *July 25,* 600.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31,* 1972, 1973, 1976, 1979, 1992, 1997.
Penmachno School Site, *July 29,* 1498, 1499.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Number of, etc., *July 30,* 1728.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
Africa, East, Steamship Communication with, *July 29,* 1458.

Census of Production Act
Forms Under.
Q. Mr. W. Benn ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22,* 71.
Returns, Date of Making.
Q. Mr. Gretton ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27,* 847.

Central Ireland Electric Power Bill
l. 3r. * *July 27,* 704.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* * *July 29* 1447.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2078.

Ceylon
Pearl Fisheries—Leasing to Private Company.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28,* 1246 ; Colonel Seely, 1261.
Public Works—Employment of Natives.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton ; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 27,* 838.

Chairman and Deputy - Chairman — Rulings
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, Schedule B—Amendment out of Order, *July 31,* 1968, 1969, 1970.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
Deletion of Part II. from Schedule, *July 27,* 1011.
Inquiries as to Act included was in Order, *July 27,* 1051.
Matter relevant to certain Amendments, *July 27,* 1019, 1025, 1029, 1030, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1043.
Motion must not be characterised as "Insincere," *July 27,* 1047.
Irrelevant matter, *July 27,* 926, 995, 1005, 1007.

[*cont.*

Chairman and Deputy-Chairman—Rulings —*cont.*
- Members should resume Seats on Rising of Chairman, *July 28*, 1270.
- Naval Marriages Bill, Matter relevant to, *July 27*, 1057, 1058.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill
  - Amendment omitted from List, Procedure as to taking, *July 28*, 1130.
  - Amendments, Wording of, *July 28*, 1118.
- Progress, Motion to Report, *July 27*, 1056.
- Unparliamentary Expressions, *July 28*, 1271.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. [Worcestershire, E.]
- Argentina, Increase in British Trade with, *July 25*, 685.
- Coal Tax, Abolition of, *July 25*, 667.
- Expenditure, Additional, Proposals for meeting, *July 25*, 664–669.
- Finance Bill, 3R., *July 25*, 663–669, 681, 685, 688, 691.
  - Precedure with Regard to Discussion, *July 25*, 663.
- Old-Age Pensions—Source of Funds, *July 25*, 664.
- Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 25*, 667.
- Taxation—Necessity for providing New Sources, *July 25*, 666–669, 691.
- Tea Duty, Reduction of, *July 25*, 667.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
- *Rt. Hon. Viscount Fowler.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer
- *Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.*

Channing, Sir F. A. [Northamptonshire, E.]
- Agricultural Rates Act—Application to Poultry Farms, *July 27*, 843.
- Autumn Session—Business Arrangements, *July 31*, 2020.
- Kettering—Bowler *v.* Foskett, Case, *July 29*, 1488.
- Motor Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1544, 1545.
- Rushden Postmen, Pay of, *July 29*, 1494.
- Tuberculosis Commission, Value of Work, *July 29*, 1542, 1543.
- Unemployment—Urgency of the Question, *July 29*, 1541.

Chapels and Churches
- Rating of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hutton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 27*, 843.

Chaplin, Rt. Hn. [Surrey, Wimbledon]
- Government Departments, *Status* of, Progress made with Inquiry, *July 29*, 1540.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon.—*cont.*
- London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1846–1848.
- Motors
  - Dust Nuisance, *July 29*, 1540.
  - Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1539.

Charities
- [*See Names of Counties, etc.*]
- Weir Charity, Objections to
  - *Q.* Sir H. Kimber; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *July 30*, 1731.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* (Liverpool, Exchange)
- Agriculture Department
  - Official Information, Circular against divulging, *July 28*, 1240.
  - Veterinary Branch Salaries, *July 28*, 1241.
- Cattle-Driving Cases
  - Prosecution of Offenders, *July 30*, 1821.
  - Self-Protection by Graziers, Measures Permissible for, *July 23*, 349, 350.
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1819–1822.
- Crimes Act, Re-imposition of, proposed, *July 30*, 1819, 1820.
- Kildorrery Petty Sessions—Case of W. Stackpoole, *Aug. 1*, 2086.
- Londonderry—Larceny from Quay, *July 27*, 846.
- Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Lords Amendt., *July 31*, 2014.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
- *Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.*

China
- Foreign Trade in 1907.
  - *Q.* Earl of Ronaldshay; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 311.
- Tienstin British Post Office.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24*, 504.
- Trade Report Presented, *July 30*, 1635.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L.—*President of Board of Trade* [Dundee]
- Africa, East—Native Labour Regulations, *July 29*, 1492.
- Agricultural Labourers' Wages, Hours of Work, etc., *July 24*, 505.
- Aldgate Tramway to Bow—Danger of Stud System, *July 22*, 90.
- All-British Steamship Route, Proposals as to, *July 28*, 1237.
- Belfast Lough—Sand-lifting from Foreshore, *July 27*, 853.
- Building Societies, Fraudulent, Protection against, *July 30*, 1760.
- Canada—Immigration Regulations for Consumptive Persons, *July 30*, 1721.

cont.]

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. L.—*cont.*
- Census of Production Act
  - Forms under, *July 22*, 71.
  - Returns, Date of making, *July 27*, 847.
- China—Foreign Trade in 1907, *July 23*, 311.
- "Clam"—Chinese Crew, *July 22*, 70.
- Cotton Industry—Reduction of Hours of Spinners of American Cotton, *July 22*, 64.
- Emigration Statistics (1898–1908), *July 23*, 316.
- Fenchurch Street Railway Point Cleaner, Case of, *July 32*, 340.
- Glaunvarane Strand Trespass Action, *July 23*, 341.
- Hop Industry
  - Acreage in England and America, *July 30*, 1718.
  - American Crop, Period of Picking, *July 30*, 1718.
  - Continental Hops, Price of, *July 30*, 1718.
  - Import Statistics, 1820–1907, *July 30*, 1722.
- Housing of the Working Classes—Cubic Space in London and Berlin, *July 22*, 91.
- Independent Order of Foresters (Toronto)—Security Deposited, *July 28*, 1177.
- International Securities Corporation, Case of, *July 30*, 1759.
- Kenmare Train Service, *July 29*, 1464.
- *Labour Gazette* Articles, Responsibility for, *July 22*, 90.
- Leeds Railway—Shunting Fatality to W. Harris, *July 30*, 1759.
- London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1873–1878, 1880.
  - Proposals as to, *July 27*, 886.
- Man, Isle of—Racing by Excursion Steamers, *July 28*, 1235.
- Marine Insurance — P.P.I. Insurances, *July 27*, 883.
- Meat Supply
  - Beef Prices in 1907–8, *July 25*, 600; *July 30*, 1721.
  - Inquiry, *July 23*, 343. *July 25*, 611; *July 27*, 855; *July 28*, 1236, 1237; *July 29*, 1491, 1492.
- Patents and Designs Act—Compulsory Working of Patents, *July 30*, 1696.
- Port of London Bill
  - Alterations suggested, *July 23*, 341, 342, 343.
  - Costs incurred, *July 28*, 1236.
  - Procedure as to, *July 30*, 1695.
- Provincial Homes Investment Company, Ltd.
  - Judgment against, *July 22*, 65.
  - Operations of, *July 27*, 884.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. L.—*cont.*
- Railways
  - Automatic Couplings, Value of, *July 27*, 881, 882.
  - Coal Freight and Wastage, *July 27*, 846.
  - Electric Precautions against Fire, *July 22*, 70.
- "Strathyre"—Chinese Crew, *July 29*, 1452.
- Tarbert (Loch Fyne)—Pier Lease, *July 30*, 1725.
- Tobacco—Expenditure by Working Classes' *July 22*, 70.
- Tramways—Men Employed, *July 23*, 311.
- Transvaal Asiatic Policy — Circular to Trade Councils, *July 27*, 881.
- Unemployment — Statistics in *Labour Gazette*, *July 30*, 1760.
- Warrenpoint Excursion Fatality, *July 29*, 1508.
- Weights and Measures—Stamping Fees *July 27*, 883.

Civil List Pensions
- Persons in Receipt of—Return Presented, *July 27*, 810.

Civil Service
- Retirements—Minute as to Retention of Certain Persons Ordered, *July 29*, 1451; Presented, *July 30*, 1692.

Civil Service Estimates
- Art and Science Buildings—£55,000, *Com.** *July 28*, 1336; *Rep.** *July 29* 1514.
- Bankruptcy Department, Board of Trad —£5, *Com.** *July 28*, 1337; *Rep.** *July 29*, 1514.
- Board of Agriculture and Fisheries—£83,124, *Com.** *July 28*, 1337; *Rep.** *July 29*, 1514.
- Board of Education—£6,594,150, *Com.** *July 28*, 1347; *Rep.** *July 29*, 1516.
- Board of Trade—£213,169, *Com.** *July 28*, 1337; *Rep.** *July 29*, 1514.
- British Museum—£115,137, *Com.** *July 28*, 1347; *Rep.** *July 29*, 1516.
- Charity Commission—£15,308, *Com.** *July 28*, 1337; *Rep.** *July 29*, 1514.
- Colonial Office—£31,450, *Com. July 28*, 1244.
- County Courts—£3, *Com.** *July 28*, 1341; *Rep.** *July 29*, 1515.
- Cyprus (Grant in Aid) £1,000, *Com.** *July 28*, 1351; *Rep.,** *July 29*, 1517.
- Diplomatic and Consular Services — £323,103, *Com.** *July 28*, 1351; *Rep.** *July 29*, 1517.
- Exchequer and Audit Department — £39,900, *Com.** *July 28*, 1337, *Rep.** *July 29*, 1514.

[*cont.*

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*

Foreign Office—£40,830, *Com. July* 27, 939.

Friendly Societies Registry—£5,819, *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Government Hospitality—£5,000, *Com.* July* 28, 1353 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1518.

Harbours—£32,840, *Com.* July* 28, 1336 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Home Office—£139,967, *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

House of Commons Offices—£19,900, *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

House of Lords Offices—£15,956, *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Houses of Parliament Building—£37,000, *Com.* July* 27, 988.

Houses of Parliament Buildings—£37,000, *Com.* July* 28, 1336 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Ireland

Charitable Donations and Bequests Office—£1,053, *Com.* July* 28, 1338 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

Chief Secretary—£18,101, *Com.* July* 28, 1338 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

County Court Officers, etc.—£70,475, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Development Grant — £85,342, *Com.* July* 28, 1352 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1517.

Dublin Metropolitan Police—£36,632, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum—£3,222, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Education (Supplementary)—£114,000, *Com.* July* 28, 1348 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Endowed Schools Commissioners—£515, *Com.* July* 28, 1348 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Hospitals and Charities—£116, *Com.* July* 28, 1352 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1517.

Household of Lord - Lieutenant—£2,627, *Com.* July* 28, 1338 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

Land Commission—£160,978, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions—£38,078, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Local Government Board—£52,616, *Com.* July* 28, 1338 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

National Gallery—£1,153, *Com.* July* 28, 1348 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Prisons—£64,661, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Public Record Office—£3,625, *Com.* July* 28, 1338 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

Public Works Office—£27,413 ; *Com.* July* 28, 1338 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

Public Works and Buildings—£134,259 *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Queen's Colleges—£2,200, *Com.* July* 28, 1348 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Railways—£31,454, *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools—£55,225, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Registrar-General's Office — £7,338, *Com.* July* 28, 1338; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

Relief of Distress—£13,000 *Com.* July* 28, 1353 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1518.

Royal Irish Constabulary—£739,902, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Supreme Court of Judicature, etc.—£60,446, *Com.* July* 28, 1342 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Valuation and Boundary Survey—£15,147, *Com.* July* 28, 1338 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

Land Registry—£21,750, *Com.* July* 28, 1341 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

Law Charges—£54,190, *Com.* July* 28, 1341 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

Local Government Board—£156,500, *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Lunacy Commission—£11,384, *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Mercantile Marine Services—£80,347, *Com.* July* 28, 1337 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Miscellaneous Expenses—£7,867, *Com.* July* 28, 1352 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1517.

Miscellaneous Legal Buildings—£48,000, *Com.* July* 28, 1336 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Miscellaneous Legal Expenses—£22,564, *Com.* July* 28, 1341 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

National Gallery—£7,414, *Com.* July* 28, 1347 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

National Portrait Gallery—£2,621, *Com.* July* 28, 1347 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1516.

Old-Age Pensions—£1,200,000, *Com.* July* 28, 1352 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1517.

Osborne—£7,300, *Com.* July* 28, 1336 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1513.

Peterhead Harbour—£22,000, *Com.* July* 28, 1336 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1514.

Police—£24,858, *Com.* July* 28, 1341 ; *Rep.* July* 29, 1515.

[*cont.*

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*

Post Office, etc.—£11,821,531, *Com.* July 28*, 1354; *Rep.* July 29*, 1519.

Privy Council Office—£6,217, *Com.* July 28*, 1337; *Rep.* July 29*, 1514.

Public Record Office—£14,820, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1514.

Public Trustee—£1,500, *Com.* July 28*, 1341; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.

Public Works Loan Commission—£2,507, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1514.

Registrar-General's Office—£26,825, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1514.

Repayments to Civil Contingencies Fund—£41,491, *Com.* July 8*, 1352; *Rep.* July 29*, 1517.

Repayments to Local Loans Funds—£4,404, *Com.* July 28*, 1352; *Rep.* July 29*, 1517.

Royal Palaces—£42,500, *Com.* July 28*, 1336; *Rep.* July 29*, 1513.

Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens—£79,900, *Com.* July 28*, 1336; *Rep.* July 29*, 1513.

Salisbury Memorial—£1,100, *Com.* July 28*, 1336; *Rep.* July 29*, 1514.

Savings Banks' and Friendly Societies' Deficiencies—£109,713, *Com.* July 28*, 1352; *Rep.* July 29*, 1517.

Scientific Investigation—£28,295, *Com.* July 28*, 1347; *Rep.* July 29*, 1516.

Scotland

- Crofters' Commission—£2,345, *Com.* July 28*, 1342; *Rep.,* July 29*, 1515.
- Education—£1,198,557, *Com.* July 28*, 1348; *Rep.* July 29*, 1516.
- Fishery Board—£14,998, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.
- Law Charges and Courts of Law—£51,316, *Com.* July 28*, 1341; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.
- Local Government Board—£11,592, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.
- Lunacy Commission—£3,901, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.
- National Galleries—£2,497, *Com.* July 28*, 1348; *Rep.* July 29*, 1516.
- Prisons—£60,790, *Com.* July 28*, 1342; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.
- Register House, Edinburgh—£26,966, *Com.* July 28*, 1342; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.
- Registrar-General's Office—£3,063, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.
- Secretary's Office—£11,600, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*

Secret Service—£10,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.

Superannuation and Retired Allowances—£375,022, *Com.* July 28*, 1351; *Rep.* July 29*, 1517.

Supplementary—Amount included

- *Q.* Mr. Cox; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 334.
- *Q.* Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 31*, 1961.

Supreme Court of Judicature—£189, 867, *Com.* July 28*, 1341; *Rep.* Jvly 29*, 1515.

Surveys—£116,815, *Com.* July 28*, 1336; *Rep.* July 29*, 1514.

Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable—£42,133; *Com.* July 28*, 1351; *Rep.* July 29*, 1517.

Temporary Commissions—£25,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1352; *Rep.* July 29*, 1517.

Treasury, etc.—£62,917, *Com.* July 28*, 1337; *Rep.* July 29*, 1514.

Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, Expenses—£200,000, *Com.* July 28*, 1352; *Rep.* July 29*, 1518.

Universities and Colleges and Intermediate Education, Wales—£146,800, *Com.* July 28*, 1347; *Rep.* July 29*, 1516.

Votes Closured in Classes, *July 29*, 1610, 1613, 1615, 1619, 1623, 1627.

Wallace Collection—£4,173; *Com.* July 28*, 1347; *Rep.* July 29*, 516.

Woods, Forests and Land Revenues, etc., Office—£13,613, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.

Works and Public Buildings Office—£53,693, *Com.* July 28*, 1338; *Rep.* July 29*, 1515.

"Clam"

Chinese Crew.

- *Q.* Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 70.

Claremorris

School, Use of

- *Q.* Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1198.

Cleland, Mr. J. W. [Glasgow, Bridgeton]

Glasgow, Unemployment in—Work of Distress Committee, etc., *July 31*, 2063, 2065.

Probation of Offenders Act—Scottish Interpretation, *July 27*, 828.

Unemployment—Grant to Scottish Distress Committee, *July 31*, 2063–2066.

Clerk of the Parliaments

Irish Universities Bill—Lords Amendts. Disagreed to by the Commons, *July 31*, 1939.

[*cont.*

Clerk of the Parliaments—*cont.*
Old-Age Pensions Bill—Lords Amendts. Disagreed to by the Commons, *July 31*, 1911, 1924, 1926, 1927, 1931, 1932, 1934.

Clery Minors Estate
Sale Proposals
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1504.

Clinton, Lord
Agricultural Holdings Bill, Commons Amendts., *July 30*, 1678, 1679.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 28*, 1111–1113, 1115, 1117, 1123, 1124, 1156.

Clonbrock, Lord
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Commons Amendments, *July 30*, 1681, 1682.
Irish Universities Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 768–770; *Com. July 30*, 1655.
Land Purchase—Sinking Fund from Tenant's Annuities, *July 29*, 1428.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 23*, 272, 273.

Clonrellick
Land Purchase.
Q. Sir W. Nugent; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1198.

Clough, Mr. W. [Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton]
Friendly Societies—Royal London Society Agreement, *July 30*, 1764.
Old-Age Pensions, Cost of, *July 23*, 335.
Ribble River Fishery Board, *Aug. 1*, 2085.

Clynes, Mr. J. R. [Manchester, N.E.]
Army Territorial Force
Government Assistance, *July 29*, 1482.
Horses System of Hiring, *July 29*, 1482.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1893–1896.
Manchester
Disturbances—Sentences on Leaders, *July 30*, 1893–1896.
Unemployment Grant, *July 30*, 1760.
Oldham Postmen's Wages, *July 30*, 1763.
Provincial Homes Investment Company, Operations of, *July 29*, 1500.

Coal
Freight Charge, *see under* Railways.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill
Standing Committee C., Constitution of.
Os. Mr. Bowles, Mr. Speaker, Sir B. Gurdon, *July 27*, 888.

Coal Tax
Abolition of.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 667; Sir E. Sassoon, 671.
Repeal, Effects of.
Os. Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29*, 1400, 1401; Earl of Crewe, 1428.

Coal Trade
Statistical Tables—Copy Ordered, *July 30*, 1692.

Coast Erosion
Inquiry—Progress made.
Os. Mr. Curran, *July 29*, 1549; Mr. Burns, 1569, 1574.

Coastguard Service
Men Required for Naval Manœuvres.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28*, 1177.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Ayrshire, N.]
Army Territorial Force, Instructors' Pay, *July 27*, 862.
Saltcoats Postmen, Pay of, *July 22*, 65.
Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill—Memorandum, proposed, *July 27*, 828.

Coffee
Consumption — Copy of Memorandum Ordered, *July 30*, 1693.

Coinage and Currency
Exhibition of Certain Specimens.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 30*, 1733.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, Bordesley]
Brass Foundries—Regulations Issued to, *July 29*, 1585–1588, 1608, 1609.
Irish Universities Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 2005.
Local Authorities (Education) Bill—Starring by the Government, proposed, *July 31*, 2024.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1989.

Collins, Mr. S. [Lambeth, Kennington]
Hoxton—Use of Douglas Hall, *July 29*, 1496.
Motor Omnibus Breakdowns, *July 28*, 1234; *July 30*, 1757.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Cattle Diseases, Contagious, Notification of, *July 30*, 1728.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 422, 467–469; *July 24*, 561–563, 566.
Regents Canal Fence, Repair of, *July 28*, 1197.
Transvaal Chinese Labour Repatriations, *July 22*, 66.
Tuberculosis, Notification of, *July 23*, 315.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.
Under-Secretary—Colonel Seely.
Criticisms on Late Under-Secretary.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1249, 1269; Colonel Seely, 1268, 1269.

Colonies and Protectorates
[*For Particular Colonies, etc., see their Names.*]
Annual Report Presented, *July 22*, 3, 61.
Crown Colony Inhabitants Stranded in England.
Q. Mr. O. Philipps; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1224.
Educational Expenditure—Return Ordered, *July 29*, 1451.
Recognition of Services in.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 23*, 310.

Colthurst Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1200.

Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Commons Bill
l. Report from Standing Committee, *July 23*, 254.
*Rep.** *July 27*, 740.
3R. *July 28*, 1165.
c. 1R.* *July 30*, 1775.

Commons Regulations (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill
c. Report,* *July 28*, 1067.
3R.* *July 29*, 1447.
l. 1R.* *July 30*, 1633.
2R. *July 31*, 1905.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 2073.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.
Standing Order XXXIX., Suspension of, etc.
Os. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *July 31*, 1905–1908; Marquess of Salisbury, 1907; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 1908.

Companies Bill
c. Com., *Rep.* and 3R. *July 27*, 993, 1002.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Companies (Consolidation) Bill
Joint Committee Report, *July 23*, 255, 368.
l. Com. July 27, 735.
Rep. July 29, 1426, 1427.
3R., *July 30*, 1676.

Compulsory Military Service
Possibility of Establishing on National Service League Plan.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 22*, 15–18; Lord Lucas, 19–21; Lord Newton, 22–23; Viscount Midleton, 26; Earl of Crewe, 30, 31; Lord Belhaven and Stenton, 31.

Congo Free State
Annexation Proposals.
Os. Sir G. White, *July 30*, 1838–1840; Sir E. Grey, 1842–1844.
Belgian Administration—Responsibility of Great Britain.
Os. Sir G. White, *July 30*, 1836–1842.
Concessions, Policy as to—Protection of Native Rights, etc.
Os. Sir E. Grey, *July 27*, 974, 975; Sir G. Parker, 980.
Reforms—British Policy.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 958–960; Earl Percy, 961, 962; Sir E. Grey, 972, 979; Sir G. Parker, 978–982.
Slave Traffic.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 960.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill
c. 1R* *July 29*, 1628.
2R. *July 30*, 1781, 1885.
Com. July 31, 1968.
3R. *Aug. 1*, 2097.
l. 1R., 2R., 3R.* *Aug. 1*, 2074.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.
Schedule B., Amendment to out of Order.
Os. Lord R. Cecil, *July 31*, 1968–1970; Mr. James Hope, 1969; Mr. Chairman, 1968–1970.

Consols
Price of.
Os. Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29*, 1404; Lord St. Davids, 1411; Lord Faber, 1419; Earl of Crewe, 1422, 1423; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1791; Mr. Asquith, 1792.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
[*See also Names of Places.*]
Canteen Fund.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 2090.
Cattle-driving Cases, *see under* Ireland.
Cosgrove, J., Case of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 611.
Extra Charges Levied in Connection with Disturbances.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1789; Mr. Birrell, 1807.
Q. Mr. W. Long; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 509.
Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 1965.
Phœnix Park Depot, Baths at.
Q. Mr. Sloan; A. Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 2089.
Recruits—Messing Arrangements.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 2089.

Contempt of Court
Irish Sentences, Remission of.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 102.

Contempt of Courts Bill
Proposals as to.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 107.

Conway and Colwyn Bay Joint Water Board Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Cooper, Mr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Anæsthetics, Deaths from (1901–8), *July 30*, 1698.
Bermondsey—Monnon Road School, *July 29*, 1497.
Cabs, Taximeter—Overcrowding, *July 27*, 812; *July 29*, 1490.
London, Ambulances for, *July 23*, 300; *July 30*, 1698, 1699.
Meat Supply—Beef Prices (1907–8), *July 30*, 1721.
West Square School Accommodation, *July 29*, 1497.

Cooper Estate
Cases of J. McGrath and T. Barry.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1186.

Cork
Condition of.
Qs. Mr. Londsale, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 105.
Post Office
Overseer, Examination for.
Q. Mr. A. Roche; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29*, 1453.
Surveyors, Allowances to.
Q. Mr. A. Roche; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 28*, 1192.
Telegraphic Delays.
Q. Mr. A. Roche. *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29*, 1454.
Process Servers, Protection of.
Q. Mr. Sheehan. *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 835.
Queen's College—Report Presented, *July 27*, 706, 809.

Cork College
Fitzgerald, Mr. E., Nomination of.
Qs. captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 108.

Cornwall, Duchy of
Lord Warden—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

Coroners (Ireland) Bill
l. Report from Standing Committee, *July 23*, 255.
Rep. July 27*, 740.
3R.* *July 28*, 1165.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.,* July 30*, 1904.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug, 1*, 2075.

Corporal Punishment
Procedure in imposing Sentence.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. H. C. Lea; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 29*, 1490.
Sentences inflicted by Judges and Prison Governors, etc.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, *July 30*, 1888£1890; Mr. Gladstone, 1898–1900.

Costs in Criminal Cases Bill
l. 2R., *July 23*, 274.
Com. July 27*, 741.
3R.* *July 29*, 1446.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
Ceylon Public Works—Employment of Natives, *July 27*, 838.
India
Administrative Policy, *July 22*, 209.
Allygurh Seditions Telegram Case, *Aug. 1*, 2087.
Bengal, Partition of, *July 22*, 209.
Bombay Riots, *July 29*, 1483, 1484; *Aug. 1*, 2087.
Civil Service, Necessity for Reconstruction of, *July 22*, 210–212.
Education—Reform of Present System, proposed, *July 22*, 208.
Prisoners, Treatment of, *July 28*, 1220.
Sedition, Measures for Dealing with, *July 22*, 209, 210; *July 28*, 1219.
Tilak, Mr., Case of, *July 28*, 1217; *July 30*, 1748.
Tinnevelly—Cases of Chidambaram Pillay and Subramania Siva, *July 28*, 1219.
Transportation Law. *July 28*, 1219.

Cotton Factories
Card-rooms, Fencing and Ventilation of.
Os. Mr. Gill, *July 29*, 1590, 1591.
Reduction of Hours of Spinners of American Cotton.
Q. Mr. Goulding. *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 64.
Time Cribbing.
Os. Mr. Gill, *July 29*, 1589; Mr. Gladstone, 1607.

County Boroughs
Applications Refused.
Q. Mr. Beaumont. *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 343.

County and Borough Councils
Financial Relations.
  Q. Mr. Adkins. *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 31*, 1958.

County Courts
Plaints and Sittings—Return Ordered, *July 29*, 1451; Presented, *July 30*, 1691.

Courthope, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
Beer-Brewing Statistics (1820–1907), *July 30*, 1732.
Bisley Camp—Hawkers' Licences, *July 29*, 1468.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1019.
Hop Industry.
  Acreage in England and America, *July 30*, 1718; *July 30*, 1728.
  American Crop, Period of Picking, *July 30*, 1718.
  Continental Hops, Price of, *July 30*, 1718.
  Import Statistics, 1820–1907, *July 30*, 1722.
Meat Supply Inquiry, Proposals for, *July 29*, 1491.
Olympic Games—Bullets Used by British Teams, *July 29*, 1476.
Poor Rate Exemption Act, 1840—Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1019.

Courtney, Lord
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Com.* *July 23*, 258, 261.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
British Indians in the Colonies—Case of Mr. Shapurji, *July 28*, 1222.
Civil Service Estimates, Supplementary
  Amount Included, *July 23*, 334.
  Discussion of, *July 23*, 365.
Expenditure, Additional, Proposals for Meeting, *July 25*, 669.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Date of Taking, *July 23*, 366.
Finance Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 669.
Income-Tax—Royalties on Patents, *July 27*, 847.
Motors
  Police Traps, *July 30*, 1761.
  Speed Regulation, *Aug. 1*, 2096.
  Automatic Restriction, *July 27*, 818.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1989.
Windsor Motorists, Prosecution of, *July 27*, 818.

Craig, Capt. J. [Down, E.]
Army, Territorial Force—Jury Service, *July 27*, 859, 860.
Ballinalack—Case of J. Carolan, *July 22*, 106.
Ballynahinch—Extra Police on 13th Inst., *July 27*, 832.
Belfast Workhouse—Number of Inmates, *July 23*, 359.
Castletown Cattle-drive, *July 23*, 359.
Cattle-drives
  Cases in the North, *July 25*, 614.
  Self-Protection by Graziers, Measures Permissible for, *July 23*, 349.
Condition of Ireland
  Opportunity for Discussing, *July 25*, 616.
  System of Issuing Police Reports, *July 22*, 110.
Contempt of Courts Bill, Proposals as to, *July 22*, 107.
Cork College—Nomination of Mr. E. Fitzgerald, *July 22*, 108, 109.
Evictions — Reinstatement Regulations, *Aug. 1*, 2088.
Galway, Condition of, *July 27*, 833.
Ginnell, Mr.—Speech at Meeting in Ballinalack, *July 22*, 108.
Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill, *Com.* *July 22*, 228, 230, 238.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 368–372, 394, 415, 416, 424, 427–430, 463, 464; *July 24*, 570.
  Grants, *July 25*, 614.
  Vatican Opinion, *July 25*, 615.
Longwood—Speeches of Mr. P. McKenna and Mr. McGuire, *July 22*, 109.
Orange Demonstrations, Disturbances During, *July 25*, 614, 615.
Queen's County Deputy Lieutenants, *Aug. 1*, 2088.
Reynall *v* Taafe, Decision as to, *July 22*, 106.
Roscommon
  Clerk to Board of Guardians, *July 24*, 511.
  Condition of, *July 22*, 110.
Russia—Luxenburg Case, *July 25*, 613; *July 27*, 877.
St. Vincent
  Carib Canal, *July 28*, 1223.
  Eruption Relief Fund, *July 28*, 1223.
Transvaal Mines—Labour Statistics, *July 25*, 612.
Westmeath, Condition of, *July 22*, 110.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]

Ardglass Cattle-driving Prosecutions, *July 22*, 98, 99.

Cattle-driving—Government Attitude, *July 22*, 99, 100.

Evictions—Applications for Reinstatement, *July 22*, 96.

Ginnell, Mr.—Speech at Meeting in Ballinalack, *July 22*, 108.

Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 386–390, 399, 438–440, 465; *July 24*, 512, 555–557, 570; 3R. *July 25*, 653–657.

Kinvarra—Firing Outrage on 12th Inst., *July 22*, 97.

Sligo, Condition of, *July 22*, 96, 97.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities.]

India

Education—Reform of present System, proposed, *July 22*, 162–167.

Sedition, Measures for Dealing with, *July 22*, 161.

Motor Omnibuses

Licensing, Conditions attached to, *July 29*, 1605.

Routes, Powers of Police to vary, etc., *July 29*, 1598–1600.

Police—Metropolitan Commission Report, *July 29*, 1598.

Cran Measures Bill

l. 2R., *July 22*, 51.

Com. Rep. and 3R.* *July 23*, 275.

c. 1R.* *July 23*, 368.

2R.* *July 25*, 700.

Com., *Rep.* and 3R.* *July 28*, 1367.

l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Cranagill

Orange Order, Use of Highway by.

Qs. Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 615; *July 29*, 1502.

Crean, Mr. E. [Cork, S.E.]

Glaunvarane Strand—Trespass Action, *July 23*, 341.

Creech Grange

Postmistress, Hours of.

Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 28*, 1179.

Creich

Crofters' Houses, Burning of.

Qs. Mr. Morton; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 25*, 613.

Qs. Mr. Morton, Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Speaker, *July 29*, 1500.

Qs. Mr. Morton; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 1*, 2096.

Crewe, Earl of

Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Army

Strength—Return proposed, *July 22*, 31.

Territorial Force, Organisation of, *July*, *22*, 28–30.

Coal Tax Repeal, Effects of, *July 29*, 1428.

Compulsory Military Service, Possibility of Establishing, *July 22*, 30, 31.

Consols, Price of, *July 29*, 1422.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, Commons' Amendts., *July 30*, 1680.

Finance Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 1419–1426.

Income-Tax—Maintaining at 1s. in the £ in Time of Peace, *July 29*, 1420.

Irish Universities Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 741–756, 779–789; *Com.*, *July 30*, 1641–1643, 1647–1650, 1653, 1655–1658, 1661–1665, 1667, 1669, 1671, 1673–1675; Commons' Amendts. to Lords' Amendts., *July 31*, 1941.

National Debt

Redemption of, *July 29*, 1422.

Reduction, Employment of Sum devoted to, *July 29*, 1421.

National Income, Statistics as to, *July 29*, 1421.

Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28* 1084–1086, 1116, 1138, 1155; Commons' Amendts. to Lords' Amendts, *July 31*, 1910, 1919–1923, 1937, 1938.

Funds, Provision of, *July 29*, 1425.

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Com. July 27*, 732.

Proclaimed Counties in Ireland—Imposition of extra Police Rate, etc., *July 23*, 290.

Standing Order No. XXXIX., Suspension of, *July 30*, 1633.

Taxation, Local—Licences transferred to Local Authorities, *July 29*, 1420.

Telegraph (Construction) Bill, 2R. *July 23*, 263.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R. *July 23*, 265–267, 271, 272.

Criccieth Water and Improvement Bill

c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *July 29*, 1447.

l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Crime

Comparisons between Great Britain and Ireland.

Os. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, *July 30*, 1817; Mr. S. Wortley, 1822.

Criminal Appeal Act

Shorthand Writers.

Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 23*, 301.

Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 27*, 816.

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 22*, 112.
2R.* *July 30*, 1904.

Croften Estate
Case of J. Reynolds.
Q. Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1707.

Crofters Commons Grazings Regulation Bill
c. 1R.* *July 30*, 1774.

Croker Estate
Cases of Peacocke and Mrs. Hammersley.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1503.

Cromer, Earl
Finance Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 1413–1415, 1418.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28.* 1086–1091, 1093, 1121; Commons' Amendts. to Lords' Amendts, *July 31*, 1911–1913.
Funds, Provision of, *July 29*, 1413.
Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 29*, 1413.
Supply—Growth of various Votes, *July 29*, 1414.

Crookenden and Casey Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1694.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R. *Aug. 1*, 2101.
London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1862.
McGhee, F., and Wife, Sentence on, *July 23*, 338.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1977, 1991.
Unemployment—Urgency of the Question, *July 31*, 2101, 2102.
Woolwich Common, War Office Rights over, *July 22*, 77, 78; *July 27*, 864, 865.

Crosfield, Mr. A. H. [Warrington]
King's Liverpool Regiment, Promotion in, *July 29*, 1457.

Crown Colonies
See under Colonies.

Crystal Palace Company Bill
c. 2R.* *July 22*, 59.
Com. July 27*, 807.
Rep. July 28*, 1167.
3R.* *July 29*, 1447.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Curraheen
Schoolhouse, State of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1469.

Curran, Mr. P. [Durham, Jarrow]
Afforestation Facilities, *July 29*, 1549, 1551.
Coast Erosion Inquiry—Progress made, *July 29*, 1549.
Navy
"Superb," Fitters Employed on, *July 28*, 1205.
"Temeraire," Apprentices Employed on, *July 28*, 1205, 1206.
Trial Trips of New Vessels, *July 30*, 1739, 1740.
Port of London Bill — Alterations Suggested, *July 23*, 343.
Unemployment
Urgency of and Suggestions for Dealing with the Question, *July 29*, 1547–1552.
Women's Work Department of Central Body, Reports on, *July 29*, 1551.

Customs House (London)
Accommodation.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 23*, 315.

Customs and Excise
Amalgamation Scheme.
Qs. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 320.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1766.
Case of Mr. C. Clarke.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 28*, 1173.
Excise Officers' Salaries.
Q. Mr. W. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 31*, 1960.
Preventive Officers, System of Appointing,
Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 23*, 301.
Report of Customs Commissioners, Presented, *July 24*, 500; *July 27*, 706.
Stock-taking System.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 30*, 1737.

Dairies, Cowsheds etc. (Ireland)
Order and Correspondence Presented, *July 22*, 3.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Granton—Steamship Communication with Burntisland, *July 31*, 2069.

Dartford
Open-air Meetings.
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1697.

Dartmouth, Earl of
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendments, *July 31*, 1937.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]
- London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1848–50, 1853.

De Blaquiere Estate
- Sale Proposals.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Duffy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 357.
- Uneconomic Holdings.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Duffy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1506; *Aug. 1*, 2081.

Dease Estate
- Sale Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 353.

Death Duties
- Receipts in 1908.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 334.

Deaths
- Infant Mortality in the Potteries, etc.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 29*, 1581–1583; Mr. Gladstone, 1606.
- Ireland—Annual Report Presented, *July 25*, 598; *July 27*, 706.
- Starvation, etc. (London)—Return Presented, *July 28*, 1170.

Defence of the Empire
- Adequacy of Present Arrangements.
  - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *July 22*, 14, 15; Mr. Hunt, *July 27*, 925, 926; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1791; Mr. Asquith, 1793.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
- Agriculture Department
  - Official Information, Circular against Divulging, *July 28*, 1240.
  - Veterinary Branch Salaries, *July 28*, 1241.
- Education Board—Duties of Secretaries, *July 27*, 852.
- Falkner Estate, Sale of, *July 29*, 1472.
- Mountmellick Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Case of M. Delany, *July 27*, 851.
- Queen's County Evicted Tenants, Position of, *July 30*, 1711.
- Rathdowney Disturbance on 20th June, *July 27*, 831; *July 28*, 1199.

Denman, Lord
- Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 57, *Com. July 29*, 1394, 1397.
- Friendly Societies Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 255.
- Galway, Proclamation of—Imposition of Extra Police Rate, etc., *July 23*, 281–284.

Denman, Lord—*cont.*
- Grand Jury (Ireland) Act, 1836, Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 28*, 1166.
- Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 727.
- Land Purchase
  - Existing Agreements and Contracts, Proposals for Readjustment of, *July 23*, 275.
  - Sinking Fund from Tenants' Annuities, Position of, *July 29*, 1428.
- Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 739.
- Proclaimed Counties—Return proposed, *July 23*, 283, 291.
- Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 728.
- Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 728; 3R., *July 29*, 1445.

Denmark
- New Customs Tariff—Translation Presented, *July 31*, 1944; *Aug. 1*, 2073.

Deptford
- Victualling Wharf, *see under* Navy.

Deputy-Lieutenants
- Qualifications Required of, on Appointment.
  - *Os.* Earl of Rosebery, *July 27*, 725, 727; Lord Lucas, 726, 727; Lord Ashbourne, 727.

Derrycassan Estate
- Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 364.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Belfast, W.]
- Ballymoney Post Office Accommodation, *July 31*, 1952.
- Belfast
  - Unemployed—Relief Proposals, *July 23*, 308.
  - Workhouse—Number of Inmates, *July 23*, 359.
- Belfast Lough—Sand-Lifting from Foreshore, *July 27*, 853.
- Independent Order of Foresters (Toronto)—Security Deposited, *July 28*, 1177.
- Irish Universities Bill, *Con., July 24*, 595.
- Londonderry — Prosecution for Larceny from Quay, *July 27*, 845.
- National School Teachers—Resignations on Pension, *July 29*, 1473.
- Patent Law (Amendment) Act, 1907, Administration of, *July 23*, 303.
- Tanderagea Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *July 27*, 854.
- Unemployment—Grant for Ireland *July 23*, 319.
- Wheat and Flour—Value of Lemstron Electrification System, *July 23*, 314.
- Workhouse Teachers, Position of, *July 29* 1474.

Devonshire, Duke of
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 28*, 1094, 1147, 1151, 1160.

Dewar, Mr. A. [Edinburgh, S.]
Natal—Dinizulu Case, *July 22*, 88.

Dewar, Sir J. A. [Inverness]
Lewis, Island of—Rating *impasse*, *July 29*, 1486.
Vatersay and Barra, Situation on, *July 27*, 824.

Dickinson, Mr. W. H. [St. Pancras, N.]
London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1863–1868.

Dickson Estate
Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1503.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]
Africa, West—Principé and San Thomé Labour Regulations, *July 27*, 878.
Autumn Session—Business Arrangements, *July 31*, 2016–2018.
Congo Free State
Reforms—British Policy, *July 27*, 958–960.
Slave Traffic, *July 27*, 960.
Factories and Workshops
Exempted Processes, Abuses of Law under, *July 29*, 1576, 1578.
Girls and Children—Increase in Number employed, *July 29*, 1576, 1578–1581.
Fish-curing Industry, Inquiry into, *July 23*, 336; *July 29*, 1576–1578.
France, British Relations with, *July 27*, 955, 956.
Germany, British Relations with, *July 27*, 957, 958.
Hague Conference—British Policy, *July 27*, 957.
Home Office Report, Delay in Issuing, *July 29*, 1577.
Infant Mortality—High Rate in the Potteries, etc., *July 29*, 1581–1583.
Lead Poisoning—Mortality Statistics, *July 29*, 1584.
Local Government Board Vote, Circumstances of Passing, *July 29*, 1575.
Macedonian Affairs—Necessity for pressing Reforms, etc., *July 27*, 956.
Truck
Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *July 23*, 348.
Necessity for Dealing with, *July 29*, 1585.
Potteries, Practice in, *July 23*, 337.
Zululand—Native Land Reservation, *July 27*, 875.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
Irish Universities Bill, *Con. July 23*, 419; *July 24*, 558, 564.

Diseases of Animals
[*See also Names of Diseases.*]

Diseases of Animals Acts
Irish Proceedings—Report Presented, *July 25*, 598; *July 27*, 705.

Divorce
Desertion—Scottish Practice.
Os. Earl Russell, *July 30*, 1686; Lord Loreburn, 1687.

Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. D. [Middlesex, Uxbridge]
Old-Age Pensions Bill—Charitable Annuities, *Aug. 1*, 2086.

Dobson, Mr. T. W. [Plymouth]
London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894—Amount Levied and Distributed, *July 25*, 609.
Unemployment—Urgency of and Suggestions for Dealing with the Question, *July 29*, 1553.

Dock Regulations
Enforcement of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Seddon, *July 31*, 2059–2061; Mr. Gladstone, 2062.

Dockyards, Naval
See under Navy.

Dogs
Distemper, Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. E. Griffith; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 30*, 1701.
Licences of Dealers.
Q. Mr. E. Griffith; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 27*, 816.

Dominica
Davis, Mr. William, Case of.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 28*, 1320.
Railway Construction.
Q. Mr. Lamont; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1227.

Doncaster Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Donegal
Assizes—Catholics on Grand Juries.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 362.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Army Engineer Services—Removal Expenses of Surveyors, *July 27*, 837.

Donoughmore, Earl of
Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 57; *Com. July 29*, 1396, 1397.

[*cont.*

Donoughmore, Earl of—*cont.*
Irish Universities Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 787–790; *Com. July 30*, 1644–1647, 1655.
Motors—Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1392.
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Com. July 27*, 729, 732.

Doughty, Sir G. [Great Grimsby]
Fisheries—Scientific and Statical Investigation Report, *July 30*, 1737.
"General"—Arrest by German Gun-Boat, *July 30*, 1753.
"Taurus"—Arrest by German Torpedo-Boat, *July 30*, 1754.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Factories and Workshops Report, Delay in Issuing, *July 29*, 1603.
Police
  Complaints Against, Method of Dealing with, *July 29*, 1601.
  Metropolitan Commission Report, *July 29*, 1601.
Vivisection Commission Report, Date of Issuing, *July 29*, 1602.

Dover Graving Docks Bill
l. 2R. *July 27*, 702.
  3R. *July 29*, 1370.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* July 30*, 1687.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.
Sessional Order as to Second Reading, Suspension of.
  Os. Lord Brassey, Lord Glantawe, *July 27*, 702; Lord Weardale, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 703; Earl of Granard, 704; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *July 29*, 1369.

Draycott Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Driffield
Guardians' Vaccination Contract.
  Q. Mr. Ferens; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 28*, 1239.

Drumlinny
Case of P. M'Guirk.
  Qs. Mr. Lardner; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1694.

Du Cros, Mr. A. [Hastings]
Hastings and St. Leonards Post Office Duties, *July 29*, 1459.
Torpedo-Boat Destroyers, Contracts for, *July 30*, 1744.

Dublin
Metropolitan Police—Case of Staff-Sergeant Scully.
  Q. Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 1963.

Dublin—*cont.*
Phœnix Park Additional Land, Use for.
  Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 27*, 841.
  Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 28*, 1171.

Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
De Blaquiere Estate
  Sale Proposals, *July 23*, 357, 358.
  Uneconomic Holdings, *July 29*, 1506; *Aug. 1*, 2081, 2082.
Lewis Estate Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *July 23*, 358.

Duke of York's School
Chelsea Site, Disposal of.
  Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 29*, 1467.
New Buildings, Date of Completing.
  Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 1476.

Duleek
Survey Operations.
  Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 27*, 842.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanarkshire, Govan]
Australian Commonwealth Coat of Arms, *July 23*, 364, 365; *July 27*, 813.
Death Duties—Receipts in 1908, *July 23*, 334.
Fisheries—Scottish New Cruiser, *July 31*, 1948.
Heraldry—*Status* of Lyon King at Arms, *July 29*, 1487.
Income - Tax — Scottish Contribution (1906–8), *July 23*, 335.

Dunleer
Sub-postmastership Vacancy.
  Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29*, 1453.

Dunraven, Earl of
Irish Universities Bill, *Com. July 30*, 1654.

Eastbourne
Charter for.
  Qs. Mr. Beaumont; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 30*, 1762.

East India Loans Bill
c. 1R.* *July 30*, 1904.

Edenbridge
Case of D. Nicholls.
  Qs. Mr. Morrell; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 27*, 844; *July 29*, 1493.
  Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 28*, 1183.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R., *Com.* and *Rep.*, *July 27*, 705.
3R.* *July 28*, 1070.
c. 1R.* *July 28*, 1168.
2R.* *July 29*, 1448.
Con. and 3R.* *July 30*, 1688.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Edinburgh University
Ordinance No. 10 Presented, *July 29*, 1374, 1450.

Education, England and Wales
[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]
Agricultural Education, Copy of Conditions Affecting—Presented, *Aug. 1*, 2073, 2079.
Attendance of Children below Five Years of Age—Report Presented, *July 30*, 1634, 1691.
Building Grants, Administration of.
Os. Mr. Bridgeman, *July 30*, 1796–1798; Mr. Runciman, 1830, 1832, 1833; Lord R. Cecil, 1831–1833.
Code
Article 14.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 28*, 1175.
Article 43, Interpretation of.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 30*, 1727.
Date of Issue.
Q. Mr. H. Gooch; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 23*, 298.
Compulsory Attendance Committee.
Qs. Mr. Bridgeman; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 22*, 92.
Denominational Schools, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. W. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 1*, 2081.
Grants in Aid of Denominational Schools.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 1456.
Half-Timers, *see that title.*
Open-Air Schools.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 1*, 2080.
Registration Council Staff—Position on Abolition of Office.
Q. Mr. Butcher; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 27*, 825.
Secondary Education in Wales—Return as to Voluntary Subscriptions, proposed.
Os. Lord Glantawe, *July 29*, 1433, 1436, 14337; Earl of Camperdown, 1436; Earl Beauchamp, 1436.
Teachers—Footnote to Article 10 of Code of 1906.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 28*, 1176.
Training Colleges
List of.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 28*, 1182.

Education, England and Wales—*cont.*
Training Colleges—*cont.*
Regulations for.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 1*, 2080.
Waiver Resolutions—Statement Presented, *July 24*, 499; *July 27*, 705.
Welsh
Central Board Relations with Board of Education.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 31*, 2070, 2071.
Code
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 1*, 2080.
Correspondence between Schools and Education Board.
Os. Sir H. Roberts, *July 30*, 1825, 1826; Mr. Runciman, 1828.
Dual Inspection Grievances.
Os. Sir H. Roberts, *July 30*, 1825; Mr. Runciman, 1827; Mr. W. Jones, 1834.
Grants, Distribution of.
Os. Mr. Runciman, *July 30*, 1827.
Intermediate Education—Recognition of Central Board in Code, proposed.
Os. Sir H. Roberts, *July 30*, 1825; Mr. Runciman, 1829; Mr. W. Jones, 1833, 1834.

Education, Ireland
[*For particular places see their names.*]
Board—Duties of Secretaries.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 852.
Brown and Nolan's Reader.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. McHugh, Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. Barrie, Mr. Lardner; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1506.
Compulsory Attendance—Local Authorities adopting Act of 1892.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 354.
Convent School Grants.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 1965.
Estimate Revised, Presented, *July 24*, 500.
Grants, Additional Conditions of Giving
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 306.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July* 23, 363.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 832.
Inspectors, Complaints against.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1201,
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 1964.
Intermediate
Inspectorate.
Q. Mr. W. Long; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1710.

[*cont.*

Education, Ireland—*cont.*
Intermediate—*cont.*
Rules.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 836.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1713.
National School Teachers
Allowances
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell. *July 31*, 1948.
Assistant Teachers' Salaries.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 352.
Resignations on Pension.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 29*, 1473.
Salary Increase, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1189.
Small Schools, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Butcher; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 1966.
Workhouse Teachers, *see under* Workhouses—Irish School Teachers.

Education, Scotland
Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
[*For particular places, see their names.*]
Grants—Deduction System
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 24*, 507.

Education, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. W. Runciman.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. T. McKinnon-Wood.
Lift in New Buildings.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 24*, 507.

Education Board Provisional Orders Conformation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill
. 1R.* *July 22*, 60.
2R.* *July 28*, 1167.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 23*, 296.
3R.* *July 24*, 497.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Egypt
Cairo Drainage Scheme.
Q. Mr. Ridsdale; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 24*, 507
Cairo Khedivial School Attendance, etc.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 332.
Education System
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 1751.

Egypt—*cont.*
Education system—*cont.*
Necessity for Reform of.
Os. Dr. Rutherford, *July 27*, 982, 983.
Mortgage Bank Proposal.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 332.
Self-Government for, proposed.
Os. Dr. Rutherford, *July 27*, 982–985.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 3) Bill
c. 3R.* *July 22*, 59.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Ellis, Rt. Hn. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
India
Administrative Policy, *July 22*, 170
Education—Reform of Present System proposed, *July 22*, 169.
Police Reforms, Increased Expenditure due to, *July 22*, 168.
Railway Administration, *July 22*, 169.
Salt Duty, Loss of Revenue due to Reduction of, *July 22*, 168.
Nigeria—Spirit Import Inquiry, *July 30*, 1715.
Opium—Effect on Indian Revenue, *July 22*, 168.

Ely Estate
Cases of B. M'Garrahan and W. McCullagh.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1697.

Emigration and Immigration
Statistics (1898–1908).
Q. Mr. King; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 316.
Statistical Tables—Return Ordered, *July 31*, 1945; Presented, *July 31*, 2072.

Empire Day
Official Recognition of.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 865.

Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill
c. 2R. *July 28*, 1362.
Com. *July 29*, 1629.
Con. and 3R.* *July 30*, 1904.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.** *July 31*, 1942.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Erith
Unemployed Relief Works.
Qs. Mr. Rowlands; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 30*, 1761.

Erskine, Mr. D. C. [Perthshire, W.]
Post Office—Cost of Living in Certain Towns, *July 23*, 311.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
Africa, South—Native Education Report, *July 27*, 839.
Basutoland Special Report, *July 27*, 839.
Bechuanaland Special Report, *July 27*, 839.
Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill, *Com. July 23*, 495, 496.

Essex, Mr. R. W. [Gloucestershire, Cirencester]
Beer—Use of Malt Substitutes, *July 29*, 1469.
Coinage and Currency—Exhibition of certain Specimens, *July 30*, 1733.
Hop Industry
Committee Report and Recommendations, Proposals for Dealing with, *July 31*, 2040–2042.
Legislative Proposals, *July 27*, 855.
House of Commons — Decoration of Strangers' Lobby, *July 30*, 1730.
Wakefield Post Office Extension, *July 27* 840.

Estimates
See also titles Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, Navy Estimates, *and* Supply.
Supplementary, Discussion of.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 365.

Everett, Mr. R. L. [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1013–1017.
Hollesley Bay Experiment, *July 29*, 1538.
Poor Rate Exemption Act, 1840—Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1013–1017.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R. *July 22*, 241.
Com. July 27, 989.
Con. and 3R.*, *July 28*, 1354.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con. July 30*, 1680.
Royal Assent, *Aug, 1*, 2074.

Exchequer and Audit Department
Colonial Audit Branch Officials.
Qs. Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 22*, 68; *July 30*, 1705.
Promotion Committee.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1704.

Exchequer and Audit Department—*cont.*
Promotion System.
Qs. Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 29*, 1460.
Removal Expenses of Officers.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1704.
Retirements Projected.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1704.
Staff, Appointment and Promotion of.
Qs. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 28*, 1174, 1202.
Stamp Sales, Receipts from.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1704.
Travelling Expenses of Civil Officers.
Q. Mr. Field; *As.* Colonel Seely, Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1716.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
c. Com. July 22, 1011.
Rep. and 3R. *July 22*, 1054.
2R.* *July 24*, 596.
Com. and 3R. *July 27*, 1011.
l. 1R.* *July 28*, 1072.
2R.* *July 29*, 1433.
Com. Rep. and 3R.* *July 30*, 1676; *July 31*, 1910.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.
Date of taking.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 366.

Eyrecourt
Case of Hynes.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 832.

Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, Andover]
Army—Special Reserve
Age Limit, *July 27*, 912.
Training Arrangements, *July 27*, 911.
"Gladiator," Use of Camels in Salving, *July 23*, 326.

Faber, Lord
Consols, Price of, July 29, 1419.
Finance Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 1415–1419.
National Debt
Reduction, Employment of Sum Devoted to, *July 29*, 1418, 1419.
Sinking Fund, Allegations as to Raids on by Salisbury Government, *July 29*, 1417.
Old Age Pensions—Contributory System, *July 29*, 1415.
Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 29*, 1424.
Taxation, Broadening Basis of, *July 29*, 1417, 1418.

Factories and Workshops
- Accidents, Increase in Number of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Gill, *July 29*, 1589.
- Brass Foundry Regulations, Modification of, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. T. Collings, *July 29*, 1585–1588, 1608, 1609; Mr. Gladstone, 1608, 1609.
- Exempted Processes, Abuses of Law under.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 29*, 1576, 1578.
- Girls and Children—Increase in Number Employed.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 29*, 1576, 1578–1581; Mr. Gladstone, 1606.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Verney, Mr. H. Law; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 31*, 1956.
- Inspectors
  - Increasing Number of, proposed.
    - *Os.* Mr. Gill, *July 29*, 1589.
  - Women Inspectors, Increase in Number of.
    - *Os.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 29*, 1607.
- Outworkers Lists.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 27*, 814.
- Report, Delay in Issuing.
  - *Os* Mr. Gill, *July 29*, 1588; Mr. A. Douglas, 1602; Mr. Gladstone, 1602.
- Royal Warrants *see that title.*
- Spark Catchers on Chimneys.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Gladstone *July 29*, 1455.

Factory and Workshop Act (1901) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
- c. 1R.* *July 27*, 890.

Falkirk and District Water Order Confirmation Bill
- c. 3R.* *July 22*, 59.
- Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Falkner Estate
- Sale of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1472.

Farrell, Mr. J. [Longford, N.]
- Dease Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 23*, 353.
- Derrycassan Estate Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *July 23*, 364.
- Monedarrah Grazing Land, Sale of, *July 23*, 352.
- Post Office Auxiliaries, Rural, Pay of, *July 23*, 312.
- Rathcline—Case of B. and J. Mullooly, *July 23*, 353.
- Richardson Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 23*, 353.

Farrihy
- Case of J. Haugh.
  - *Q.* Mr. Halpin. *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1501.

Fatal Accidents (Damages) (No. 2) Bill
- Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Federated Malay States
- Children in Gaming and Opium Dens.
  - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 83.
- Gambling Licence System.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Laidlaw. *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 83, 84.
- Revenue Statistics.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Laidlaw; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 82.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
- Canadian Cattle Disease, *July 23*, 345.
- Housing of the Working Classes—Cubic Space in London and Berlin, *July 22*, 90.
- Morocco—Case of Mr. Clark-Kennedy, *July 28*, 1229.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Aliens in East of London, Work entailed by, *July 28*, 1185.
  - Regulations, Issue of, *July 30*, 1702.
- Port of London Bill—Costs incurred, *July 28*, 1235.
- St. Vincent Eruption Relief Fund, *July 28*, 1223.
- Trade, Board of—*Labour Gazette* Articles, *July 22*, 90.
- Transvaal White Labour, Particulars of, *July 30*, 1750.

Fenchurch Street
- Railway Point Cleaner, Case of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Wardle; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 340.

Ferens, Mr. T. R. [Hull, E.]
- Driffield Guardians' Vaccination Contract, *July 28*, 1239.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
- British Indians in the Colonies—Conference proposed, *July 28*, 1306–1308.
- Indian Government Churches, Use of, *July 22*, 223.
- Naval Works at Rosyth, *July 27*, 821; *July 30*, 1737.

Fermoy
- Courthouse, Control of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Abraham. *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1188.

Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G. [Fermanagh, N.]
- Aileen Estate—Case of J. Cassidy, *July 30*, 1768.
- Barmagh—Case of J. Graham, *July 30*, 1768.
- Castle Archdale Estate—Case of J. Bacon, *July 30*, 1768.
- Ely Estate—Cases of B. M'Garrahan and W. McCullagh, *July 30*, 1697.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
- Boxwell Estate Sale Proposals, *July 27,* 834.
- Education—Intermediate Rules, *July 27,* 836.
- Land Commission Report, *July 27,* 834.
- Land Purchase Transactions, *July 27,* 834.
- Wexford Labourers' Cottages Schemes, *July 30,* 1709.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Audit of Irish Public Accounts, *July 22,* 68.
- Customs and Excise—Case of Mr. C. Clarke, *July 28,* 1173.
- Duleek Survey Operations, *July 27,* 842.
- Education Board—Lift in New Buildings, *July 24,* 507.
- Exchequer and Audit Department
  - Colonial Audit Branch Officials, *July 22,* 68; *July 30,* 1705.
  - Promotion Committee, *July 30,* 1704.
  - Promotion System, *July 29,* 1460, 1461.
  - Removal Expenses of Officers, *July 30,* 1704.
  - Retirements Projected, *July 30,* 1704.
  - Staff, Appointment and Promotion of, *July 28,* 1174, 1202.
  - Stamp Sales, Receipts from, *July 30,* 1704.
  - Travelling Expenses of Civil Officers, *July 30,* 1716.
- Post Office—Case of Miss Bradley, *July 22,* 69; *July 24,* 504.
- Post Office Savings Bank
  - Female Clerks, Transfer of, *July 24,* 503.
  - Irish Work, *July 24,* 502, 503.
- Ordnance Survey, Field Superintendents, *July 27,* 842.
- Straffan Stud Farms—Military Manœuvres in Vicinity, *July 23,* 325.

Fiennes, Mr. E. E. [Oxfordshire, Banbury]
- Volunteer Long-Service Medal, *July 30,* 1703.

Finance Bill
- *c.* 3R. *July 25,* 663.
- *l.* 1R.* *July 27,* 708.
  - 2R.* *July 29,* 1398.
  - 3R. *July 30,* 1676.
  - Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2074.
- Procedure with Regard to Discussion.
  - *Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 25,* 663; Mr. Lloyd-George, 680.

Finchley Urban District Council Bill.
- Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2077.

Findlay, Mr. A. [Lanarkshire, N.E.]
- Naval Works at Rosyth, *July 27,* 823.

First Lord of the Treasury—*Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith*

Fisheries
- [*See also Names of Places, Rivers, etc.*]
- Board, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Williamson; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 30,* 1701.
- Curing Industry
  - Conditions of Employment.
    - *Os.* Sir C. W. Dilke, *July 29,* 1576–1578; Mr. Gladstone, 1606.
  - Inquiry into.
    - *Q.* Sir C. W. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23,* 336.
- Investigation—Report Presented, *July 31,* 1909; *Aug. 1,* 2078.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Doughty; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 30,* 1737.
- Line and Trawl-Caught Fish Landed in Scotland (1898–1907).
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 23,* 312.
- Scottish Cruisers.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Hay, Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 23,* 347.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 31,* 1948.
- Steam Trawlers—Return Presented, *July 27,* 705, 809.
- Trawling Scottish Prosecutions.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22,* 69.

Fitzmaurice, Lord—*Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs*
- Irish Universities Bill, 2R. *July 27,* 797–805.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28,* 1108 1109, 1126, 1128, 1129, 1136, 1138, 1140–1143, 1148–1150, 1152–1154, 1157–1159, 1161; *Rep. July 29,* 1440, 1442.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
- Blacker-Douglas Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 29,* 1476; *July 30,* 1713.
- Education—Intermediate Rules, *July 30,* 1713.
- Franks Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 30,* 1712.
- Killarney Land Commission Sittings, *July 29,* 1475.
- Listowel Fair Rent Decision, *July 31,* 1946,
- Listowel Estate—Disposal of, *July 30·* 1712.
- Naval Marriages Bill, *Com. July 27,* 1056.

Fleury Estate
- Case of J. Sisk.
  - *Q.* Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31,* 1964.

Flogging
See Corporal Punishment.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Beardesley Evans Estate, Purchase of, *July 22*, 95, 96.
Fuge Estate, Untenanted Land. *July 22*, 95.
Hastings Twiss Estate—Case of D. Barry, *July 23*, 303.
Meat Supply Inquiry, *July 28*, 1236.
Natal—Dinizulu Case, *July 22*, 87.
Naval Obsolete Vessels, Cost of and Price Realised, *July 27*, 820.
Osborne Cadets' Examination Papers, *July 22*, 77.

Folliott Estate
Case of Mr. Felly.
Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1178.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
Under-Secretary—Lord Fitzmaurice.

Foreshores
Crown Rights—Treasury Minutes presented, *July 30*, 1636, 1692.

Forestry
Afforestation Facilities.
Os. Mr. Curran, *July 29*, 1549, 1551; Mr. Burns, 1569, 1574.

Forster, Mr. H. W. [Kent, Sevenoaks]
London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1872.
Public Works Loans (Remission) Bill Expenses Resolution, *July 23*, 486.
Registration Bill, 3R. *July 23*, 494.

France
British Relations with.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 955, 956.
Customs Tariff on certain British Imports.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *July 27*, 985; Sir E. Grey, 986.
Elastic Tissues, Import Duty on.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Sir E. Grey. *July 27*, 813.
Trade Report Presented, *July 30*, 1635.

Franks Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1712.

Friendly Societies
Royal London Society, Agreement as to.
Qs. Mr. Clough, Mr. Lupton, Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 30*, 1764.

Friendly Societies Bill
l. 2R. *July 23*, 255.
Com. and *Rep.* July 29*, 1426.
3R.,* *July 31*, 1910.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.* July 31*, 2072.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Fuge Estate
Untenanted Land.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 95.

Graine River
Improvement Works.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 25*, 599.

Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Galway
Condition of.
Q. Captain Craig; *A*, Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 833.
Proclamation of County—Imposition of extra Police Rate, etc.
Os. Lord Killanin, *July 23*, 275, 278, 291; Lord Denman, 281–284.
Queen's College—Report Presented, *July 27*, 706, 809.

Gardner, Mr. E. [Berkshire, Wokingham]
Meat Supply Inquiry, Proposals for, *July 27*, 885.

Garforth
School Dispute.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 1498.

Garw and Ogmore Gas Bill
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill
c. Rep. July 23*, 295.
Con. July 24*, 497.
3R.* *July 25*, 598.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 28*, 1070.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
c. Rep. July 23*, 295.
Con. July 24*, 497.
3R.* *July 25*, 598.
l. Common's Amendts., *Con.* July 28*, 1070.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Gas Undertakings
Returns Ordered, *July 31*, 1944, 1945.

Gateshead
Unemployment, Public Bodies dealing with.
Q. Mr. J. Johnson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 31*, 1967.

"General"
- Arrest by German Gun-boat.
  - *Qs.* Sir G. Doughty, Earl Winterton; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 1753.

Germany
- British Relations with.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 957, 958; Earl Percy, 961,; Sir E. Grey, 969, 970; Dr. Rutherford, 982.
- Prussian and Bavarian Schools, Religious Teaching in.
  - *Q.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 29*, 1458.
- Naval Programme, *see under* Navy.
- Trade Report, Presented, *July 22*, 3.

Gibbs, Mr. G. A. [Bristol, W.]
- Post Office—Territorial Force leave of Officials, *July 25*, 610.

Gilbert Islands
- Administration, Complaints as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Summberbell, *July 28*, 1320, 1329; Colonel Seely, 1328, 1329.
- Charges against Resident Commissioner.
  - *Q.* Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 30*, 1751.

Gill, Mr. A. H. [Bolton]
- Bleaching and Dye Works—Employment of Women, *July 29*, 1591.
- Cotton Factories
  - Card-rooms, Fencing and Ventilation of, *July 29*, 1590, 1591.
  - Time cribbing, *July 29*, 1589.
- Factories and Workshops
  - Accidents, Increase in Number of, *July 29*, 1589.
  - Inspectors, Increasing Number of, proposed, *July 29*, 1589.
  - Report, Delay in Issuing, *July 29*, 1588.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
- Gaine River Improvement Works, *July 25*, 599.
- Speech at Meeting in Ballinalack.
  - *Qs.* Captain Craig, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 108.

Gladstone Rt. Hn. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]
- Anæsthetics—Deaths from *July 30*, 1698; *July 31*, 1953.
- Australian Commonwealth Coat of Arms, *July 23*, 365; *July 27*, 813.
- Brentford—Case of Swallow, *July 30*, 1757.
- Cabs
  - Railway Station Service, *July 27*, 814.
  - Taximeter—Overcrowding, *July 27*, 812.
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1897–1902.

Gladstone, Rt. Hn. H. J.—*cont.*
- Corporal Punishment—Sentences inflicted, *July 30*, 1898–1900.
- Cotton Factories—Time-cribbing, *July 29*, 1657.
- Dartford Open-air Meetings, *July 30*, 1698.
- Dock Regulations, Enforcement of, proposed, *July 31*, 2062.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1012.
- Factories and Workshops
  - Brass Foundries, Regulations—Modification of, proposed, *July 29*, 1608, 1609.
  - Girls and Children, Increase in Number employed, *July 29*, 1606; *July 31*, 1956, 1957.
  - Inspectors, Women, Increase in Number of, *July 29*, 1607.
  - Outworkers' Lists, *July 27*, 815.
  - Report, Delay in issuing, *July 29*, 1603.
  - Spark Catchers on Chimneys, *July 29*, 1455.
- Fish-Curing Industry, Inquiry into, *July 23*, 337; *July 29*, 1606.
- Glasgow Factory Outworkers, Premises of, *July 27*, 815.
- Hamstead Colliery Disaster—Recognition of Bravery of Rescuers, *July 23*, 338.
- Home Office Vote, Inadequate time allowed for Discussion, *July 29*, 1602, 1609.
- Home Work
  - Conference of Medical Officers, *July 27*, 814.
  - Returns of Addresses, etc., *July 28*, 1232, 1233.
- Inebriate Homes, Cost of, *July 31*, 1955.
- Infant Mortality—High Rate in the Potteries, etc., *July 29*, 1606.
- Law Courts—Report of Council of Judges' *July 30*, 1697.
- London, Ambulances for, *July 23*, 300; *July 30*, 1699, 1700.
- Lunacy
  - Asylums, cost of, *July 31*, 1955.
  - Statistics, *July 30*, 1756.
  - Three Counties Asylum, Beer brewed at, *July 30*, 1758.
- McGhee F., and Wife, Sentence on, *July 23*, 337, 338.
- Man, Isle of—Deputation to Home Secretary *July 31*, 2061.
- Manchester Disturbances—Sentences on Leaders, *July 30*, 1897, 1898.
- Medical Officers of Health, Reports of, *July 28*, 1231.
- Mile End Road Motor Omnibus Accidents' *July 22*, 66.

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hn. H. J.—*cont.*
Motor Omnibus
Breakdowns, *July 28*, 1234; *July 30*, 1757.
Licensing, Conditions attached to, *July 29*, 1605.
Routes, Powers of Police to vary, etc., *July 29*, 1604.
Police
Complaints against, Method of dealing with, *July 29*, 1603.
Cost of, *July 31*, 1958.
Metropolitan.
Annual Holiday, *July 27*, 813.
Commission Report, *July 29*, 1603, 1604.
Exceptional Duties, Recognition of, *July 30*, 1758.
Weekly Day of Rest, Ballot for, *July 30*, 1728.
Prisons
Books for Prisoners, *July 23*, 301.
Cost of, *July 31*, 1954.
Provincial Homes Investment Company, Operations of, *July 30*, 1757.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools
Cost of, *July 31*, 1953.
Number of, etc., *July 30*, 1728.
Royal Warrants, Conditions of granting, *July 23*, 336.
Spitalfields Market—Carts in Vicinity, *July 30*, 1696.
Tramways—Speed of Cars in London, *July 28*, 1233, 1234.
Truck—Practice in Potteries, *July 23*, 337.
Vivisection Commission Report, Date of issuing, *July 29*, 1602.
Women's Suffrage Movement — Prison Treatment, *July 22*, 71; *July 23*, 339, 340; *July 28*, 1231; *July 30*, 1900, 1901.

Glantawe, Lord
Dover Graving Docks Bill—Sessional Order as to Second Reading, *July 27*, 703.
Education, Secondary, in Wales—Return as to Voluntary Subscriptions, proposed, *July 29*, 1433, 1436, 1437.

Glasgow
Factory Outworkers, Premises of.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 27*, 815.
Unemployment in—Work of Distress Committee, etc.
Os. Mr. Cleland, *July 31*, 2063, 1065; Mr. Sinclair, 2067–2069.

Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill
c. Con.,* *July 22*, 59.
3R.,* *July 24*, 497.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Glaunvarane Strand
Trespass Action.
Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 341.

Glen Boat Cove
Improvement Works.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1470.

Glendinning, Mr. R. [Antrim, N.]
Ballintoy Pier Repair, *July 24*, 506.
Rathlin Island Pier, *July 24*, 506.

Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Bill
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Gold Coast
Northern Territories—Annual Report Presented, *July 22*, 3, 61.

Gooch, Mr. G. P. [Bath]
Natal—British Troops, *July 27*, 867.

Gooch, Mr. H. C. [Camberwell, Peckham]
Education Code—Date of Issue, *July 23*, 298.
Venezuela—Concessions cancelled, *July 28*, 1228.

Gordon, Mr. J. [Londonderry, S.]
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 590; 3R. *July 25*, 616–622.

Goschen, Viscount
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.* *July 28*, 1124–1126, 1128.

Gosport Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *July 27*, 704.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 29*, 1447.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Goulding, Mr. [Worcester]
Cotton Industry—Reduction of Hours of Spinner's of American Cotton, *July 22*, 64.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1988, 1989.

Government Departments
Expenditure (1905–9).
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 24*, 508.
Status of certain Departments—Progress made with Inquiry.
Os. Mr. W. Long, *July 29*, 1519–1521; Mr. Chaplin, 1540; Mr. Burns, 1561.

Government Hospitality
Policy as to.
Q. Mr. L. Jones; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 23*, 345.

Granard, Earl of
Dover Graving Docks Bill—Sessional Order as to Second Reading, *July 27*, 704.
Merchant Service—Training of Officers, *July 22*, 50.
Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 1445.
Naval Marriages Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 1433.
Telegraph (Construction) Bill, 2R. *July 23*, 261 ; *Com. July 27*, 733, 735.

Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill
c. Com. July 22, 228.
Rep. July 22*, 241.
Con. and 3R. *July 23*, 495, 496.
l. 1R.* *July 25*, 597.
2R. *July 28*, 1166.
Com. and *Rep.* July 29*, 1446.
3R.* *July 30*, 1678.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Grantham
Barracks, Use for.
Q. Lord J. Joicey-Cecil ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 866.

Granton
Steamship communication with Burntisland.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *July 31*, 2069 ; Mr. Whitley, 2070.

Gravesend
Torpedo-slipway.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 322.

Great Northern Piccadilly and Brompton Railway Bill
*c. Con.** and 3R.* *July 27*, 806.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 28*, 1069.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Greenwich Hospital
Accounts, *July 30*, 1904.

Greenwich Park
Night Watchmen's Hours.
Q. Mr. Summerbell ; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 30*, 1729.

Greenwood, Mr. G. [Peterborough]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1*, 2097.
Natal
Affairs, Right to Criticise, *July 28*. 1295, 1296.
Dinizulu, Trial of, *July 28*, 1297, 1299.
Indemnity Bill, Terms of, *July 27*, 871 : *July 28*, 1301 ; *July 2*, 1485 ; *Aug 1*, 2093, 2094, 2099, 2101.
Martial Law, Administration of, etc., *July 28*, 1297–1300.

Greenwood, Mr. H. [York]
British Indians in the Colonies—Conference proposed, *July 28*, 1308.
Natal
Dinizulu, Trial of, *July 28*, 1309–1311.
Native Races, Treatment of, *July 28*, 1308–1311.
Small Holdings—Applications in Yorkshire, *July 29*, 1463.

Grehan Estate
Case of J. Therry and Son.
Q. Mr. Abraham ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 360.

Gretton, Mr. J. [Rutland]
Census of Production Act Returns, Date of making, *July 27*, 847.
Coastguard Service—Men required for Naval Manœuvres, *July 28*, 1177.
Hop Industry—Committee Report and Recommendations, *July 31*, 2042–2045.
Horse-Breeding Scheme, *July 28*, 1184.
Naval Officers, Press Communications by, *July 28*, 1212.
Public Works Loans Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 249.
Russo-Japanese War—British Shipping Claims, *July 28*, 1230.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
Bagdad Railway, Progress made with, etc., *July 27*, 988.
Belgium—Religious Instruction in Schools, *July 29*, 1459.
Canadian Tariff Treaty with France, *July 28*, 1229.
Cattle Importation Restrictions—Foreign Representations, *July 28*, 1228.
Congo Free State
Annexation Proposals, *July 30*, 1842–1844.
Concessions, Policy as to—Protection of Native Rights, etc., *July 27*, 974, 975.
Reforms—British Policy, *July 27*, 972, 979.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1842–1844.
Egypt
Cairo
Drainage Scheme, *July 24*, 507.
Khedivial School Attendance, etc., *July 23*, 332.
Education System, *July 30*, 1752.
Mortgage Bank Proposal, *July 23*, 332.

[*cont.*

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
- France
  - Customs Tariff on certain British Imports, *July 27*, 986.
  - Elastic Tissues, Import Duty on, *July 27*, 813.
- "General"—Arrest by German Gun-Boat *July 30*, 1753, 1754.
- Germany
  - British Relations with, *July 27*, 969, 970.
  - Prussian and Bavarian Schools, Religious Teaching in, *July 29*, 1459.
- Hague Conference—British Policy, *July 27*, 971, 972.
- Macedonia
  - Bands, Suppression of, *July 23*, 333.
  - Condition of Affairs in—Necessity for Pressing Reforms, etc., *July 27*, 966–969, 971.
  - Reform Proposals, *July 23*, 332.
  - Turkish Army in, Responsibility for Maintenance of, *July 27*, 964, 965.
- Morocco—Clark-Kennedy Case, *July 28*, 1229, 1230.
- Patent Law (Amendment) Act, 1907, Administration of, *July 23*, 303.
- Persia
  - Arms, Import of, *July 30*, 1755.
  - British Legations—Regulations as to Harbouring of Refugees, *July 27*, 977.
  - British Policy in, *July 27*, 976–978.
  - Frontier Negotiations with Turkey, *July 23*, 331.
  - Liakhoff, Colonel, Position of, *July 30*, 1755, 1756.
  - Situation in *July 23*, 333, 334.
  - Teheran British Legation, Insult offered to and Apology tendered, *July 27*, 977.
- Rome—Scots College Case, *July 28*, 1230.
- Russia
  - Czar's Visit to England, *July 28*, 1230.
  - Loan—Issue in Great Britain, *July 23*, 331.
  - Luxenburg, Mr., Case of, *July 25*, 613.
  - Tchaikovsky, Mr., Case of, *July 30*, 1754.
- Russo-Japanese War—British Shipping Claims, *July 28*, 1230.
- Siam, New Agreement with, *July 25*, 612, 613.
- Suez Canal
  - British Government Voting Power on Company, *July 23*, 330.
  - Dues, Dissatisfaction with, *July 23*, 330, 331

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
- "Taurus"—Arrest by German Torpedo-boat, *July 30*, 1754.
- Turkey—Circular as to British Subjects Captured by Brigands, *July 30*, 1753.
- Venezuela—Concession Cancelled, *July 28*, 1228.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
- Dogs
  - Distemper, Inquiry into, *July 30*, 1701.
  - Licences of Dealers, *July 27*, 816.

Grocers' Licences (Abolition) Bill
- c. 1R.* *July 29*, 1513.

Guinness, Mr. W. [Bury St. Edmunds]
- Admiralty Quantity Surveyors, Payments to, *July 28*, 1207; *July 30*, 1740.

Gurdon, Rt. Hon. Sir W. B. [Norfolk N.]
- Coal Mines Eight Hours Bill—Constitution of Standing Committee C., *July 27*, 888.

Gwynn, Mr. S. L. [Galway]
- India
  - Administrative Policy, *July 22*, 198, 199.
  - Education System, Reform of, *July 22*, 197.
- Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 421.

Hague Conference
- British Policy.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 957; Sir E Grey, 971, 972.
- Final Act, Correspondence, etc., Presented, *July 24*, 498; *July 27*, 706.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
- Aerial Navigation—War Office Expenditure (1903–8), *July 29*, 1481.
- Africa, South—Garrison
  - Cost of, *July 23*, 322.
  - Reduction, *July 22*, 66.
- Bermuda, Engineer Stores, *July 28*, 1190.
- Brecon, Meeting on 12th Ult., Disturbance at, *July 28*, 1190.
- Clutterbuck and Pepys, Captains, Transfer of, *July 23*, 324.
- Colonial and Foreign Garrison Reductions, *July 27*, 860.
- Director of Finance, Office of, *July 30*, 1736.
- Dublin—Phœnix Park Additional Ground, *July 28*, 1171.
- Duke of York's School, New Buildings, Date of Completing, *July 29*, 1476.
- Empire Day, Official Recognition of, *July 27*, 865.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
Engineer Services—Removal Expenses of Surveyors, *July 27*, 837.
Foreign Manœuvres, Attendance of Officers at, *July 27*, 866.
Foreign Service—Officers' Houses, *July 27*, 859.
Fourth Notts and Derby Regiment, Headquarters of, *July 29*, 1483.
Grantham Barracks, Use for, *July 27*, 866.
Gravesend Torpedo—Slipway, *July 23*, 322
King's Liverpool Regiment, Promotion in, *July 29*, 1457.
Militia Organisation under New Scheme, *July 27*, 892.
Natal —British Troops, *July 27*, 867.
New Forest Military Manœuvres, *July 28*, 1202.
Officers
Training Corps, *July 27*, 861, 862.
Universities and Public Schools, Recruiting from, *July 27*, 895, 896.
Olympic Games—Bullets used by British Teams, *July 29*, 1476.
Recruiting and Enlistment — Pay of Recruits, *July 27*, 861.
Reductions Effected, *July 27*, 903.
Reserve, Strength of, *July 27*, 921, 923.
Rifle Clubs, War Office Assistance to, *July 29*, 1457.
Royal Engineers Special Reserve—Age for Enlistment, *July 27*, 862.
Sandhurst Royal Military College Cadetships, *July 27*, 837.
Shoeburyness
Fishery Rights on War Office Ground, *July 30*, 1735.
Foreshore, Ownership of, *July 22*, 79; *July 28*, 1189.
Special Reserve
Foreign Service Organisation, *July 27*, 923.
Officers
Conditions of Service for, *July 27*, 895, 916; *July 29*, 1458.
Transfers from the Militia, *July 27*, 895, 897.
Organisation of, *July 27*, 890–893, 898.
Recruiting Returns, *July 27*, 894.
Transfers from the Militia, *July 27*, 894.
Straffan Stud Farms—Military Manœuvres in Vicinity, *July 23*, 325.
Territorial Force
Appeals by Commanding Officers of Volunteers, etc., for Support to Scheme, *July 27*, 856.
Civil Power, Aid to, *July 27*, 856.
Cyclist Battalions and Companies, *July 27*, 866, 867.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
Territorial Force—*cont.*
Government Assistance, *July 29*, 1482.
Horses, System of Hiring, *July 29*, 1482.
Inns of Court Volunteers, Position of, *July 27*, 864.
Instructors' Pay, *July 27*, 863.
Jury Service, *July 27*, 859, 860; *July 30*, 1736.
Quartermaster-Sergeants, Position of, *July 22*, 74; *July 30*, 1702.
Uniform Contracts, *July 28*, 1189.
Wagon and Harness Supply, *July 23*, 302.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, Clause 2—Application to Athletic Clubs, *July 23*, 302.
Volunteer Long-Service Medal, *July 30*, 1703.
War Office Uniform Contracts, *July 30*, 1702.
Wilson, Captain Bryce, case of, *July 30*, 1734.
Wireless Telegraphy, Control of, *July 27*, 855.
Woolwich Arsenal—Stores Available, *July 30*, 1703.
Woolwich Common, War Office right over, *July 22*, 77, 78; *July 27*, 864, 865.
Yeomanry—Case of Private Rennie (Fife and Forfar Regiment), *July 27*, 857, 858.

Half-Timers
Departmental Committee, Constitution and Scope of, etc.
Os. Mr. Bridgeman, *July 30*, 1798–1800, 1829; Mr. Runciman, 1829; Mr. Montague, 1835.
Qs. Mr. Montague; *As.* Mr Runciman, *July 29*, 1495.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
Farrihy—Case of J. Haugh, *July 29*, 1501

Halsbury, Earl of
Friendly Societies Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 257.
Married Women's Property Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 736.
Motors
Accidents due to—Statistics, *July 29*, 1387.
Dust Nuisance, *July 29*, 1387
Horns, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 29*, 1388.
Legislation, Necessity for, *July 29*, 1387–1389.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1082–1084;
Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments, *July 31*, 1936.
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Com. July 27*, 732.

Hamilton, Marquess of [Londonderry]
  Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 410.

Hamilton of Dalzell, Lord
  Merchant Service—Officers Training, *July 27*, 716.

Hampton, Lord
  Sat First in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *July 23*, 253.

Hamstead Colliery Disaster
  Bravery of Rescuers, Recognition of.
    Q. Mr. Meysey-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 338.
  Report presented, *July 24*, 499, *July 27*, 707.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]
  Bristol Post Office Erection—Notices Posted by Contractor, *July 27*, 840; *July 28*, 1181.
  British Museum Extension—Cause of Delay, *July 28*, 1185.
  Building Trade, State of, *July 30*, 1729.
  Customs House (London)—Accommodation, *July 23*, 316.
  Duke of York's School, Chelsea Site, Disposal of, *July 29*, 1468.
  Government Hospitality, Policy as to, *July 23*, 345.
  Greenwich Park Night Watchmen's Hours, *July 30*, 1730.
  House of Commons
    Newspaper Files Available, *July 29*, 1499.
    Strangers' Lobby, Decoration of, *July 30*, 1730.
  Plymouth Post Office—Wages of Bricklayers, *July 28*, 1172.
  Regent's Canal Fence, Repair of, *July 28*, 1197.
  Richmond Royal Houses, Use for, *July 27*, 846.

Harcourt, Mr. R. [Montrose Burghs]
  Indian Famine Relief Works, *July 28*, 1220.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
  Brecon Open Air Meetings, Police Attendance at, *July 29*, 1487, 1488.
  Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1045.
  India
    Army Expenditure, Increase in, etc., *July 22*, 171.
    Bengal, Partition of, *July 22*, 178.
    Budget Surplus, *July 22*, 171.
    Charges on Native States for Imperial Purposes, *July 22*, 172.

Hardie, Mr. J. K.—*cont.*
  India—*cont.*
    Education.
      Increased Expenditure on, *July 22*, 172.
      Reform of Present System, proposed, *July 22*, 173.
    Famine Relief Works, Suspension of Land Revenue, etc., *July 22*, 174.
    Judicial Administration, Cost of, *July 22*, 180.
    Liquor Traffic, Increased Revenue Derived from, *July 22*, 177.
    Natives, Administrative Posts Open to, *July 22*, 179, 180.
    Plague Statistics, *July 22*, 174.
    Seditious Writings and Propaganda Evils of, *July 22*, 175.
    Sylhet Bomb Manufacture, *July 28*, 1213.
    Tilak, Mr., Case of, *July 28*, 217.
  Merthyr Tydvil Police Pension Rights, *July 27*, 879.
  Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1981.
  Opium—Diminution of Indian Revenue, *July 22*, 176.
  Prisons, Convict—Women Directors, *July 27*, 879.
  Russia—Case of Mr. Tchaikovsky, *July 30*, 1754.
  Unemployed Workmen Act — Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1045.
  Woolwich Common, War Office Right over, *July 22*, 78.
  Yeomanry—Case of Private Rennie, *July 27*, 856, 858.

Hardinge, Viscount
  Army
    Infantry Units — Shortage below Establishment, *July 22*, 53.
    Special Reserve, Equipment of, *July 22*, 54.
    Territorial Force, Organisation of, *July 22*, 28.

Hardy, Mr. G. A. [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
  Unemployment—Urgency of and Suggestions for Dealing with the Question, *July 29*, 1560.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
  Hop Industry—Committee Report and Recommendations, *July 31*, 2037–2040.

Harlech Estate
  Case of Mrs. A. Reilly.
    Q. Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1706.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
- Finance Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 697–699.
- Local Government Board
  - Loans to Municipalities, Conditions attached to, *July 29*, 1555–1557.
  - Sinking Funds on Public Buildings—Period of Repayment, *July 29*, 1558, 1559.
- Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 25*, 699.
- Taxation—Necessity for providing New Sources, *July 25*, 697–699.
- Waterworks, Sinking Fund on—Period of Repayment, *July 29*, 1557.

Harmsworth, Mr. C. B. [Worcester, Droitwich]
- Port of London Bill—Alterations suggested, *July 23*, 341.
- Shetland Cable Breakdown, Cause of, *July 27*, 839.

Hart-Davies, Mr. T. [Hackney, N.]
- Bristol Post Office Erection—Notices posted by Contractor, *July 28*, 1181.
- India
  - Administrative Policy, *July 22*, 193–197.
  - Bengal, Partition of, *July 22*, 196.
  - Executive Councils, Admission of Natives to, proposed, *July 22*, 195.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
- India—Bombay Factory Disturbances, *July 28*, 1218.

Hastings and St. Leonards
- Post Office Duties.
  - *Q.* Mr. Du Cros; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29*, 1459.

Hastings Twiss Estate
- Case of D. Barry.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 303.

Haversham, Lord
- Army—Territorial Force, Organisation of, *July 22*, 32.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.* *July 28*, 1163.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Admiralty Statements to the Press, Authorship of, *July 30*, 1892.
- Fisheries—Scottish Cruisers, *July 23*, 347, 348.
- Navy—Portsmouth Gun Wharf Fire in 1907, *July 23*, 325.
- Royal Warrants, Conditions of Granting, *July 23*, 336.
- War Office, Ministers other than Secretary of State for War attending at, *July 23*, 365.

Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. [West Bromwich]
- Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 514–524.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
- Blackrock Tramp Nuisance, *July 29*, 1471.
- Dublin—Phœnix Park Additional Land, *July 27*, 841; *July 28*, 1171.
- Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 416 475; *July 24*, 570, 572, 587.
- Public Works Loans Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 249.
- Public Works Loans (Remission) Bill—Expenses Resolution, *July 23*, 479, 490, 492, 493.
- Women's Suffrage Movement, Prison Treatment, *July 23*, 339.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
- China—Tientsin British Post Office, *July* 24, 504.

Hedges, Mr. A. P. [Kent, Tonbridge]
- Railways—Coal Freight and Wastage *July 27*, 846.

Helmsley, Viscount, [Yorkshire, N.R. Thirsk]
- Africa, East—Date of Presenting Labour Employment Report, *July 22*, 67.

Henderson, Mr. T. M. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
- Argentina, Increase in British Trade with, *July 25*, 700.
- Finance Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 696, 699.

Heneage, Lord
- Cran Measures Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 52.

Heraldry
- Lyon King at Arms, *Status* of.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. Duncan; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 29*, 1487.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Buckinghamshire, Wycombe]
- Admiralty Shipbuilding Contractors and Foreign Contracts, *July 28*, 1204, 1205.
- Motors
  - Dust Nuisance, Suggestions for Obviating, *July 28*, 1240.
  - Legislation, Necessity for, *July 29*, 1528.
  - Scouts giving Warning against Police Traps, Necessity for Dealing with, *July 29*, 1528.
  - Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1529, 1530.

Herschell, Lord
- Crofters, Arrears in Payment of Instalments by, etc., *July 22*, 38–40.

Hill, Sir C. L. [Shrewsbury]
- Africa, East
  - Labour Rules, *July 27*, 868.
  - Land Tenure Legislation, *July 27*, 868.
  - Ordinances—Placing in Library, *July 22*, 67.
  - Rules in Cd. 4122, *July 22*, 67.
- Maryborough Postman, Speech by, *July 29*, 1494.

Hobart, Sir R. [Hampshire, New Forest]
- New Forest Military Manœuvres, *July 28*, 1201.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Bristol, E.]
- Audit of Irish Public Accounts, *July 22*, 68.
- Ballinorley School, Closing of, *July 30*, 1767.
- Birth Certificates—Cost of Copy, *July 30*, 1705.
- Books—Import Regulations, *July 27*, 816.
- Criminal Appeal Act—Shorthand Writers, *July 23*, 301; *July 27*, 817.
- Customs and Excise
  - Case of Mr. C. Clarke, *July 28*; 1174.
  - Preventive Officers, System of Appointing, *July 23*, 302.
  - Reorganisation Scheme, *July 30*, 1767.
- Dog Licences of Dealers, *July 27*, 816.
- Dublin—Phœnix Park Additional Land, *July 27*, 841.
- Education
  - Intermediate Rules, Printing of, *July 30*, 1713.
  - National School Teachers' Resignations on Pension, *July 29*, 1473.
- Exchequer and Audit Department
  - Colonial Audit Branch Officials, *July 22*, 68; *July 30*, 1705.
  - Promotion Committee, *July 30*, 1704.
  - Promotion System, *July 29*, 1460, 1461, 1462.
  - Removal Expenses of Officers, *July 30*, 1704.
  - Retirements projected, *July 30*, 1704.
  - Staff, Appointment and Promotion of, *July 28*, 1175, 1204.
  - Stamp Sales, Receipts from, *July 30*, 1705.
  - Travelling Expenses of Civil Officers, *July 30*, 1716.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1012, 1053, 3R. 1055.
- Friendly Societies—Royal London Society Agreement, *July 30*, 1765.
- Gaine River Improvement Works, *July 25*, 599.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H.—*cont.*
- Government Departments Expenditure (1905–9), *July 24*, 508.
- Irish Congestion Commission, Cost of, *July 30*, 1694.
- Land Purchase-Stock—Return as to Issues, *July 22*, 112.
- Limavady and Dungiven Railway, Grant to, *July 27*, 817.
- Public Works Loans Bill, 2R., *July 22*, 248, 249, 251, 252; *Com.*, *July 27*, 1003, 1006, 1008–1010.
- Public Works Loans (Remission) Bill Expenses Resolution, *July 23*, 479, 483, 484, 490, 492, 493.
- Revenue raised by Taxes, *July 28*, 1194.
- Superannuation, Case of Edward Lynam *July 23*, 347.
- Westmeath, Re-valuation Expenses, *July 29*, 1453.

Holderness Water Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee, *July 23*, 253.
  - 3R.* *July 27*, 704.
- *c.* Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 28*, 1167.
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Hollesley Bay
- *See under* Labour Colonies.

Holt, Mr. R. D. [Northumberland, Hexham]
- Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 574.

Home Office
- *Secretary of State.*—Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.
- *Under-Secretary.*—Mr. H. Samuel.
- Report, Delay in Issuing.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 29*, 1577.
- Vote—Inadequate Time Allowed for Discussion.
  - *Os.* Mr. Atherley-Jones, *July 29*, 1592; Mr. Gladstone, 1602, 1609; Mr. H. J. Tennant, 1609.

Home Work
- Conference of Medical Officers.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 27*, 814.
- Returns of Addresses, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 28*, 1231.
- Select Committee Report Presented, *July 22*, 112.

Honourable Artillery Company Bill
- *c.* 3R.* *July 24*, 497.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *July 27*, 704.
- Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Hong Kong
- Opium *see that title.*

Hop Industry
Acreage in England and America.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1718.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 30*, 1728.
American Crop, Period of Picking.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1718.
Committee Report and Recommendations, Proposals for Dealing with.
Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *July 31*, 2037–2040; Mr. Essex, 2040–2042; Mr. Gretton, 2042–2045; Mr. Lloyd-George, 2045–2050.
Continental Hops, Price of.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1718.
Import Statistics 1820–1907.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1722.
Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 27*, 855.

Hope, Mr. James [Sheffield, Central]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—Amendment to Schedule B., out of Order, *July 31*, 1969.
Old-Age Pensions, Cost of, *July 23*, 335.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendments, *Con., July 31*, 1993.

Horniman, Mr. E. [Chelsea]
Duke of York's School
Chelsea Site, Disposal of, *July 29*, 1467.
New Buildings, Date of Completing, *July 29*, 1476.
Womens Suffrage Movement—Prison Treatment, *July 22*, 71.

Horses
Breeding Scheme.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 28*, 1184.

Hort Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. John O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 1961.

Housing of the Working Classes
Cubic Space in London and Berlin.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 90.

Howard, Mr. G. [Cumberland, Eskdale]
Meat Supply Inquiry, *July 23*, 343.

Hoxton
Douglas Hall, Use of, for Schoolhouse.
Qs. Mr. A. Allen, Mr. S. Collins; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 1496.

Hudson, Mr. W. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
Navy
"Defence"—Wages of Engine-Fitters, *July 27*, 822.
"Invincible"—Wages of Electrical Wire Workers, *July 28*, 1209, 1210.
Post Office—Provincial Superintending Engineers' Offices Staff, *July 27*, 810.
Public Works Loans (Remission) Bill Expenses Resolution, *July 23*, 493.
Railways—Value of Automatic Couplings, *July 27*, 882.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill
l Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Hunt, Mr. R [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Army
Officers—Recruiting from Universities and Public Schools, *July 27*, 923.
Special Reserve
Officers Liability for Service as High Sheriff, *July 27*, 923.
Physique of Recruits, *July 27*, 923, 924.
Territorial Force Horses, *July 27*, 924.
Defence of the Empire—Adequacy of present Arrangements, *July 27*, 925, 926.
Jamaican Relief Fund, Distribution of, *July 30*, 1716.
Old-Age Pensions—Estimate of Rural Pensioners, *July 23*, 319.

Hutton, Mr. A. E. [Yorks, W.R., Morley]
Chapels and Churches, Rating of, *July 27*, 843.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con., July 23*, 378-380, 420; *July 24*, 548–550.

Hynes Estate
Sale Proposals
Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 1945.

Imperial Conference
Secretariat, Duties of.
Qs. Mr. Tennant; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 29*, 1484.

Importation of Plumage Prohibition Bill
c. 1R.* *July 22*, 113.

Income-Tax
Earned Income, Definition of.
Q. Mr. W. F. D. Smith; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 320.
Maintaining at 1s. in the £ in time of Peace.
Os. Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29*, 1407, 1408; Lord St. Davids, 1412; Earl of Crewe, 1420.
Officers on Retired Pay, Form Issued to.
Q. Mr. W. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Causton, *July 28*, 1185.

[*cont*

Income-Tax—*cont.*
Reduction Claims, Date for Making.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 2*, 1197.
Royalties on Patents.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 27*, 847.
Scottish Contribution (1906–8).
Q. Mr. R. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 335.

Independent Order of Foresters (Toronto)
Security Deposited.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 28*, 1177.

India
Administrative Policy.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 127, 213; Earl Percy, 139, 140; Mr. Ellis, 170; Mr. Maccaw, 185–187; Sir H. Roberts, 190–193; Mr. Hart-Davies, 193–197; Mr. Gwynn, 198, 199; Sir G. S. Robertson, 205–208; Sir H. Cotton, 209.
Executive Councils, Admission of Natives to, proposed.
Os. Mr. Hart-Davies, *July 22*, 195.
Reform Proposals.
Qs. Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 30*, 1746.
Afforestation of Waste Lands.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 30*, 1746.
Allygurh Seditious Telegram Case.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Aug. 1*, 2087.
Army Expenditure, Increase in, etc.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 116–118; Mr. K. Hardie, 171.
Bengal
Judicial and Executive Functions, Proposals for Separation of.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 22*, 140.
Partition of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 127; Mr. K. Hardie, 178; Mr. Hart-Davies, 196; Sir H. Cotton, 209; Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, 215; Mr. Lupton, 216.
Press Regulation, Necessity for.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 23*, 299.
Bombay
Disturbances.
Qs. Mr. Harwood, Sir E. Sassoon; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1218.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Speaker, *July 29*, 1483.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Aug. 1*, 2087.
Factories Commission Report.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1221.

India—*cont.*
Budget Surplus.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 114, 115; Earl Percy, 130, 168; Mr. K. Hardie, 171.
Calcutta
Bomb Conspiracy.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 125.
Liquor Licences.
Q. Sir H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1215.
Liquor Shops, Hour of Closing.
Q. Sir H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1215.
Charges on Native States for Imperial Purposes.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 22*, 172.
Churches, Government
Expenditure on Upkeep.
Q. Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 27*, 830.
Use of.
Os. Mr. Maclean, *July 22*, 220–222; Mr. E. Wason, 222; Mr. M. Ferguson, 223; Mr. C. E. Price, 224; Mr. Buchanan, 225; Mr. Morton, 226; Mr. J. D. White, 227; Mr. Bright, 227.
Qs. Mr. J. D. White, Mr. Laidlaw; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 27*, 829.
Civil Service, Necessity for Reconstruction of.
Os. Sir H. Cotton, *July 22*, 210–212.
Condition of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 113; Sir G. S. Robertson, 203, 204.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Mr. Lupton, Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 30*, 1745.
Customs, Yield from.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 123.
Death-Rate Statistics.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 27*, 830; *July 30*, 1713.
Debt Charge, Position of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 122.
Decentralisation Commission Report.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 127, 128.
Economic and Industrial Condition.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 124; Earl Percy, 133; Mr. Lupton, 216.
Education
Increased Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 116, 213; Mr. K. Hardie, 172.
Reform of Present System proposed.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 22*, 134–139; Mr. Rees, 141, 145, 148, 152–158; Sir H. Craik, 162–167; Mr. Ellis, 169; Mr. K. Hardie, 173; Mr. Maccaw, 184; Mr. Gwynn, 197; Sir G. S. Robertson, 202, 203, 206; Sir H. Cotton, 208; Mr. Buchanan, 214.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

Excise Administration Statement.
Q. Sir H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1214.

Executive and Judicial Functions, Separation of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1214.

Exports and Imports—Statistics.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 123.

Famine

Effect on Expenditure.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 118.

Loans to Local Authorities.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 119, 120.

Relief Works—Suspension of Land Revenue, etc.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 119, 121; Mr. K. Hardie, 174.
Q. Mr. R. Harcourt; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1220.

Government Stores, Local Purchase of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 80.

Jasdan Succession.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As* Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 80; *July 31*, 1967.
Q. Mr. E. H. Lamb; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 30*, 1715.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 31*, 1949.

Judicial Administration, Cost of.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 22*, 180.

Kankinara Bomb Outrage.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 80.

Kathi Chiefs—Grievances as to Rule of Succession.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 31*, 2070.

Kothandaramayya, Mr., Case of.
Qs. Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 30*, 1714.

Limbdi Succession.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 80.

Liquor Traffic, Increased Revenue Derived from.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 22*, 177; Sir H. Roberts, 189.

Loans, Committee to Consider Authorising *Resolution* (Mr. J. Pease) *July 22*, 252.

Malaria, Mortality from.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 22*, 142.

Military Training of Civilians.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 23*, 299.

Mohmand Campaign, Conduct and Organisation of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 117; Earl Percy, 129.

India—*cont.*

Mosques and Temples, Grant for Upkeep of.
Q. Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 27*, 830.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 27*, 848.

Muslim Attitude towards Public Unrest, etc.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1214.

Natives, Administrative Posts Open to.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 22*, 179, 180.

Opium, *see that title.*

Orissa Village Records.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1191.

Plague Statistics,
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 124, 125; Mr. Rees, 142; Mr. K. Hardie, 174.

Police Reforms, Increased Expenditure Due to.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 116; Mr. Ellis, 168.

Press Act, Enforcement of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 125; Earl Percy, 131, 132; Mr. Rees, 151; Mr. Maccaw, 186.

Prisoners, Treatment of.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1220.

Public Works Department—Pay of Engineers.
Q. Mr. Younger; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 29*, 1484.

Quetta-Nushki Trade Route, Traffic by.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1212.

Railways

Administration of.
Os. Mr. Ellis, *July 22*, 169; Mr. Maccaw, 188, 189; Sir H. Kimber, 199.

Capital, Question of Raising without Government Guarantee.
Os. Sir H. Kimber, *July 22*, 201, 202.

Revenue Derived from.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 122; Sir H. Kimber, 200.

Railway and Irrigation Works and General Purposes, Loans for.

Resolution (Mr. Buchanan), *July 29*, 1631. Reported, *July 30*, 1903.

Revenue and Expenditure Accounts.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 113, 114; Mr. Lupton, 218, 219.

Resolution (Mr. Buchanan), *July 22*, 228.

Salt Duty, Loss of Revenue Due to Reduction of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 114, 115; Mr. Ellis, 168.

India—*cont.*
Sedition, Measures for dealing with.
Qs. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 125; Sir H. Craik, 161; Mr. Maccaw, 186; Sir H. Cotton, 209, 210.
Seditious Writings and Propaganda, Evils of.
Qs. Mr. Rees, *July 22*, 146–151, 160; Mr. K. Hardie, 175.
Prosecution for—Return Ordered, *July 29*, 1452.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1219.
Statement (Mr. Buchanan), *July 22*, 113–129.
Sylhet Bomb Manufacture.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1213.
Tilak, Mr., Case of.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees, Mr. K. Hardie, Sir H. Cotton, Mr. Lupton, Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1216.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 29*, 1483.
Qs. Mr. Lupton, Mr. O'Grady, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Speaker, *July 30*, 1747.
Tinnevelly—Cases of Chidambaram Pillay and Subramania Siva.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1219.
Transportation Law.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan *July 28*, 1219.

India Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Viscount Morley.
Under-Secretary—Rt. Hon. T. R. Buchanan.

Industrial and Reformatory Schools
See Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

Inebriate Homes
Cost of.
Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 31*, 1954.

Infantile Mortality
See under Deaths.

Inland Revenue
Chemical Officers, Petition of.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 30*, 1733.
Excise Officers, *see* Customs and Excise.
Report Presented, *July 22*, 3.
Returns, etc., required by.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George *July 23*, 320.

International Securities Corporation
Case of.
Q. Mr. Walsh; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1758.

Invergordon
Naval Base Scheme.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 29*, 1468.

Ireland
Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.
Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.
Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.
Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.
[*For particular Places, Estates, etc., see their Names.*]
Agrarian Outrages—Statistics.
Qs. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1787; Mr. Birrell, 1802.
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*
Audit of Public Accounts.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 22*, 68.
Boycotting—Statistics.
Qs. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1748.
Cattle-drives
Cases in the North.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 614.
Government Attitude.
Qs. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 23*, 284; Earl of Mayo, 289.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Moore, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *July 22*, 99.
Prosecution of Offenders.
Qs. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1788, 1789,; Mr. Birrell, 1805; Mr. Lonsdale, 1806; Mr. W. Long, 1810; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1816; Mr. Cherry, 1821.
Self-protection by Graziers, Measures Permissible for.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 23*, 349.
Condition of.
Qs. Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1801–1808; Mr. W. Long, 1808–1814; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1817–1819.
Opportunity for Discussing.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 25*, 616.
System of issuing Police Reports.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *July 22*, 110.
Congestion Commission, Cost of.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse; *July 30*, 1694.
Constabulary, *see that title.*
Crimes Act, Re-imposition of, Proposed.
Qs. Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1805; Mr. W. Long, 1810; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1816; Mr. Cherry, 1819, 1820.
Education, *see that title.*

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Estimates, *see under* Supply.

Evictions

Applications for Reinstatement.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 96.

Reinstatement Regulations.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 2088.

Return Presented, *July 25*, 598; *July 27*, 706.

Grazing Lands Disputes.
Os. Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1802–1804; Mr. W. Long, 1811.

Land Acts, Land Commission, Land Judges Court and Land Purchase, *see those titles.*

National Gallery—Report Presented, *July 31*, 1909; *Aug. 1*, 2079.

Orange Demonstrations, Disturbances during.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 614.

Outrages in which Firearms were used
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1505.

Outrages in 1908—Return Presented, *July 31*, 1943.

Persons under Police Protection.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1504.

Police, *see* Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police,

Poor Law, *see that title.*

Process Servers, Protection of.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell *July 22*, 104.

Proclaimed Counties—Imposition of extra Police Rate, etc.
Os. Lord Killanin, *July 23*, 275–281; Marquess of Londonderry, 284; Lord Macdonnell of Swinford, 285–287; Lord Atkinson, 287; Lord Ashbourne, 288; Earl of Crewe, 290.

Return as to, proposed
Os. Lord Killanan, *July 23*, 281, 291; Lord Denman, 283, 291.

Return Ordered, *July 23*, 292; Presented *July 27*, 708.

Public Works—Annual Report Presented, *July 22*, 362.

Queen's Colleges, *see Names of Cities.*

Royal University—Catholic Attendance.
Qs. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *July 23*, 357.

Irish Universities Bill

c. Con. July 23, 368; *July 24*, 512.
3R. *July 25*, 616.
l. 1R.* *July 25*, 597.
2R. *July 27*, 741.
Com. and 3R. *July 30*, 1637.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 2000.

Irish Universities Bill—*cont.*

l. Commons reasons for disagreeing to Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 1939.

Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Debates on Consideration (Commons) *July 23*, 268; *July 24*, 512; Third Reading, *July 25*, 616; Second Reading (Lords) *July 27*, 741; Committee, *July 30*, 1637. Lords and Commons Amendts., *July 31*, 1939, 2000.

Affiliation, Powers for 405, 634, 642, 648, 751, 794, 795, 796, 798.

"By Statute," Proposed, 456–462.

Appeal, Provisions for, 1664.

Chairs

Candidates for to be free from any Religious Tests, proposed, 561–567, 1658–1664, 2000.

Theological, Elimination of Religious Tests for, proposed, 574–576.

Charters, Draft of, 754, 760.

Church or Chapel within Precincts of Universities, Prohibition of, proposed, 577–586, 620, 629, 638, 752, 761, 767, 795, 1668–1673, 1941, 2001–2012.

Clause 1—Omission of, proposed, 368–390.

Clause 3, Omission of Subsection 3, proposed 561.

Constituent Colleges—Constitution of Governing Bodies, 430–446, 796, 798.

Outside Element to be only one-third, proposed 1645–1655.

Denominational Character of Universities 616–620, 622–624, 633, 641, 642, 653, 657, 760, 768, 776, 792, 1662, 1663, 2005.

Discussion in the House of Lords, Inadequate time allowed for, 741–745.

Establishment of new Universities in Dublin and Belfast, Proposals for, 369, 370, 372–374, 379, 750, 759.

Funds

Additional sums provided by Parliament, Regulations as to, 587, 778, 779.

Allocation of, between the two Universities, 550–573, 753, 779, 1638, 1639, 1643.

Fee Fund, Appropriation of, 588–590.

Governing Bodies or Senates, Constitution of, 370, 376, 381, 382, 644, 647, 754, 755, 796.

Belfast Technical Instruction Committee, Representation of 594, 595.

[*cont.*

Irish Universities Bill—*cont.*
Debates on Consideration (Commons), etc.—*cont.*
Governing Bodies or Senates, etc.—*cont.*
Chambers of Commerce, Representation of, 594.
Permanent Lay Majority, proposed, 395–400, 427–430.
Representation of Royal College of Surgeons and Royal College of Science, proposed, 569, 570.
Government Amendts. 447, 463, 570, 587, 593, 1665, 1667.
History of the Question, 745–750, 757, 780–784, 801.
Magee College, Position of, 402–415, 751.
Maynooth, Affiliation Arrangements, 634–639, 643, 655, 751, 763, 794, 799.
Necessity for Founding a New University, 765, 771, 772.
Nomenclature of New Universities, 394, 395, 750, 768.
Professors
Form of Declaration, 555–558, 752.
Theological Professors not to be Eligible for Membership of General Board or any other Faculty, proposed, 1658–1664, 1940, 1941, 2001.
Queen's Colleges
Funds allocated to, 1638, 1641, 1644.
Status, Objections to Changes in, 369, 370.
Rejection of Bill, proposed, 616–624.
Residential Colleges, Absence of Provision for, 379, 625, 648–650, 751, 753, 774, 777, 778, 785, 800, 1666.
Roman Catholic Hierarchy, Allegations as to, 382–384, 386, 387, 765, 793, 804, 1659–1662.
Royal University.
Buildings, Estimated Value of, 1638, 1642.
Dissolution of, Proposals for, 375, 392, 393, 645, 749, 7 0.
Statutory Commissioners, Granting Power to recognise Institutions, proposed, 448–455, 761, 798, 1655, 1656.
Trinity College, Dublin, not included in Scope of the Bill, 770, 773, 776, 788, 789, 791.
Undenominational College in Dublin, proposed, 415–426.

Irish Universities Bill—*cont.*
Debates on Consideration (Commons), etc.—*cont.*
Universities Committee, Establishment of, 1673–1676.
University Degrees
Extension of Facilities to Extern Students, proposed, 463–476, 647.
Students of Recognised Colleges, extending Privileges to, proposed, 512–514, 635.
Two Years Study in a Constituent College as a Qualification, proposed, 514–552, 767.
University in Dublin only, proposed, 391–393.
University Statutes, Appeal to Privy Council, proposed, 567–569, 752, 2000.
Draft Charters, Amended, Issue of.
Q. Sir P. Magnus; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 105.
Extern Students.
Qs. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 356.
Grants.
Q. Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 614.
Titles of New Universities.
Qs. Sir P. Magnus, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 111.
Vatican Opinion.
Q. Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 615.

Iron and Steel
Memorandum, etc.—Copy Ordered, *July 30*, 1692.

Isle of Man
See Man, Isle of.

Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill
l. 2R., *July 27*, 727.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 28*, 1064.
3R.* *July 29*, 1444.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Italy
Commercial Travellers' Samples—Agreement Presented, *July 24*, 498; *July 27*, 705.

Jamaica
Banana Trade.
Qs. Mr. Lamont, Sir G. Parker, Mr. Byles; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1226.
Coolies—Rate of Pay.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, *July 28*, 1319, 1328; Colonel Seely, 1328.
King's House, Repair of.
Q. Mr. O. Philipps; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1224.

[*cont.*

Jamaica—*cont.*
Kingston Wharves and Railway Scheme.
Q. Mr. O. Philipps; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1224.
Relief Fund, Distribution of.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 30*, 1716.

Japan
Trade Report presented, *July 31*, 1909.

Johnson, Mr. J. [Gateshead]
Admiralty Chain Contracts, *July 28*, 1212.
Gateshead Unemployment, Public Bodies dealing with, *July 31*, 1967.

Joicey-Cecil, Lord J. [Lincolnshire, Stamford]
Army (Special Reserve), Organisation of *July 27*, 917.
Grantham Barracks, Use for, *July 27*, 866.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Africa—Liquor Traffic among Native Races, *July 28*, 1330.
Government Hospitality, Policy as to, *July 23*, 345.
Nigeria, Southern—Import Statistics, *July 22*, 85.
Prisons, Cost of, *July 31*, 1954.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Cost of, *July 31*, 1953.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvon, Arfon]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill. 2R., *July 30*, 1833–1835.
Education in Wales
Dual Inspection, Grievances as to, *July 30*, 1834.
Intermediate Education—Recognition of Central Board in Code, proposed, *July 30*, 1833, 1834.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Autumn Session—Business Arrangements, *July 31*, 2023.
Unemployment—Urgency of the Question, *July 31*, 2023.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Taylor Estate—Fishery Rights, *July 23*, 360.

Joynson-Hicks, Mr. [Manchester, N.W.]
Finance Bill, 3R., *July 25*, 676–680.
Old-Age Pensions—Provision of Funds, *July 25*, 678, 679.
Tea Duty, Reduction of, *July 25*, 676.

Kanturk
Process Server, Attack on.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 104.

Kearley, Sir H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Companies Bill, *Com. July 27*, 994, 997–1000.

Kearney Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 361.

Keighley Corporation Bill
c. Rep. July 22*, 60.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 27*, 806.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 27*, 1069.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Kenmare
Train Service.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 22*, 93.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 1463.

Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H. [Devon, Honiton]
Nigeria, Southern—Liquor Traffic Inquiry, *July 22*, 82.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
Cavan Evicted Tenants, Position of, *July 29*, 1472.
Creich—Burning of Houses, *July 29*, 1501.
Crookenden and Casey Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 30*, 1694.
Land Commission Fair Rents—Originating Notices (1890–1903), *July 30*, 1772.
Land Purchase Transactions to Date, *July 29*, 1502.
Provincial Homes Investment Company, Operations of, *July 23*, 347; *July 29*, 1499, 1500.

Kerry
Cattle Breeding in.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Russell, *July 29*, 1456.
Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 351.

Kettering
Bowler *v.* Foskett, Case of.
Q. Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 29*, 1488.

Kettle, Mr. T. M. [Tyrone, E.]
Irish Universities Bill, *Con., July 23* 429; Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 2003–2005.
Liverpool—Appeal in Cleave's Case, *Aug. 1*, 2096.

Kildorrery
Petty Sessions—Case of W. Stackpoole.
Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 1*, 2086.

Killanin, Lord
Galway, Proclamation of—Imposition of Extra Police Rate, etc., *July 23*, 75, 278, 291.
Irish Universities Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 779–787; *Com.*, *July 30*, 1639 1641, 1666, 1668.
Proclaimed Counties
  Imposition of Extra Police Rate, etc., *July 23*, 275–281.
  Return as to, proposed, *July 23*, 281, 291.

Killaraght
Floods, Cause of.
  Qs. Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 23*, 350.

Killarney
Land Commission Sittings.
  Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1475.

Kimber, Sir H. [Wandsworth]
Indian Railway Administration, *July 22*, 199.
Putney Telephone Service, *July 30*, 1763.
St. Lucia Property Tax Bill, *July 30*, 1748.
Weir Charity Scheme, Objections to, *July 30*, 1731.

King, Mr. A. J. [Cheshire, Knutsford]
Emigration Statistics (1898–1908), *July 23*, 316.

King-Harman Estate
Sale Proposals.
  Q. Mr. James O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1471.

King's College London (Transfer) Bill
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Kingston Estate
Sale Proposals.
  Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 509.

Kinvarra
Firing Outrage on 12th inst.
  Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 97.

Knutsford, Viscount
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.* *July 28*, 1115.

Labour Colonies
Hollesley Bay Experiment.
  Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 29*, 1533; Mr. Everett, 1538; Mr. Burns, 1570.

Labourers (Ireland) Act
Stamp Duty.
  Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 363.

Laidlaw, Mr. R. [Renfrew, E.]
Federated Malay States
  Children in Gaming and Opium Dens, *July 22*, 83.
  Gambling Licence System, *July 22*, 83, 84.
  Revenue Statistics, *July 22*, 82, 83.
India
  Churches
    Expenditure on Upkeep, *July 27*, 830.
    Use of, by Troops, *July 27*, 830
  Mosques and Temples, Grant for Upkeep of, *July 27*, 830.

Lamb, Mr. E. H. [Rochester]
India—Jasdan Succession, *July 30*, 1715.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
Dominica—Railway Construction, *July 28*, 1227.
Jamaica—Banana Trade, *July 28*, 1226.
Millport Telegraph Facilities, *July 29*, 1493.
St. Vincent
  Carib Canal, *July 28*, 1221.
  Eruption Relief Fund, *July 28*, 1221.

Lanark Corporation (Extension of Boundaries, &c.) Order Confirmation Bill.
c. 3R.,* *July 22*, 59.
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 22*, 2.
  3R.* *July 28*, 1070.
  Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Lancashire
Charities—Return Presented, *July 29*, 1450.

Land Commission (Ireland)
[*For Particular Estates, etc., see their Names*].
Boyd, Mr., Experience of.
  Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 354.
Fair Rents—Originating Notices (1890–1903).
  Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1772.
Report Presented, *July 28*, 1071, 1169.
  Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 834.

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Land Law (Ireland) Act
Amendment Proposals.
Q. Mr. McHugh, Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 28*, 1242.

Land Purchase (Ireland)
[*For Particular Estates, etc., see their Names.*]
Existing Agreements and Contracts, Proposals for Readjustment of.
Os. Earl of Mayo, *July 23*, 274; Lord Denman, 275.
Financial Proposals.
Q. Mr. Ainsworth; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 1511.
Sinking Fund from Tenants' Annuities, Position of.
Os. Lord Clonbrock, Lord Denman, *July 29*, 1428.
Stock Issues
Applications for New Issue.
Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 27*, 829.
Return Ordered, *July 24*, 500; Presented, *July 30*, 1691.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 22*, 112.
Suggestions for Future Issues.
Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 1510.
Transactions.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 834.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1502.

Land Registry
Accounts Presented, *July 27*, 707, 810.

Land Valuation Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 22*, 112.

Lane-Joynt Estate
Cases of Mrs. O'Shaughnessy and Mrs. Hayes.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 73.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Army, Strength, *July 29*, 1437.
Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill, *Com. July 29*, 1393, 1395.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, Commons Amendts., *July 30*, 1681.
Irish Universities Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 744, 790–797; *July 30*, 1651–1653, 1663, 1670; Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts., *July 31*, 1942.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1078–1082, 1102, 1106, 1114, 1116, 1121, 1123, 1127, 1158; Commons Amendts., to Lords Amendts, *July 31*, 1913–1920, 1930, 1958, 1940.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*cont.*
Police Commission Report—Mis-statements by Constables, *July 30*, 1686.
Scottish Crofters, Arrears in Payment of Instalments by, etc., *July 22*, 45.
Telegraph (Construction) Bill, *Com. July 27*, 735.
Territorial Reserve Forces Bill, 2R. *July 23*, 269–271, 272.

Lardner, Mr. J. C. R. [Monaghan, N.]
Brookborough—Orange Arches on Public Road, *July 29*, 1506.
Drumlinny—Case of F. M'Guirk, *July 30*, 1694, 1695.
Education—Use of Brown and Nolan's Reader, *July 29*, 1508.
House of Commons—Newspaper Files available, *July 29*, 1499.
Leslie Estate—Case of P. M'Clushy, *July 29*, 1474.
Monaghan Evicted Tenants, *Aug. 1*, 2079.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]
Donegal Assizes—Catholics on Grand Juries, *July 23*, 362.
Education Grants, Additional Conditions of giving, *July 23*, 363.
Factory—Employment of Young Persons—Safeguards against overwork, etc., *July 31*, 1957.
Liverpool—Cleave's Case, *July 31*, 1959.

Law Courts
Council of Judges, Report of.
Q. Mr. Bertram; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1696.
High Court Accounts (1907–8) Presented, *July 24*, 500; *July 27*, 707.

Law of Distress Amendment Bill
l. Com. July 23, 258.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
Corporal Punishment—Procedure in imposing Sentence, *July 29*, 1490.
Naval Officers, Business Engagements of, *July 22*, 76.
Walsall Excise Offences—Fines (1898–1907), *July 29*, 1485, 1486.

Lead Poisoning
Mortality Statistics.
Os. Sir C. W. Dilke, *July 29*, 1584.

Leeds
Railway Shunting Fatality to W. Harris.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1759.

Leeds Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Lehmann, Mr. R. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]
Vaccination—Case of Mr. Cooper, *July 27*, 819.

Leicester Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Leith Burgh Bill
c. 3R.* *July 24*, 497.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 27*, 704.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Leslie Estate
Cases of D. McClean and M'Clushy.
Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 852.
Q. Mr. Lardner; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1474.

Lewis, Mr. J. H. [Flintshire]
Transvaal Mines—Labour Statistics, *July 25*, 612.

Lewis Estate
Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 358.

Lewis, Island of
Fish Landed in 1898 and 1907.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 1*, 2085.
Fisheries.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 27* 84.
Houses, Proposals for Rebuilding.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 29*, 1466.
Lochs Schools, Cleansing of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 31*, 1959.
Migration Scheme.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 23*, 313.
Rating *impasse.*
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 28*, 1191; *July 29*, 1466.
Q. Sir J. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 1486.
Sanitary Condition.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 27*, 823.
Skigersta Boat Shelter and Sea Wall.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 23*, 313.

Licensing Bill
Allocation of Time to.
Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 366.
Clause 1, Interpretation of.
Qs. Mr. Adkins, Mr. C. Roberts; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 1511.
Discussion, Arrangements for.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *July 31*, 2015; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 2015.

Light Railways Act, 1896
Amendment of certain clauses, proposed.
Os. Mr. Luttrell, *July 27*, 1025–1026; Mr. Burns, 1026.

Limavady and Dungiveen Railway
Grant to.
Q. Mr. Ainsworth; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 27*, 817.

Limerick
Land Sale Negotiations.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 28*, 1187.

Lincoln Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Liquor Traffic
Hotel Licences Granted in Scotland.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 27*, 848.
Six-Day Licences in Scotland.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 319.

Listowel
Fair Rent Decisions.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 21*, 1946.

Listowel Estate
Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1712.

Liverpool
Cleave's case, Appeal in.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Sir E Strachey, *July 31*, 1959.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Aug. 1*, 2096.

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill
c. Lords Amendments *Con.* July 24*, 497.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1.*, 2077.

Liverpool Corporation (Streets and Buildings) Bill
c. *Con.* and 3R.* *July 22*, 59.
l. 1R.* *July 22*, 1.
2R. *July 27*, 701.
Sessional Order as to Second Reading, Suspension of.
Os. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *July 27*, 701.

Llangollen
School Dispute
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 1498.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* (Carnarvon)
Argentina, Increase in British Trade with, *July 25*, 685, 686.

[*cont.*

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
- Armaments, Limitation of Expenditure on, *July 25*, 690.
- Beer
  - Brewing Statistics (1820–1907), *July 30*, 1732.
  - Use of Malt Substitutes, *July 29*, 1469.
- Bisley Camp Hawkers' Licences, *July 29*, 1468.
- Civil Service Estimates, Supplementary Amount Included, *July 23*, 334; *July 31*, 1961.
- Coinage and Currency—Exhibition of certain Specimens, *July 30*, 1733.
- Customs and Excise
  - Amalgamation Scheme, *July 23*, 321.
  - Excise Officers' Salaries, *July 31*, 1960.
  - Stock Taking System, *July 30*, 1738.
- Death Duties—Receipts in 1908, *July 23*, 334.
- Finance Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 680–693.
  - Procedure with Regard to Discussion, *July 25*, 680.
- Hop Industry
  - Committee Report and Recommendations, Proposals for Dealing with, *July 31*, 2045-2050.
  - Legislative Proposals, *July 27*, 855.
- Income-Tax
  - Earned Income, Definition of, *July 23*, 320.
  - Reduction Claims, Date for Making, *July 28*, 1198.
  - Royalties on Patents, *July 27*, 847.
  - Scottish Contribution (1906–8), *July 23*, 336.
- Inland Revenue Chemical Officers, Petition of, *July 30*, 1733.
  - Returns, etc., Required by, *July 23*, 320.
- Land Purchase Stock
  - Applications for New Issue, *July 27*, 829.
  - Suggestions for Future Issues, *July 29*, 1510.
- Lewis, Island of—Rating *Impasse*, *July 29*, 1486.
- Liquor Traffic
  - Hotel Licences Granted in Scotland, *July 27*, 848.
  - Six-Day Licences in Scotland, *July 23*, 319.
- National Assurance Company of Ireland—Case of Corrigan *v.* Read, *July 29*, 1509, 1510.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Aliens in East of London, Work Entailed by, *July 28*, 1186.
  - Cost of, *July 23*, 335.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
- Old-Age Pensions—*cont.*
  - Funds, Provision of, *July 25*, 681–684.
  - Medical Relief of Pensioner, *July 27*, 829.
  - Rural Pensioners, Estimate of, *July 23*, 319.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1971–1976, 1980, 1983–1989, 1991, 1994–1999.
  - Charitable Annuities, *Aug. 1*, 2086.
  - Excise Officers' Salaries, *July 31*, 1960.
  - Regulations, Issue of, *July 30*, 1702.
  - Workhouses, Position of Pensioners in, *July 30*, 1733.
- Revenue and Expenditure
  - Additional Expenditure, Proposals for Meeting, *July 25*, 681–685.
  - Statistics for 1907–8, *July 27*, 848.
  - Welsh Purposes, Expenditure on, *July* on, *July 22*, 89.
- Spirits—Duties Paid in 1907–8, *July 29*, 1468.
- Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 25*, 685.
- Taxation—Necessity for Providing New Sources, *July 25*, 690–692.
- Trade, State of, in Great Britain and the United States, *July 25*, 686–689.
- Unemployment Grant, Proposals for, *July 22*, 89; *July 23*, 319.
- Walsall Excise Offences—Fines (1898-1907), *July 29*, 1485, 1486.
- War Office Accounting Officer, Name of, *July 31*, 1960.

Local Authorities
- Scottish Deputation Expenses—Return Ordered, *July 30*, 1693.

Local Authorities (Education) Bill
- Starring by the Government, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 31*, 2024; Mr. Asquith, 2024.

Local Government Board
- *President*—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. C. F. G. Masterman
- Loans to Municipalities, Conditions Attached to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, *July 29*. 1555–1557; Mr. Burns, 1565–1567.
- Sinking Funds on Public Buildings—Period of Repayment.
  - *Os.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, *July 29*, 1558, 1559; Mr. Burns, 1566.
- Vote, Circumstances of Passing.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 29*, 1575.

[*cont.*

Local Government Board (Ireland)
Annual Report Presented, *July 28*, 1071, 1169.
Auditors.
Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 362.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
c. *Con.** *July 22*, 59.
3R.* *July 23*, 295.
l. Commons' Amendt., *Con** *July 29*, 1369.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Local Government Provisional Order (Ireland) (No. 4) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 23*, 295.
Con. and 3R.* *July 24*, 498.
l. Commons' Amendt., *Con** *July 29*, 1369.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 28*, 1070.
3R.* *July 29*, 1369.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 28*, 1070.
3R.* *July 29*, 1369.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
c. Report * *July 27*, 889.
*Con.** *July 28*, 1167.
3R.* *July 31*, 1942.
l. 1R.* *July 31*, 1942.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 28*, 1070.
3R.* *July 29*, 1369.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
*Com.** *July 28*, 1070.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 29*, 1372.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 30*, 1687.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
*Com.** *July 28*, 1070.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 29*, 1372.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 30*, 1687.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 28*, 1070.
3R.* *July 29*, 1373.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 28*, 1070.
3R.* *July 29*, 1373.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
*Com.** *July 28*, 1070.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 29*, 1373.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 30*, 1687
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
l. Report * *July 28*, 1069.
*Com.** *July 28*, 1070.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 29*, 1373.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 30*, 1688.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
l. Report* *July 28*, 1069.
*Com.** *July 28*, 1070.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 29*, 1373.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 30*, 1688.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Local Government (Scotland) Bill
c. 1.R* *July 30*, 1774.

Local Taxation
See under Taxation.

Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lieu.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Wireless Telegraphy, Control of, *July 27*, 855.

London
Ambulances for.
Qs. Mr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 300; *July 30*, 698.

London, Brighton and South Coast Railway Bill
c. 3R.* *July 24*, 497.
l. Commons Amendts, *Con.** *July 27*, 704.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

London Corporation
Accounts (1907), Presented, *July 23*, 254, 297.

London County Council, (General Powers) Bill
l. 3R.* *July 27*, 704.
c. Lords Amendts, *Con.** *July 29*, 1447.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

London County Council (Money) Bill
l. 3R.* *July 23*, 253.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements)
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *July 22*, 2.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

London and District Electricity Supply Bill
c. 2R. *July 30*, 1846.
Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Morton; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, 886.

London (Equalisation of Rates) Act
Accounts—Return (1907–8) Ordered, *July 22*, 64.
Amount Levied and Distributed.
Q. Mr. Dobson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 25*, 609.

London United Tramways Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 23*, 253.
3R.* *July 27*, 704.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 28*, 1165.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Londonderry
Flax Seed supplied.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 22*, 94.
Larceny from Quay, Prosecution for.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 27*, 845.
Postal Staff.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 25*, 609.

Londonderry, Marquess of
Cattle-Driving in Ireland—Action of the Government, *July 23*, 284.
Proclaimed Counties—Imposition of Extra Police Rate, etc., *July 23*, 284.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
Bills, Private—Suspension of Standing Order 8, *July 30*, 1778–1780.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 29*, 1512.
Cattle-Driving Cases—Prosecution of Offenders, *July 30*, 1810.
Condition of Ireland, *July 30*, 1808–1814.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1808–1814, 1816.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
Constabulary—Extra Police, *July 24*, 509.
Crimes Act, Re-imposition of, proposed, *July 30*, 1810.
Education — Intermediate Inspectorate, *July 30*, 1710.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 242–244; *Com. July 27*, 992.
Government Departments, *Status* of—Progress made with Inquiry, *July 29*, 1519–1521.
Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 238.
Irish Grazing Lands, Disputes as to, *July 30*, 1811.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 385, 395, 397–399, 417, 454; *July 24*, 583; Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 2002.
Motors
  Dust Nuisance, *July 29*, 1523.
  Police Powers, Increasing, proposed, *July 29*, 1521, 1522, 1529.
  Scouts giving Warning against Police Traps, Necessity for dealing with, *July 29*, 1522.
  Sign Posts, Duties of Local Authorities in Connection with, *July 29*, 1523.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1978.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1355, 1357, 1358, 1359.
Tuberculosis Commission, Value of Work of, and Necessity for Continuing Investigations, *July 29*, 1524–1528.

Longwood
Speeches of Mr. P. McKenna and Mr. McGuire.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 109.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
Cattle-Driving
  Government Attitude, *July 22*, 101.
  Prosecution of Offenders, *July 30*, 1806.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1806.
Cork, Condition of, *July 22*, 105.
Kanturk Process-server, Attack on, *July 22*, 104.
Newspaper Postage Regulations, *July 31*, 1947.
Outrages in which Firearms were used, *July 29*, 1505.
Persons under Police Protection, *July 29*, 1504.
Process-servers, Protection of, *July 22*, 104, 105.

Lord Chamberlain
Viscount Althorp.

Lord Chancellor
Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council
Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.

Lord Privy Seal
Marquess of Ripon.

Lords-Lieutenant
Scottish Appointments.
Qs. Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 1465.

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor*
Companies (Consolidation) Bill, *Com July 27*, 735; *Rep. July 29*, 1427.
Costs in Criminal Cases Bill, 2R. *July 23*, 274.
Desertion, Practice in Scotland with Regard to, *July 30*, 1687.
Legislation by Reference—Committee to Inquire into Drafting of Bills, *July 29*, 1427.
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Com. July 23*, 259.
Lunacy Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 1444.
Married Women's Property Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 736, 737.
Matrimonial Causes Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 11.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1077, 1116, 1117; *Rep. July 29*, 1440. Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts., *July 31*, 1924, 1935.
Scottish Crofters, Arrears in Payment of Instalments by, etc., *July 22*, 43–45.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, 3R. *July 23*, 273.

Lotteries and Indecent Advertisements
Joint Committee Report Presented, *July 29*, 1373, 1512.

Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Lower Thames (Grays) Dock Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, etc., and Bill withdrawn, *July 30*, 1687.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
[*For Rulings as Speaker, see titles* Speaker *and* Questions.]

Lucas, Lord—*Under-Secretary of State for War*
Cavalry for Scotland, *July 27*, 724.
Compulsory Military Service, Possibility of establishing, *July 22*, 19–21.
Deputy-Lieutenants, Qualifications required of, on Appointment, *July 27*, 726, 727.
Infantry Units—Shortage below Establishment, *July 22*, 55.
Special Reserve
  Equipment of, *July 22*, 55.
  Officers, Proposals as to, *July 22*, 56.
Territorial Force, Organisation of, and Value as a Fighting Force, *July 22*, 18.

Lunacy
Asylums, Cost of.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 31*, 1955.
Returns Presented, *July 27*, 707, 810.
Statistics.
Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1756.
Three Counties Asylums, Beer brewed at.
Q. Mr. Wiles; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1758.

Lunacy Bill
l. 1R.* *July 22*, 3.
2R. *July 29*, 1444.
Com. Rep. and 3R.* *July 30*, 1677.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
Ballyvourneen—Case of Mrs. Reardon, *July 29*, 1505.
Clery Minors Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 29*, 1504.
Cooper Estate—Cases of J. McGrath and T. Barry, *July 28*, 1186.
Croker Estate—Cases of Peacocke and Mrs. Hammersley, *July 29*, 1503.
Dickson Estate—Disposal of, *July 29*, 1503.
Limerick Land Sale Negotiations, *July 28*, 1187.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Friendly Societies—Royal London Society Agreement, *July 30*, 1765.
India
  Bengal, Partition of, *July 22*, 216.
  Condition of, *July 22*, 216.; *July 30*, 1745.
  Revenue and Expenditure Accounts, *July 22*, 218, 219.
  Tilak, Mr., Case of, *July 28*, 1217; *July 29*, 1483; *July 30*, 1747, 1748.
Milk—Tuberculosis Germs in, *July 29*, 1537.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 1979, 1982.
Post Office—Small-pox among Employees, *July 28*, 1180.

Lupton, Mr. A.—*cont.*
- Vaccination
  - Deaths as a Result of, *July 29*, 1537, 1538.
  - Exemption Certificates received in 1907, *July 23*, 344.
  - Gallimore, J., Case of, *July 22*, 91, 92.

Luttrell, Mr. H. F. [Devonshire, Tavistock]
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Con., July 27*, 1024–1026.
- Light Railways Act, 1896—Amendment of certain Clauses, proposed, *July 27*, 1025, 1026.

Lynch, Mr. H. F. B. [Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon]
- Macedonian Reform Proposals, *July 23*, 332; *July 27*, 944–950.
- Persia
  - Anglo-Russian Agreement, Terms of, *July 27*, 952.
  - Arms, Import of, *July 30*, 1755.
  - British Policy in, *July 27*, 944, 945, 953–955.
  - Constitution—Action of the Shah, *July 27*, 951, 952.
  - Frontier Negotiations with Turkey, *July 23*, 331.
  - Liakhoff, Colonel, Position of, *July 30*, 1755, 1756.
  - Situation in, *July 23*, 333.
- Russian Loan—Issue in Great Britain, *July 23*, 331.
- Turkish Customs Duties, increase in—Conditions of British Sanction to, *July 27*, 951.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
- Africa, South
  - Administrative Policy, *July 28*, 1247–1250.
  - Financial Administration under Crown Colony Government, *July 28*, 1250.
  - Manhood Suffrage, Results of lowering, *July 28*, 1248.
- Ceylon, Pearl Fisheries, Leasing of, *July 28*, 1246.
- Colonial Office—Criticisms on late Under-Secretary, *July 28*, 1249, 1269.
- London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1878–1880.
- Natal
  - Affairs, Right to criticise, *July 28*, 1275.
  - Dinizulu, Trial of, *July 28*, 1257, 1258, 1259.
  - Martial Law, Administration of, etc., *July 28*, 1258.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Opium Traffic—Action of His Majesty's Government in Hong Kong, etc., *July 28*, 1245, 1261.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour Question, *July 28*, 1252, 1253.
  - Civil Servants' Grievances, *July 28*, 1253–1257.
  - Portuguese Native Labour—Conditions of Employment, *July 28*, 1251.

Lyveden, Lord
- Merchant Service—Officers' Training, *July 27*, 720.

M'Arthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
- Marine Insurance—P.P.I. Insurances, *July 27*, 883.
- Russo-Japanese War, British Shipping Claims, *July 27*, 876.

McCalmont, Colonel J. [Antrim, E.]
- Territorial Force—Jury Service of Officers, *July 30*, 1736.

McCaw, Mr. [Down, W.]
- India
  - Administrative Policy, *July 22*, 185–187.
  - Education System, Reform of, *July 22*, 184.
  - Press Act, Enforcement of, *July 22*, 186.
  - Railways, Administration of, *July 22*, 188, 189.
  - Sedition, Measures for dealing with, *July 22*, 186.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
- Africa, South—Results of lowering Manhood Suffrage, *July 28*, 1277.
- Autumn Session—Business Arrangements, *July 31*, 2020.
- Brecon Open-Air Meetings, Police Attendance at, *July 29*, 1488.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1011, 1037–1042, 1050.
- Factories—Outworkers Lists, *July 27*, 814.
- Glasgow Factory Outworkers, Premises of, *July 27*, 815.
- Home Work
  - Conference of Medical Officers, *July 27*, 814.
  - Returns of Addresses, etc., *July 28*, 1231, 1232, 1233.
- Medical Officers of Health, Reports of, *July 28*, 1231.
- Natal
  - Affairs, Right to Criticise, *July 28*, 1275, 1276.

[*cont*

Macdonald, Mr. J. R.—*cont.*
- Natal—*cont.*
  - Dinizulu, Trial of—Charges and Procedure, *July 22*, 81, 82; *July 28*, 1279–1281.
  - Martial Law, Administration of, etc., *July 28*, 1278.
- Poplar Poor Law Guardians, Allocation of Clothing Contracts by, *July 27*, 819.
- Transvaal Civil Servants' Grievances, *July 28*, 1276.
- Unemployed Workmen's Act—Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1037–1042, 1050.

Macdonnell of Swinford, Lord
- Irish Universities Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 770–775.
- Proclaimed Counties—Imposition of Extra Police Rate, etc., *July 23*, 285–287.

McGhee, F., and Wife
- Sentence on.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Wiles, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 337.

McGillicuddy Eager Estate
- Evicted Tenants' Applications.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1470.

McHugh, Mr. P. A. [Sligo, N.]
- All-British Steamship Route, Proposals as to, *July 28*, 1237.
- Ballinorley School, Closing of, *July 30*, 1767, 1769, 1771.
- Brockagh—Case of E. Gillmore, *July 28*, 1186.
- Education—Use of Brown and Nolan's Reader, *July 29*, 1507, 1508.
- Land Law (Ireland) Acts, Amendment Proposals, *July 28*, 1242.
- Sligo Post Office Night Duty, *July 28*, 1179.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berkshire, Newbury]
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R. *Aug. 1*, 2097.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1026, 1037.
- India—Case of Mr. Tilak, *July 28*, 1217.
- Motors
  - Law, Necessity for Strengthening, *July 27*, 1026, 1037.
  - Speed Regulation, *Aug. 1*, 2095, 2096.
- Natal
  - British Troops, *July 27*, 867.
  - Dinizulu, Trial of—Charges and Procedure, *July 22*, 86, 87; *July 27*, 869, 871, 872, 873; *July 31*, 2036; *Aug. 1*, 2098.
  - Indemnity Bill, Terms of, *July 28*, 1242; *Aug. 1*, 2098.

McKean, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
- Box—Rents of B. O'Reilly, T. Walsh and P. Callan, *July 23*, 298.
- Customs Preventive Officers, System of Appointing, *July 23*, 301.
- Leslie Estate—Case of D. M'Clean, *July 27*, 852.

McKenna, Rt. Hn. R.—*First Lord of the Admiralty* [Monmouth, N.]
- Aberdeen, Naval Volunteer Reserve Division for, *July 30*, 1731.
- Admiralty
  - Chain Contracts, *July 28*, 1212.
  - China and Earthenware Contracts, *July 22*, 75.
  - Contracts—Wages paid by Messrs. Rolf, *July 27*, 820.
  - Press, System of giving Information to, *July 27*, 822; *July 30*, 1892.
  - Quantity Surveyors, Payments to, *July 28*, 1208; *July 30*, 1740.
  - Rough Carpentry, Men Employed on, *July 31*, 1950.
  - Shipbuilding Contractors and Foreign Contracts, *July 28*, 1204, 1205.
- Coal Supply, *July 28*, 1196.
- Coastguard Service — Men Required for Naval Manœuvres, *July 28*, 1177.
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1892.
- Court Martial Trials in 1907–8, *July 28*, 1178; *July 30*, 1743.
- "Defence"
  - Date of completing, *Aug. 1*, 2083.
  - Wages of Engine-Fitters, *July 27*, 822.
- Deptford Victualling Yard
  - Discharge System, *July 29*, 1481.
  - Labourers Employed on Coopers Work, *July 27*, 820.
  - Overtime, *July 30*, 1742.
  - Storehouse Staff, Pay of, *July 30*, 1743.
- Dockyards—Wages of Joiners, *July 27*, 845.
- Expenditure—Comparison with Germany, *July 28*, 1210, 1211.
- "Gladiator," Use of Camels in Salving, *July 23*, 326.
- "Indomitable" Speed Test, *Aug. 1*, 2084.
- Invergordon Naval Base Scheme, *July 29*, 1468.
- "Invincible"—Wages of Electrical Wire Workers, *July 28*, 1210.
- Keyham Private Students, Commissions offered to, *July 23*, 312.
- Manœuvres, *Aug. 1*, 2084.
  - "Good Hope" and "Argyll" Case, *July 30*, 1741, 1742.
  - Report on, *July 30*, 1739.

[*cont.*

McKenna, Rt. Hon. R.—*cont.*
- Merchant Shipping—Protection in War Time, *July 28*, 1209.
- Mess Debts, Payment of, *July 29*, 1455.
- Obsolete Vessels, Cost of and Price Realised, *July 27*, 821.
- Officers
  - Business Engagements of, *July 22*, 76.
  - Interpreters, Number Eligible as, *July 31*, 1950.
- Ordnance Department—Storehouse Clerks, Petition, *July 30*, 1742.
- Osborne—Cadets' Examination Papers, *July 22*, 77.
- Paymasters—Promotion System, *July 28*, 1197.
- Portsmouth Gun Wharf Fire in 1907, *July 23*, 325.
- Press Communications by Naval Officers, Rule as to, *July 28*, 1211, 1212; *July 30*, 1744.
- Reserve—Decoration and Promotion, *July 30*, 1739.
- "Rohilla" Contract—Wages of Workmen, *July 28*, 1172.
- Rosyth Works
  - Area of Site, *July 27*, 823.
  - Date of completing, *July 27*, 821.
- Shipbuilding Programme, *Aug. 1*, 2084.
  - Comparison with Germany, *July 29*, 1478, 1479, 1480, 1481.
  - New Armoured Cruiser, *July 27*, 821.
- Submarine A 9, Accident in, *July 30*, 1738.
- "Superb," Fitters employed on, *July 28*, 1205.
- "Temeraire," Apprentices employed on, *July 28*, 1206.
- Torpedo-Boat Destroyers
  - Contracts for, *July 30*, 1744.
  - German Programme, *July 28*, 1209.
- Trial Trips of New Vessels, *July 30*, 1740.
- West India Dock Stores, Wages at, *July 27*, 845.
- "Whiting," Crew of, etc., *July 31*, 1951.
- Wireless Telegraphy—Admiralty Staff, *July 27*, 823.

McLaren, Mr. H. D. [Staffordshire, W.]
- Man, Isle of—Racing by Excursion Steamers, *July 28*, 1235.

Maclean, Mr. D. [Bath]
- Indian Government Churches use of, *July 22*, 220–222.
- Marine Insurance—P. P. I. Insurances, *July 27*, 883.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Camberwell, N.]
- Estimates—Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiencies, *July 27*, 1063.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J.—*cont.*
- Naval Marriages Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1057.
- Rosyth Works, Expenditure on, *July 27*, 1064.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
- Bills, Private—Suspensions of Standing Order 8, *July 30*, 1776.
- Brookborough—Orange Arches on Public Road, *July 29*, 1505.
- Cattle-Driving—Government Attitude, *July 22*, 100.
- Condition of Ireland—System of issuing Police Reports, *July 22*, 111.
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1844–1846, 1885–1890.
- Contempt of Court—Remission of Irish Sentences, *July 22*, 102, 103, 104.
- Corporal Punishment
  - Procedure in imposing Sentence, *July 29*, 1490.
  - Sentences inflicted by Judges and Prison Governors, etc., *July 30*, 1888–1890.
- Natal
  - Administration, Discussion of, *July 28*, *July 28*, 1243, 1244.
  - Dinizulu, Trial of—Charges and Procedure, *July 22*, 87, 88; *July 27*, 870, 873, 874, 875.
  - Indemnity Bill, Terms of, *July 27*, 874.
- National Assurance Company of Ireland—Case of Corrigan *v.* Read, *July 29*, 1508, 1509, 1510.
- Women's Suffrage Movement—Prison Treatment, *July 23*, 339; *July 30*, 1844, 1885–1888, 1900.

Macpherson, Mr. J. T. [Preston]
- Submarine A9, Accident in, *July 30*, 1738.
- Willesden Education Committee Area Scheme, *July 28*, 1182.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
- Autumn Session—Business Arrangements, *July 31*, 2021–2023.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1050–1054, 3R., 1054, 1055.
- Osborne—Cadets' Examination Papers, *July 22*, 76.

MacVeigh, Mr. C. [Donegal, E.]
- Wallace Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 22*, 72.

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *July 23*, 253.
- Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Macedonia
- Bands, Suppression of.
  - *Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey. *July 23*, 332.

[*cont.*

Macedonia—*cont.*
Condition of Affairs in—Necessity for pressing Reforms, etc.
Os. Mr. A. Ponsonby, *July 27*, 939–944; Mr. Lynch, 944–950; Sir C. Dilke, 956; Earl Percy, 962–964; Sir E. Grey, 966–969, 971.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 332.
Turkish Army in, Responsibility for Maintenance of.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 27*, 964; Sir E. Grey, 964, 965.

Madden Estate
Case of D. Dorgan.
Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 74.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Burnley]
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1042.
Railways—Automatic Couplings, *July 27*, 881, 882.
Unemployed Workmen's Act—Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1042.

Maghery
Catholic Excursion on 5th inst.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 850.

Magnus, Sir P. [London University]
Irish Universities Bill, *Con., July 23*, 409, 430, 448–452, 462; *July 24*, 514, 573, 574, 589, 594; Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 2008.
Draft Charters, Amended, Issue of, *July 22*, 105.
Titles of New Universities, *July 22*, 111.
Milk, Tuberculosis Germs in, *July 29*, 1546.
Tuberculosis Commission, Value of Work of and Necessity for continuing Investigations, *July 29*, 1545–1547.

Man, Isle of
Deputation to Home Secretary.
Os. Mr. Seddon, *July 31*, 2058, 2059; Mr. Gladstone, 2061.
Excursion Steamers, Racing by.
Q. Mr. McLaren; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 28*, 1235.

Manchester
Disturbances—Sentences on Leaders.
Os. Mr. Clynes, *July 30*, 1893–1896; Mr. Gladstone, 1897, 1898.
Post Office Staff.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31*, 1951.
Unemployment Grant.
Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 30*, 1760.

Manchester Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 23*, 253.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.* *July 24*, 497.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Marchamley, Lord
Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 737.

Margate Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 22*, 1.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.* *July 24*, 497.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Marine Insurance
P.P.I. Insurances.
Qs. Mr. Maclean, Mr. McArthur; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, 883.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Nottinghamshire, Mansfield]
Companies Bill, *Com. July 27*, 998.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1028–1032, 1054.
Motors
Law, Necessity for Strengthening, *July 27*, 1028, 1031.
Omnibus Speed Regulations, *July 27*, 1029.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1004.
Public Works Loans (Remission) Bill, Expenses Resolution, *July 23*, 492.

Marks, Mr. G. C. [Cornwall, Launceston]
Patents and Designs Act—Compulsory Working of Patents, *July 30*, 1695.

Marriages
Ireland—Annual Report Presented, *July 25*, 598; *July 27*, 706.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill
l. Rep. *July 28*, 1069.
Com. and *Rep.* *July 29*, 1369.
3R.* *July 30*, 1634.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Married Women's Property Bill
l. 1R.* *July 22*, 3.
2R.* *July 27*, 736; *July 28*, 1165.
Com. and *Rep.* *July 29*, 1446.
3R.* *July 30*, 1677.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Marsham Estate
Case of M. Dunne.
Q. Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1706.

Maryborough
Postman, Speech by.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29*, 1494.

Mason, Mr. A. E. W. [Coventry]
British Indians in the Colonies.
  Agreement as to, proposed, *July 31*, 2027, 2028.
  Report of Mr. W. L. MacKenzie King, *July 31*, 2025–2027.

Massie, Mr. J. [Wiltshire, Cricklade]
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 426; *July 24*, 566, 573, 574, 577–580; Lords' Amendments, *Con.*, *July 31*, 2009.

Matrimonial Causes Bill
l. 2R., *July 22*, 4.

Mayo, Earl of
Bee Pest (Ireland) Bill, *Com. July 29*, 1394
Cattle-driving in Ireland—Action of the Government, *July 23*, 289.
Irish Universities Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 775–779; *Com.*, *July 30*, 1637–1639, 1643, 1650.
Land Purchase—Existing Agreements and Contracts, *July 23*, 274.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1109, 1159.

Meat Supply
Beef Prices in 1907–8.
  Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 25*, 600.
  Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1721.
Inquiry.
  Q. Mr. Howard; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 343.
  Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 25*, 610.
  Qs. Mr. W. O'Brien, Mr. T. O'Donnell. Mr. E. Barry, Mr. Gardner; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, *884*.
  Qs. Mr. Watt, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 28*, 1236.
  Qs. Mr. Courthope, Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 1491.

Medical Officers of Health
Reports of.
  Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald. *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 28*, 1231.

Meehan, Mr. F. [Leitrim, N.]
Belcoo and Enniskillen Loan Fund, Position of, *July 27*, 849.
Folliott Estate—Case of M. Felby, *July 28*, 1178.
West Estate—Case of Peter D. Kelly, *July 27*, 849.

Meehan, Mr. P. A. [Queen's Co., Leix]
Armagh Post Office Appointments, *July 24*, 499.

Members of Parliament
Return as to Names, etc.—Order of 23rd June read, etc., and Return Substituted, *July 28*, 1170.

Merchant Shipping
Casualties (1906–1907)—Report Presented, *July 23*, 254, 297.
Lossof Life—Return (1891–1907) Presented *July 28*, 1071, 1168.
Progress—Return Ordered, *July 30*, 1692.
Protection in War Time.
  Q. Mr. Staveley - Hill; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28*, 1207.
Officers' Training.
  Os. Lord Brassey, *July 22*, 46–49; Lord Muskerry, 49; Earl of Granard, 50; Lord Muskerry, *July 27*, 708, 723; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 716; Lord Lyveden, 720; Marquess of Salisbury, 721.

Merchant Shipping Acts
Section 78—Report Presented, *July 30*, 1636, 1690.

Merthyr Tydvil
Police Pension Rights.
  Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 27*, 879.

Merthyr Tydvil Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Meteorological Committee
Report Presented, *July 27*, 707, 809.

Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Metropolitan Electric Tramways Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *July 27*, 807.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *July 28*, 1069.
  Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Metropolitan Water Board
Clerks Employed by.
  Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 344.

Meysey-Thompson, Mr. E. C. [Staffordshire, Handsworth]
Hamstead Colliery Disaster—Recognition of Bravery of Rescuers, *July 23*, 338.

Midleton, Viscount
Army
  Reductions Effected, *July 22*, 25, 27.
  Strength—Return proposed, *July 22*, 27.
  Territorial Force, Organisation of and Value as a Fighting Force, *July 22*, 26.
Compulsory Military Service, Possibility of Establishing, *July 22*, 26.

[*cont.*

Midleton, Viscount—*cont.*
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28,* 1100, 1150, 1151; Commons' Amendts. to Lords' Amendts., *July 31,* 1924, 1933.
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, 2R. *July 22,* 59; *Com. July 27,* 730, 733.
Telegraph (Construction) Bill, *Com. July 27,* 734, 735.

Mildmay, Mr. F. B. [Devonshire, Totnes]
Post Office Pensions, Payment of, *July 30,* 1764.

Mile End Road
Motor Omnibus Accidents.
Q. Mr. B. S. Straus; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 22,* 65.
Tramway, *see* Aldgate—Tramway to Bow.

Milford Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27,* 853.

Militia
Abolition of.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *July 27,* 936.
Ballot Act, Position of.
Os. Sir S. Scott, *July 27,* 1023, 1024; Mr. Acland, 1023.
Officers—Commissions in the Regular Army.
Os. Mr. W. Nicholson, *July 27,* 915.
Organisation under new Scheme.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 27,* 892.

Milk Supply
Condensed Milk Company case.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Aug. 1,* 2084.
Legislative Proposals.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 29,* 1531.
Tuberculosis Germs in Milk.
Os. Mr. Lupton, *July 29,* 1539; Sir P. Magnus, 1546.

Millport
Telegraph Facilities.
Q. Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29,* 1493.

Mitchell Thomson, Mr. W. [Lanark, N. W.]
Liquor Traffic
Hotel Licences granted in Scotland, *July 27,* 848.
Six-Day Licences in Scotland, *July 23,* 319.
St. Vincent
Carib Canal, *July 28,* 1222, 1312.
Relief Fund—Distribution of Balance, *July 28,* 1312, 1315, 1327.
Siam, New Agreement with, *July 25,* 612.

Michell-Thomson, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Tobacco—Expenditure by Working Classes, *July 22,* 70.
West Indies, Cable Communication with, *July 28,* 1316, 1317.

Mohill
Seed Loan—Period for Repayment.
Q. Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30,* 1705.

Molteno, Mr. P. A. [Dumfriesshire]
Suez Canal
British Government's Voting Power on Company, *July 23,* 329.
Dues, Dissatisfaction with, *July 23,* 326, 330.

Monaghan
Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. Lardner; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1,* 2079.

Mond, Mr. A. [Chester]
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31,* 1993.

Monedarrah
Grazing Land, Sale of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23,* 352.

Montagu, Mr. E. S. [Cambridgeshire, Chesterton]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., *July 30,* 1835.
Half-timers Committee, Scope of etc., *July 29,* 1495; *July 30,* 1835.
Prisons—Books for Prisoners, *July 23,* 300; *July 29,* 1489.
Small Holdings Act, Administration of, *July 31,* 2053–2055.

Montagu of Beaulieu, Lord
Motors
Dust Nuisance, *July 29,* 1381, 1383.
Horns, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 29,* 1382.
Speed Restrictions, *July 29,* 1381.

Mooney Mr. J. J. [Newry]
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, Lords Amendts., *July 29,* 1632.
Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Lords Amendment, *July 31,* 2014.

Moore, Mr. W. [Armagh, N.]
Army Territorial Force—Jury Service, *July 27,* 860.
Cattle-driving—Government Attitude, *July 22,* 100.
Cork, Condition of, *July 22,* 105
Cranagill—Orange Order, Use of Highway by, *July 25,* 615, 616; *July 29,* 1502.

Moore, Mr. W.—*cont.*

Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 230, 233, 235, 237, 240.

Hynes Estate Sale Proposals, *July 31*, 1945.

Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 372–374, 395, 423, 430, 440–442, 464, 476; *July 24*, 512, 558 '567, 571, 575, 590, 594.

Titles of New Universities, *July 22*, 111.

Sligo, Condition of, *July 22*, 97.

Vermin, Legislative Measures for suppressing, *July 25*, 613.

Moray, Firth

Trawling Negotiations.

Q. Mr. Sutherland; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 28*, 1241.

Morgan, Mr. G H. [Cornwall, Truro]

Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 524–527, 563; Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 2007.

Morocco

Clark-Kennedy, Mr., Case of.

Qs. Mr. Fell, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 28*, 1229.

Morrell, Mr. P. [Oxon, Henley]

Agricultural Credit Banks—Foreign Systems, *July 29*, 1462.

Edenbridge—Case of D. Nicholls, *July 27*, 844; *July 29*, 1493.

Small Holdings Act, Administration of, *July 31*, 2050–2053.

Morrison-Bell, Captain E. F. [Devon, Ashburton]

Army

Officers

Promotion, Effect of Special Reserve on, *July 27*, 919, 934–936.

Supply of, *July 27*, 920.

Reductions Effected, *July 27*, 918.

Special Reserve, New Rifles, Date of supplying, *July 27*, 920.

Rifle Clubs, War Office Assistance to, *July 29*, 1457.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R. *Aug. 1*, 2104–2106.

Creich Crofters, Houses, Burning of, *July 25*, 613; *July 29*, 1500, 1501; *Aug. 1*, 2096, 2097.

Indian Churches, Use of, *July 22*, 226.

London Electricity Bills, Proposals as to, *July 27*, 886.

Motors—Speed Regulation, *Aug 1*, 2095.

Scottish Votes, Inadequate Time allowed for Discussion, *July 31*, 2105, 2106.

Morton, Mr. A. C.—*cont.*

Thurso, Steamboat Service with, *July 29*, 1500.

Tobacco—Scottish Cultivation, *Aug. 1*, 2097.

Unemployment—Scottish Distress Committee Grant, *July 31*, 2104

Motherwell Burgh Extension, etc., Bill

l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Motors

Accidents due to—Statistics.

Os. Lord Willoughby de Broke, *July 29*, 1376; Earl of Halsbury, 1387; Earl Russell, 1389.

Competitions on Public Highways.

Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Burns. *July 28*, 1239.

Dust Nuisance.

Os. Lord Willoughby de Broke, *July 29*, 1374, 1376–1378; Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, 1381, 1383; Lord Allendale, 1386; Earl of Halsbury, 1387; Earl Russell, 1391; Mr. W. Long, 1523; Mr. Summerbell, 1530; Mr. Chaplin, 1540.

Q. Mr. Herbert; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 28*, 1240.

Horns, Prohibition of, proposed.

Os. Lord Willoughby de Broke, *July 29*, 1377; Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, 1382; Lord Allendale, 1384; Earl of Halsbury, 1388; Earl Russell, 1389.

Law as to, Necessity for strengthening.

Os. Mr. Mackarness, *July 27*, 1026, 1037; Mr. J. C. Wason, 1027, 1036, 1037; Mr. Markham, 1028, 1031; Mr. Burns, 1032–1036; Mr. Herbert, *July 29*, 1528; Mr. Summerbell, 1530; Mr. Burns, 1562–1564; Lord Willoughby de Broke, 1374–1380; Lord Allendale, 1833; Earl of Halsbury, 1387–1389.

Omnibus

Breakdowns.

Qs. Mr. S. Collins, Earl Winterton; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 28*, 1234.

Q. Mr. S. Collins; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1757.

Licensing, Conditions attached to.

Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 29*, 1605; Sir H. Craik, 1605.

Routes, Powers of Police to vary, etc.

Os. Sir H. Craik, *July 29*, 1598–1600; Mr. Gladstone, 1604.

Speed Regulations.

Os. Mr. Markham, *July 27*, 1029.

Scouts giving Warning against Police Traps, Necessity for dealing with.

Os. Mr. W. Long, *July 29*, 1522; Mr. Herbert, 1528; Mr. Burns, 1563.

Qs. Mr. Cox, Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 30*, 1761.

Motors—*cont.*
Sign Posts, Duties of Local Authorities in connection with.
Os. Mr. W. Long, *July 29*, 1523; Mr. Burns, 1563.

Speed Restrictions.
Os. Lord Willoughby de Broke, *July 29*, 1378, 1379; Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, 1381; Lord Allendale, 1384–1386; Earl Russell, 1389–1391; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 1392; Earl of Donoughmore, 1392; Mr. Herbert, *July 29*, 1529, 1530; Mr. Chaplin, 1539; Sir F. Channing, 1544, 1545; Mr. A. S. Wilson, 1552.

Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Morton, Mr. Cox; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 1*, 2095.

Automatic Restriction.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 27*, 818.

Police Powers, increasing, proposed.
Os. Mr. W. Long, *July 29*, 1521, 1522, 1529.

Mount Edgcombe, Earl of
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1115.

Mountmellick
Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Case of M. Delany.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 851.

Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) Bill].
l. Report from Standing Committee, *July 23*, 255.
Rep. July 27*, 740.
3R.* *July 28*, 1165.
c. 1R.* *July 29*, 1513.

Murphy, Mr. J. (Kerry, E.)
Education Grant, Additional, Distribution of, *July 27*, 832.

Muscat
Traffic in Arms.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 28*, 1213.

Muskerry, Lord
Merchant Service—Training of Officers, *July 22*, 49; *July 27*, 708, 723.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1117.

Myer, Mr. H. (Lambeth, N.).
Tramways—Speed of Cars in London, *July 28*, 1234

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. (Dublin, College Green)
Dunbar — Sub-Postmastership Vacancy, *July 29*, 1453.

Nannetti, J. P.—*cont.*
Police—Weekly Day of Rest, Ballot for, *July 30*, 1727.

Warrenpoint Excursion Fatality, *July 29*, 1508.

Nason Estate
Case of Mrs. M. Eagan.
Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 73.

Natal
Administration, Freedom for Discussion of.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, *July 28*, 1243; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1275, 1276; Mr. Lyttelton, 1275; Mr. G. Greenwood, 1295, 1296; Mr. Boulton, 1323.

British Indians, *see that title.*

British Troops.
Qs. Mr. G. Gooch, Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Mr. Haldane, Mr. Speaker, *July 27*, 867.

Dinizulu, Case of.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1257, 1258, 1259; Colonel Seely, 1262, 1325, 1331; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1279; Sir G. Parker, 1286; Mr. G. Greenwood, 1297, 1299, 1309; Earl Winterton, 1302; Lord Balcarres, 1325; Mr. Mackarness, *July 31*, 2036; Colonel Seely, 2036; Mr. Mackarness, *Aug. 1*, 2098.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 81.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Flynn, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. H. P. Pease, Mr. Byles, Mr. A. Dewar, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Colonel Seely, Mr. Speaker, *July 22*, 86.
Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 839.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. H. P. Pease, Mr. Nield; *As.* Colonel Seely, Mr. Speaker, *July 27*, 869, 871, 873, 875.
Qs. Mr. Byles; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 30*, 1749.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Colonel Seely; *Aug. 1*, 2094.

Indemnity Act.
Os. Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1266, 1267, 1331, 1332; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1277; Mr. G. Greenwood, 1301, Mr. Mackarness, *Aug. 1*, 2098; Mr. G. Greenwood, 2099, 2101; Mr. Byles, 2109; Colonel Seely, 2100.
Qs. Mr. G. Greenwood, Dr. Rutherford; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 871.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 874.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 28*, 1242.
Qs. Mr. G. Greenwood; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 29*, 1485; *Aug. 1*, 2093.

[*cont.*

Natal—*cont.*
Martial Law, Administration of, etc.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28,* 1258; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1278; Sir G. Parker, 1285; Mr. G. Greenwood, 1297–1300.
Native Affairs—Correspondence presented, *July 24,* 499; *July 27,* 706.
Native Races, Treatment of.
Os. Mr. G. Greenwood, *July 28,* 1308–1311.
Trial for certain Crimes—Despatch, etc., presented, *July 27,* 706, 809.

National Assurance Company of Ireland
Case of Corrigan *v.* Read.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. J. Campbell; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Speaker, *July 29,* 1508.

National Debt
Redemption of.
Os. Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29,* 1405, 1406; Earl of Crewe, 1422.
Reduction, Employment of Sums devoted to.
Os. Lord Faber, *July 29,* 1418, 1419; Earl of Crewe, 1421.
Sinking Fund, Allegations as to Raids on by Salisbury Government.
Os. Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29,* 1403, 1404; Lord Faber, 1417.

National Income
Statistics as to.
Os. Earl of Crewe, *July 29,* 1421.

Natural History Museum
Directorship Vacancy.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 24,* 506.

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill
c. Com. Rep.* and 3R.* *July 23,* 494.
l. 1R.* *July* 25,
l. 1R.* *July 25,* 597.
2R. *July 29,* 1445.
Com. Rep. and 3R.* *July 30,* 1677.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2074.

Naval Marriages Bill
c. 2R.* *July 23,* 494.
Com. and 3R. *July 27,* 1056.
l. 1R.* *July 28,* 1072.
2R. *July 29,* 1433.
Com., Rep. and 3R.* *July 30,* 1676.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2074.

Navigation and Shipping
Annual Statement presented, *July 30,* 1635, 1689.

Navy
First Lord—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
Financial Secretary—Dr. T. J. Macnamara.
Accidents and Casualties—Return presented, *July 29,* 1450; *July 30,* 1692.

Navy—*cont.*
Coal Supply.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1195.
Coastguards, *see that title.*
Comparative Strength—Return ordered, *July 28,* 1072, presented 1166.
Court Martial Trials in 1907–8.
Qs. Mr. Nield; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1178; *July 30,* 1743.
"Defence"
Date of completing.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 1,* 2083.
Wages of Engine-fitters.
Q. Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27,* 822.
Deptford Victualling Yard
Discharge System.
Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 29,* 1481.
Labourers Employed on Coopers' Work.
Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27,* 820.
Overtime.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 1742.
Storehouse Staff, Pay of.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 1743.
Dockyards—Wages of Joiners.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27,* 845.
Expenditure—Comparison with Germany.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1210.
"Gladiator," Use of Camels in Salving.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 23,* 326.
"Indomitable" Speed Test.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 1,* 2084.
Inquiries Held since 1800—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29,* 1456.
Return Ordered, *July 30,* 1693.
"Invincible"—Wages of Electrical Wire Workers.
Qs. Mr. Hudson; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1209.
Keyham Private Students—Commissions Offered to.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 23,* 312.
Manœuvres.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 1,* 2084.
"Good Hope" and "Argyll" Cases.
Qs. Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. Bellairs, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 1741.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
Manœuvres—*cont.*
  Report on.
    Q. Mr. Staveley - Hill; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30* 1739.
Mess Debts, Payment of.
  Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 29,* 1455.
Obsolete Vessels, Cost of and Price Realised.
  Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27,* 820.
Officers
  Business Engagements of.
    Qs. Mr. H. C. Lea; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22,* 76.
  Interpreters, Number Eligible as.
    Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 31,* 1949.
  Press Communications, Rule as to.
    Qs. Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Gretton; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1211.
    Qs. Earl Winterton, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *July 30,* 1744.
Ordnance Department—Storehouse Clerks' Petition.
    Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 1742.
Osborne, *see that title.*
Pay—List of Exemptions Presented, *July 30,* 1635, 1690.
Paymasters—Promotion System.
  Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1196.
Portsmouth Gun Wharf Fire in 1907.
  Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 23,* 325.
Repairs, Expenditure on—Return Ordered, *July 31,* 1908; Presented, *July 31,* 1910.
Reserve—Decoration and Promotion.
  Qs. Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 1739.
  "Rohilla" Contract—Wages of Workmen.
  Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1172.
Rosyth Works
  Area of Site.
    Q. Mr. Findlay; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27,* 823.
  Date of Completing.
    Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27,* 821.
  Expenditure on.
    Os. Mr. J. Ward, Dr. Macnamara, *July 27,* 1064; Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29,* 1399.
  Expediting of.
    Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 30,* 1737.

Navy—*cont.*
Shipbuilding Programme.
    Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 1,* 2083.
  Comparison with Germany.
    Qs. Mr. Arthur Stanley, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Nield, Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *July 29,* 1478.
  New Armoured Cruiser.
    Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27,* 821.
Submarine A9, Accident in.
  Q. Mr. Macpherson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 1738.
"Superb," Fitters Employed on.
  Qs. Mr. Curran; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1205.
"Temeraire" Apprentices Employed on
  Q. Mr. Curran; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1205.
Torpedo-Boat Destroyers
  Contracts for.
    Q. Mr. Du Cros; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 1744.
  German Programme.
    Qs. Mr. Staveley-Hill, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 28,* 1209.
Trial Trips of New Vessels.
  Qs. Mr. Curran; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 1739.
West India Dock Stores, Wages at.
  Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27,* 844.
"Whiting," Crew of, etc.
  Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 31,* 1950.

Navy Estimates
Admiralty Office—£370,200, *Com.* July 28,* 1353; *Rep.* July 29,* 1518.
Application of Surpluses to Meet Deficiencies—Resolution (Mr. Hobhouse), *July 27,* 1060–1064; *July 28,* 1364.
    Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, Dr. Macnamara, *July 27,* 1063.
Armaments—£2,048,700, *Com.* July 28* 1353; *Rep.* July 29,* 1518.
Martial Law—£13,900, *Com.* July 28,* 1353; *Rep.* July 29,* 1518.
Miscellaneous Effective Services—£409,200, *Com.* July 28,* 1353; *Rep.* July 29,* 1518.
Royal Naval Reserves—£368,300, *Com.* July 28,* 1353; *Rep.* July 29,* 1518.
Scientific Services—£66,000, *Com.* July 28.* 1353; *Rep.* July 29,* 1518.
Victualling and Clothing—£2,286,400, *Com.* July 28,* 1353; *Rep.* July 29,* 1518.
Votes Closured, *July 29,* 1627.

New Forest
Military Manœuvres.
Q. Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 28*, 1201.

New Writs and New Members Sworn
See under Parliamentary Elections.

Newcastle-under-Lyne
Post Office Classification.
Qs. Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 27*, 887.

Newton, Lord
Compulsory Military Service, *July 22*, 22, 23.

Nicholson, Mr. W. G. [Hants, Petersfield]
Army, Special Reserve
  Age Limit, *July 27*, 914.
  Bounty, Conditions of Granting, *July 27*, 913, 929.
  Conditions of Service, *July 27*, 913.
Denominational Schools, Improvement of, *Aug. 1*, 2081.
Excise Officers' Salaries, *July 31*, 1960.
Income-Tax Form Issued to Officers on Retired Pay, *July 28*, 1185.
Militia, Officers—Commissions in the Regular Army, *July 27*, 915.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Army—Case of Captain Bryce Wilson, *July 30*, 1733.
Colonies, Recognition of Services in, *July 23*, 310.
Natal—Dinizulu Case, *July 27*, 870.
Navy
  Court Martial Trials in 1907–8, *July 28*, 1178; *July 30*, 1743.
  Shipbuilding Programme—Comparison with Germany, *July 29*, 1479.
Woolwich Arsenal—Stores Available, *July 30*, 1703.

Nigeria
Southern
  Import Statistics.
    Q. Mr. L. Jones; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 85.
  Liquor Traffic Inquiry.
    Qs. Sir J. Kennaway, Mr. Belloc; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 82.
  Spirit Import Inquiry.
  Q. Mr. Ellis; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 30*, 1715.
Taxation System.
  Qs. Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Aug. 1*, 2093.

Norman, Sir H. [Wolverhampton, S.]
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1991.

North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

North East London Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

North Eastern Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Northern Assurance Company Bill
l Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Northumberland, Duke of
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R. *July 23*, 267–269, 272.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill
l. Rep. July 23*, 253.
3R.* *July 27*, 704.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* July 28*, 1167.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Nugent, Sir W. R. [Westmeath, S.]
Clonrellick Land Purchase, *July 28*, 1198.
Westmeath Re-valuation Expenses, *July 29*, 1453.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
Autumn Session—Friday Sittings, *July 31*, 1968.
Caledon Band Parade on 7th Inst., *July 30*, 1707.
Education—Use of Brown and Nolan's Reader, *July 29*, 1507.
Maghery Catholic Excursion on 5th Inst., *July 27*, 850.
Portadown
  Catholics and Protestants in William Street, *July 30*, 1707.
  Disturbance on 13th Inst., *July 23*, 308, 309; *July 24*, 505.

O'Brien, Mr. W. [Cork]
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 436–438; *July 24*, 523, 537–541, 543; 3R. *July 25*, 650–653.
Land Law (Ireland) Acts—Amendment Proposals, *July 28*, 1243.
Meat Supply Inquiry, Proposals for, *July 27*, 884.

O'Connell Estate
Sale Proposals.
  Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1471.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare, N.]
Hort Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 31*, 1961.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
Cattle-driving Cases—Prosecution of Offenders, *July 30*, 1816.
Condition of Ireland, *July 30*, 1817–1819.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill 2R. *July 30*, 1814–1819.

[*cont.*

O'Connor, Mr. T. P.—*cont.*
Crime—Comparisons Between Great Britain and Ireland, *July 30*, 1817.
Crimes Act, Re-Imposition of, proposed, *July 30*, 1816.
Supply—Curtailment of Discussion by Closure, *July 30*, 1814, 1815.

O'Donnell, Mr. C. J. [Newington, Walworth]
Belfast University Proposals, Local Opinion on, *July 23*, 355, 356.
Bengal, Partition of, *July 22*, 215.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 391–393, 415, 423, 460, 470, 472; *July 24*, 584–586.
  Extern Students, *July 23*, 356, 357.
Royal University—Catholic Attendance, *July 23*, 357.

O'Donnell, Mr. J. [Mayo, S.]
Milford Estate Sale Proposals, *July 27*, 853.
Post Office Sunday Duty, Payment for, *July 28*, 1173.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
Education
  Compulsory Attendance, Local Authorities Adopting Act of 1892, *July 23*, 354.
  National School Teachers
    Assistant Teachers Salaries, *July 23*, 352.
    Salary Increase, Proposals for, *July 28*, 1189.
Kearney Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 23*, 361.
Kerry
  Cattle Breeding in, *July 29*, 1456.
  Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement of, *July 23*, 351.
Land Commission—Experience of Mr. Boyd, *July 23*, 354.
Meat Supply, Inquiry, Proposals for, *July 27*, 885.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
Cattle-Driving—Self-Protection by Graziers, *July 23*, 349.
Killaraght Floods, Cause of, *July 23*, 350, 351.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
Creech Grange Postmistress, Hours of, *July 28*, 1179.
Friendly Societies—Royal London Society, Agreement, *July 30*, 1765.
India
  Condition of, *July 30*, 1746.
  Kothandaramaryya, Mr., Case of, *July 30*, 1714.
  Tilak, Mr., Case of, *July 30*, 1747.
Leeds—Railway Shunting Fatality to W. Harris, *July 30*, 1759.

O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, N.]
Claremorris School, Use of, *July 28*, 1198.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1012, 1021.
Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill, *Com. July 22*, 232; *Com. July 23*, 496.
Quiltybo Schoolhouse, *July 23*, 309.
Tubrahan Farm, Price of, *July 23*, 364.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
King-Harman Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 29*, 1471.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
Labourers (Ireland) Act—Stamp Duty, *July 23*, 363.
Lane-Joynt Estate—Cases of Mrs. O'Shaughnessy and Mrs. Hayes, *July 22*, 73.
Local Government Board Auditors, *July 23*, 362, 363.
Raheen—Case of Mrs. Sheehy, *July 22*, 72.
Rathkeale—Case of J. Reardon, *July 22*, 73.

Oatquarter.
School Teachers Salary
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 306.

Old-age Pensions.
Aliens in East of London, Work Entailed by.
  Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George *July 28*, 1185.
Charitable Annuities
  Q. Sir F. Dixon-Hartland; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Aug. 1*, 2086.
Contributory System, Advantages of.
  Os. Lord Faber, *July 29*, 1415.
Cost of.
  Q. Mr. Clough, Mr. James Hope; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Speaker, *July 23*, 335.
Excise Officers' Salaries.
  Q. Mr. W. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 31*, 1960.
Funds, Source of.
  Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 664; Mr. Joynson-Hicks, 678, 679; Mr. Lloyd-George, 681–684; Sir G. Parker, 693; Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29*, 1400, 1402, 1407; Lord St. Davids, 1412; Earl Cromer, 1413; Earl of Crewe, 1425.
Medical Relief of Pensioner.
  Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 27*, 829.
Rural Pensioners, Estimate of.
  Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 319.
Workhouses, Position of Pensioners in.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 30*, 1733.

[*cont.*

Old-age Pensions Bill

l. Com. July 28, 1073.
l. Rep. July 29, 1438.
l. 3R. *July 30*, 1637.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 1970.
l. Commons' Reasons for Disagreeing to Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 1910.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Debates in Committee (Lords], *July 28*, 1073; Report, *July 29*, 1438; Lords and Commons Amendts., *July 31*, 1910, 1970.

Account at Bank of England, proposed, 1096.

Accounts, Auditing and Presenting to Parliament Annually, proposed, 1096.

Administrative Authority for London, Decision as to, 1150, 1151.

Age—Birth or Baptism Certificates or Census Returns as Proof, proposed, 1100–1104, 1439, 1924, 1925, 1971–1973.

Continuance of Pensions, Periodical Inquiry into Qualifications of Recipients, proposed, 1162, 1163, 1934, 1998–2000.

Contributory Schemes, Advantages and Disadvantages of, 1089, 1090, 1098–1100.

Costs and Expenses to be Defrayed by Local Government Board, proposed, 1096.

Discussion in the House of Lords, Inadequate Time Allowed for, 1086–1088.

Experimental Nature of Measure, 1090.

Financial Privileges of the Commons, Interference with by the Lords, 1077–1086, 1092, 1914–1917, 1919–1924, 1928–1930, 1935–1940.

Fraud or False Statement, Punishment for, 1443, 1934, 1997.

Funds, Provision of, 1095.

Government Amendments, 1161, 1442, 1443.

Imprisonment, Limitation of Disqualification for, 1131, 1439, 1440, 1927–1931, 1979–1982.

Income

Benefits and Privileges, Method of Reckoning, 1135–1141.

Not to Exceed £31 10s. Yearly, 1117, 1118.

Property Capable of Profitable Investment, Reckoning of, proposed, 1131–1135, 1441, 1931, 1983–1993.

Industry Test, 1124–1128.

Man Belonging to Benefit Society for Ten Years previous to Attaining Age of Sixty, Interpretation of Clause, 1128–1130, 1927, 1974–1979.

Old-age Pensions Bill—*cont.*

Debates in Committee [Lords], etc.—*cont.*

Limitation of Operation to 31st December, 1915, proposed 1075, 1086, 1089–1093, 1911, 1913,–1918.

Existing Pensioners not to be Interfered with, 1093, 1918.

Lords' Amendts., agreed to, 1973, 1996.

Machinery for Carrying into Effect, 1095, 1097.

Pension Committee

Appeals from Decisions of, 1145, 1441, 1932, 1994.

Constitution of, 1147–1150.

Delegation of Powers to Sub-Committees, 1158–1161.

Ex Officio Members to be Appointed by Local Government Board, proposed, 1151–1156, 1161, 1932, 1933, 1995.

Local Members, Appointment of, proposed, 1156–1159.

Member Disapproving of a Decision to be Deemed a "Party Aggrieved," proposed, 1146, 1141, 1142, 1932, 1994.

Persons Living Together, Method of Calculating Income, etc., 1141-1144.

Poor Law Disqualification.

Cost of Removal, 1121.

Limitation of to 1910, Objections to, 1118–1123, 1926, 1974.

Regulations for Carrying out, 1097, 1108, 1163.

Laying before Parliament, etc., 1163, 1164, 2000.

Residential Qualifications.

Exceptions, 1105–1110.

Onus of Proof, 1104, 1105.

Persons Absent on Businesses not to be Disqualified, proposed, 1111–1117.

Seamen, Exemption of, proposed 1117.

Responsibility for the Measure, 1073-1077.

Thrift, Effect on, 1098.

Regulations, Issue of.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George *July 30*, 1702.

Third Reading in House of Lords, Procedure as to.
Os. Viscount Wolverhampton, Ear of Camperdown, Lord Balfour o Burleigh, *July 29*, 1444.

Oldham
Postmen's Wages.
Qs. Mr. Clynes; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 30*, 1763.

Olympic Games
Bullets used by British Teams.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 1476.

Omnibuses
Motor, *see under* Motors.

Onslow, Earl of—*Chairman of Committees*
Cattle Importation Restrictions, Removal of, proposed, *July 23*, 292.
Telegraph (Construction) Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 261.

Opium
Indian Revenue, Diminution of.
Qs. Mr. Buchanan, *July 22*, 115; Mr. Ellis, 168; Mr. K. Hardie, 176.
Suppression of Traffic—Action of His Majesty's Government in Hong Kong, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1245, 1261; Colonel Seely, 1260, 1261, 1325; Mr. T. Taylor, 1320–1323.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Col. Seely, *July 27*, 867.

Orange River Colony
Land Board—Relations with the Government.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, *July 28*, 1291.

Oranmore and Brown, Lord
Irish Universities Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 762–768.

Ordnance Survey
Field Superintendents
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 27*, 842.

Osborne
Cadets' Examination Papers.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22*, 76.

Pacific Cable Act
Account Presented, *July 28*, 1071, 1169.

Padiham Urban District Council Bill
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* July 29*, 1447.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Africa—Liquor Traffic among Native Races, *July 28*, 1292–1295, 1330.
Africa, East—Portuguese Native Labour Recruitment Regulations, *July 23*, 329.

Parker, Sir G.—*cont.*
British Indians in the Colonies, Inter-Colonial and Imperial Agreement as to, proposed, *July 31*, 2034.
Canadian Cattle Disease, *July 23*, 346
Congo Free State
Concessions, Policy as to—Protection of Native Rights, etc., *July 27*, 980.
Reforms—British Policy, *July 27*, 978–982.
Finance Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 686, 687, 692–697.
Jamaica—Banana Trade, *July 28*, 1227.
Muscat—Traffic in Arms, *July 28*, 1214.
Natal
Dinizulu, Trial of—Charges and Procedure, *July 22*, 88; *July 28*, 1286.
Martial Law, Administration of, etc. *July 28*, 1285.
Navy
Manœuvres—"Good Hope" and "Argyle" Case, *July 30*, 1742.
Reserve—Decoration and Promotion, *July 30*, 1739.
Old-Age Pensions—Provision of Funds, *July 25*, 693.
Orange River Colony Land Board—Relations with the Government, *July 28*, 1291.
Taxation—Necessity for Providing New Sources, *July 25*, 694.
Trade, State of, in Great Britain and the United States, *July 25*, 636, 687, 695–697.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *July 28*, 1284.
Civil Service Retrenchments, *July 28*, 1287–1290.
Return as to, *July 30*, 1749.
Loan of £5,000,000—Imperial Guarantee, *July 28*, 1284, 1292.
Unemployment, Increase in, *July 25*, 694.

Parliament
House of Commons
Newspaper Files available.
Q. Mr. Lardner; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 29*, 1499.
Strangers' Lobby, Decoration of.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 30*, 1730.
House of Lords
Offices—Report of Select Committee, *July 23*, 274.
Sat first—Lord Hampton, after the Death of his Father, *July 23*, 253.

Parliamentary Elections
New Writ issued—Shoreditch (Haggerston) *July 27*, 890.

Parliamentary Procedure
Blocking Motions.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1783; Mr. Asquith, 1794.
Closure Resolutions, Increase in.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1783.

Patent Law (Amendment) Act, 1907.
Administration of.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 303.

Patents and Designs Act
Compulsory Working of Patents.
Q. Mr. C. Marks; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1695.

Patents and Designs Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074

Pearce, Mr. W. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
Port of London Bill, Procedure as to, *July 30*, 1695.
Spitalfields Market, Proceedings, Delay in *July 25*, 610.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
Natal—Dinizulu Case, *July 22*, 88; *July 27*, 870.
Turkey—Circular as to British Subjects captured by Brigands, *July 30*, 1752.

Pease, Mr. J. A.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Essex, Saffron Walden]
Africa, West—Principe and San Thomé Labour Regulations, *July 27*, 878.
Killaraght Floods, Cause of, *July 23*, 350, 351.
Naval Marriages Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1056.
Russia—Luxenburg Case, *July 27*, 877.
Russo-Japanese War—British Shipping Claims, *July 27*, 876, 877.

Penmachno.
School Site.
Qs. Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 1498.

Percy, Earl [Kensington, S.]
Congo Free State Reforms—British Policy, *July 27*, 961, 962.
Germany, British Relations with, *July 27*, 961.
India
Administrative Policy, *July 22*, 139, 140.
Bengal, Judicial and Executive Functions, *July 22*, 140.
Budget Surplus, *July 22*, 130, 168.
Condition of, *July 22*, 133.

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
India—*cont.*
Education—Reform of Present System, proposed, *July 22*, 134–139.
Mohmand Campaign, Conduct and Organisation of, *July 22*, 129.
Press Act, Enforcement of, *July 22*, 131, 132.
Macedonia
Condition of—Necessity for Pressing Reforms, etc., *July 27*, 962–964.
Turkish Army in, Responsibility for Maintenance of, *July 27*, 964.

Persia
Anglo-Russian Agreement, Terms of.
Os. Mr. Lynch, *July 27*, 952.
Arms, Import of.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 1755.
British Legations, Regulations as to Harbouring of Refugees.
Os. Sir E. Grey, *July 27*, 977.
British Policy in
Os. Mr. Lynch, *July 27*, 944, 945, 953–955; Sir E. Grey, 976–978.
Constitution—Action of the Shah.
Os. Mr. Lynch, *July 27*, 951, 952.
Frontier Negotiations with Turkey.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 331.
Liakhoff, Colonel, Position of.
Qs. Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 1755.
Situation in.
Qs. Mr. Lynch, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 333.
Teheran British Legation, Insult offered to and Apology Tendered.
Os. Sir E. Grey, *July 27*, 977.
Trade Report Presented, *July 30*, 1635.

Persian Gulf
Gun-running in.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 27*, 987.

Peru
Trade Report Presented, *July 27*, 706.

Philipps, Mr. O. C. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]
Crown Colony Inhabitants Stranded in England, *July 28*, 1224.
Jamaica
King's House, Repair of, *July 28*, 1224.
Kingston Wharves and Railway Scheme, *July 28*, 1224.

Phillips, Mr. J. [Longford, S.]
Ballymahon—Case of G. Daly, *July 28*, 1198.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R. *Aug. 1*, 2102.
Criminal Appeal Act—Shorthand Writers, *July 23*, 301.
London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1851.
Unemployment—Urgency of the Question, *July 31*, 2102.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
c. Rep. July 23*, 295.
Con. July 24*, 497.
3R.* *July 25*, 598.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 28*, 1071, *July 29*, 1372.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. Con. July 22*, 59.
3R.* *July 23*, 295.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 28*, 1071.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill
c. Con. July 22*, 59.
3R.* *July 23*, 295.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 28*, 1071.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
Aberdeen, Naval Volunteer Reserve Division for, *July 30*, 1731.
Shetland Cable Breakdown, Cause of, *July 28*, 1181.

Plymouth
Post Office—Wages of Bricklayers.
Q. Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 28*, 1171.

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill
l. 3R.* *July 22*, 58.

Police
Complaints against, Method of Dealing with.
Os. Mr. Atherley-Jones, *July 29*, 1594–1597; Mr. A. Douglas, 1601; Mr. Gladstone, 1603.
Cost of.
Q. Mr. C. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 31*, 1957.
Metropolitan
Annual Holiday.
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 27*, 813.

Police—*cont.*
Metropolitan—*cont.*
Commission Report.
Os. Mr. Atherley-Jones, *July 29*, 1592, 1598; Sir H. Craik, 1598; Mr. A. Douglas, 1601; Mr. Gladstone, 1603, 1604.
Gamble or (Pearce) case of.
Os. Earl Russell, *July 30*, 1682, 1683; Earl Beauchamp, 1685.
Mis-statements by Constables.
Os. Earl Russell, *July 30*, 1684; Earl Beauchamp, 1685; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1686.
Proceedings against Officers found Guilty, Decision as to.
Os. Earl Russell, *July 30*, 1682; Earl Beauchamp, 1685.
Report Presented, *July 30*, 1636, 1691.
Exceptional Duties, Recognition of.
Q. Mr. Rowlands. *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1758.
Weekly Day of Rest, Ballot for.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1727.
Remuneration, scale of.
Os. Mr. Atherly-Jones, *July 29*, 1597; Mr. Remnant, 1597.

Police and Sanitary Committee
Report Presented, *July 24*, 511.

Police (Superannuation) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill
l. 2R. *July 22*, 57.
Com. July 27, 729, 740.
3R.* *July 28*, 1165.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Polling Districts
Orders Altering Presented, *July 29*, 1373, 1449.

Pollings Districts (County Councils) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 22*, 58.
3R.* *July 28*, 1165.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill
l. 2R. *July 27*, 737.
Com. and *Rep.* July 28*, 1166.
3R.* *July 29*, 1446.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* July 31*, 1968.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Ponsonby, Mr. A. [Stirling Burghs]
Macedonian Affairs—Necessity for Pressing Reforms, etc., *July 27*, 939–944.

Pontypridd Water Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2077.

Poor Law
Relief
Annual cost of.
Q. Mr. C. Roberts ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 31,* 1958.
Expenditure on—Return Ordered, *July 22,* 63.
Return presented, *July 23,* 297.
Scottish Statistics (1906–7)—Return presented, *July 30,* 1691.

Poor Rate Exemption Act, 1840
Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed.
Os. Mr. Everett, *July 27,* 1013–1017 ; Mr. Burns, 1018 ; Mr. H. Beach, 1019 ; Mr. Courthope, 1019.

Poplar
Poor Law Guardians, Allocation of Clothing Contracts by.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 27,* 819.

Port of London Bill
Alterations Suggested,
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23,* 341.
Qs. Mr. W. Benn, Mr. Carr-Gomm, Mr. Curran, Mr. B. S. Straus ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23,* 342.
Costs Incurred.
Qs. Mr. Fell ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 28,* 1235.
Joint Committee Report presented, *July 30,* 1776 ; *July 31,* 1908.
Procedure as to
Q. Mr. W. Pearce ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30,* 1695.

Port Talbot
Postmen's Duties.
Q. Mr. J. Williams ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31,* 1948.

Portadown
Catholics and Protestants in William Street.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30,* 1707.
Disturbance on 13th Inst.
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23,* 308.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24,* 505.

Post Office
[*Postmaster-General*—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton. *See also names of Places.*]
Auxiliaries, Rural, Pay of.
Q. Mr. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 23,* 312.
Bradley, Miss, Case of.
Qs. Mr. Field ; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 22,* 69 ; *July 24,* 504.

Post Office—*cont.*
Classification of Certain Towns.
Q. Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 28,* 1172.
Clothing Contracts, Allocation of.
Q. Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 27,* 886.
Contracts Placed in Scotland.
Q. Mr. Watt ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31,* 1947.
Cost of Living in Certain Towns.
Q. Mr. Erskine ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 23,* 311.
Mail Conveyance by Thames Steamboats.
Q. Mr. Carr-Gomm ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 28,* 1180.
Newspaper Postage Regulations.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31,* 1947.
Pensions, Payment of.
Q. Mr. Mildmay ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 30,* 1764.
Provincial Superintending Engineers' Office Staff.
Q. Mr. Hudson ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 27,* 810.
Report Presented, *July 27,* 707, 809.
Small-Pox among Employees.
Q. Mr. Lupton ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 28,* 1180.
Sunday Duty, Payment for.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 28,* 1173.
Territorial Force—Leave of Officials.
Q. Mr. Gibbs ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 25,* 610.

Post Office Consolidation Bill
Joint Committee Report, *July 23,* 255, 368.

Post Office Savings Bank
Female Clerks, Transfer of.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24,* 503.
Irish Work.
Qs. Mr. Field ; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24,* 502, 503.

Post Office Savings Bank Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2074.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Barron Estate—Case of Murphy Family, *July 23,* 304.
Beresford Estate—Case of G. Crowley, *July 23,* 304.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education
Rt. Hon. W. Runciman.

President of the Board of Trade
Rt. Hon. W. S. Churchill.

President of the Local Government Board
Rt. Hon. J. Burns.

Press
Admiralty Communications, *see under* Admiralty.
Naval Officers, *see* Navy—Press.

Prevention of Crime Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee C., *July 22*, 113.

Price, Mr. C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]
Finance Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 697.
Indian Churches, Use of by Presbyterians' *July 22*, 224.
Scottish Registration of Titles—Report of Royal Commission, *July 28*, 1191.

Prisons
Books for Prisoners.
Q. Mr. Montagu; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 300.
Q. Mr. Montagu; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 29*, 1489.
Convict—Women Directors.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel. *July 27*, 879.
Cost of.
Q. Mr. L. Jones; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 31*, 1954.
Ireland—Report Presented, *July 30*, 1635, 1689.

Probation of Offenders Act
Scottish Interpretation.
Q. Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *July 27*, 828.

Prosecution of Offences Acts
Working of Regulations—Return Ordered, *July 30*, 1693; Presented, *July 31*, 1943.

Provincial Homes Investment Company Limited
Judgment Against.
Q. Mr. Scott; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 65.
Operations of.
Qs. Sir F. Cawley, Mr. Byles, Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Sir W. Robson, *July 23*, 346.
Q. Sir F. Cawley; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, 884.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. Clynes; *As.* Sir W. Robson, *July 29*, 1499.
Q. Mr. Walsh; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1756.

Provisional Orders (Procedure) Bill
l. Report from Standing Committee, *July 23*, 253.
Rep. July 27*, 740.
3R.* *July 28*, 1165.

Public Accounts Committee
Report Presented, *July 23*, 367.

Public Health (Markets in Rural Districts) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 27*, 705.
Com., Rep. and 3R.* *July 28*, 1072.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* July 29*, 1628.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Public Petitions Committee
Report Presented, *July 22*, 112.

Public Works Loans Bill
c. 2R. *July 22*, 245.
Com. July 27, 1003.
Con. and 3R.* *July 28*, 1354.
l. 1R.* *July 29*, 1374.
2R.* *July 30*, 1677.
3R.* *July 31*, 1910.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Public Works Loans (Remission) Bill
Expenses Resolution (Mr. Hobhouse), *July 23*, 479.—Reported, *July 24*, 596.
Os. Mr. T. M. Healy, *July 23*, 479, 490, 492, 493; Mr. Hobhouse, 479, 483, 484, 490, 492, 493; Mr. Forster, 486; Mr. Ainsworth, 487, 491; Mr. Markham, 492; Mr. Hudson, 493.

Putney
Telephone Service.
Q. Sir H. Kimber; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 30*, 1763.

Queen's County
Deputy-Lieutenants.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 2088.
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1711.

Questions
Argumentative, *July 23*, 356.
Matter of Opinion, *July 23*, 356, 357; *July 27*, 867; *July 30*, 1748.
Notice to be Given of, *July 22*, 89; *July 29*, 1484; *July 30*, 1745, 1748.
Out of Order, *July 22*, 79, 101, 111; *July 27*, 874; *July 29*, 1479, 1501, 1509.
Reference to Debate in House of Lords, *July 23*, 335.
Speech may not be made during Time for, *July 22*, 100.

Quiltybo
- Schoolhouse.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 309.

Raheen
- Case of Mrs. Sheehy.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 72.

Railways
- Automatic Couplings, Value of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Maddison, Mr. Hudson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, 881.
- Coal Freight and Wastage.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hedges; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, 846.
- Electric—Precautions against Fire.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 70.
- Hours of Labour of Employees—Report Presented, *July 30*, 1636, 1690.
- Returns Presented, *July 30*, 1635, 1689.

Railway and Canal Traffic Act
- Report Presented, *July 30*, 1636, 1690.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]
- Clutterbuck and Pepys, Captains, Transfer of, *July 23*, 323.

Rathcline
- Case of B. and J. Mullooly.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 353.

Rathdowney
- Disturbance on 20th June.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 831; *July 28*, 1199.

Rathkeale
- Case of J. Reardon.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell. *July 22*, 73.

Rathlin Island
- Pier.
  - *Q.* Mr. Glendinning; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 24*, 506.

Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill
- *c.* 3r.* *July 24*, 497.
- *l.* Commons Amendts., *Con.** *July 27*, 705.
- *c.* Lords Amendt. to Commons Amendts., *Con.*, *July 29*, 1447.
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
- Companies Bill, *Com. July 27*, 993, 999.
- Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill, 2r. *July 28*, 1362; *Com. July 29*, 1629, 1630.
- Public Works Loans Bill, 2r. *July 22*, 249.
- Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1359.

Redenham
- Village Green.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 30*, 1700.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
- Contempt of Courts Bill, Proposals as to, *July 22*, 107.
- Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 380–382, 405, 412, 472; *July 24*, 527–533, 582; 3r., *July 25*, 625–628.
- Meat Supply Inquiry, Proposals for, *July 25*, 610.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
- Africa, East
  - Land Tenure Legislation, *July 27*, 868.
  - Railway Construction, Grants for, *July 27*, 838.
- Bagdad Railway, Progress made with, etc., *July 27*, 987.
- Education—Welsh Central Board Relations with Board of Education, *July 31*, 2070, 2071.
- Egypt—Education System, *July 30*, 1752.
- India
  - Afforestation of Waste Lands, *July 30*, 1746.
  - Bengal Press Regulation, Necessity for, *July 23*, 299.
  - Bombay Factories Commission Report, *July 28*, 1221.
  - Condition of, *July 30*, 1745.
  - Death Rate Statistics, *July 27*, 830; *July 30*, 1713.
  - Education—Reform of present System proposed, *July 22*, 141, 145, 148, 152–158.
  - Executive and Judicial Functions, Separation of, *July 28*, 1214.
  - Government Stores, Local Purchase of, *July 22*, 80.
  - Jasden Succession, *July 22*, 80; *July 31*, 1949, 1967.
  - Kankinara Bomb Outrage, *July 22*, 80.
  - Kathi Chiefs, Grievances as to Rule of Succession, *July 31*, 2070.
  - Limbdi Succession, *July 22*, 80.
  - Malaria, Mortality from, *July 22*, 142.
  - Military Training of Civilians, *July 23*, 299.
  - Mosques and Temples, Grant for Upkeep of, *July 27*, 848.
  - Muslim Attitude towards Public Unrest, etc., *July 28*, 1214.
  - Orissa Village Records, *July 28*, 1191.
  - Plague Statistics, *July 22*, 142.
  - Press Act, Enforcement of, *July 22*, 151.
  - Quetta-Nushki Trade Route, Traffic by, *July 28*, 1212.

[*cont.*

Rees, Mr. J. D.—*cont.*
India—*cont.*
Seditious Writings and Propaganda, Evils of, *July 22*, 146–151, 160.
Sylhet Bomb Manufacture, *July 28*, 1213.
Tilak, Mr., Case of, *July 28*, 1216, 1217.
Muscat—Traffic in Arms, *July 28*, 1213.
Opium Policy in Hong Kong, Effect of, *July 27*, 867.
Persia, Situation in, *July 23*, 334.
Persian Gulf, Gun-running in, *July 27*, 987.
Post Office
Classification of certain Towns, *July 28*, 1172.
Clothing Contracts, Allocation of, *July 27*, 886.
Russian Loan—Issue in Great Britain, *July 23*, 331.
Transvaal Asiatic Policy—Circular to Trade Councils, *July 27*, 880, 881.
Welsh Church Commission Report, *July 31*, 1966.
Welsh Purposes, Expenditure on, *July 22*, 89.
Zulus—Legal *Status* of, *July 27*, 876.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools.
Cost of.
Q. Mr. L. Jones; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 31*, 1953.
Number of, etc.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1728.

Regents Canal
Fence, Repair of.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 28*, 1197.

Registration Bill
c. Con. and 3R. *July 23*, 494.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 29*, 1446.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
Police Remuneration, Scale of, *July 29*, 1597.

Revenue and Expenditure
Additional Expenditure, Proposals for Meeting.
Qs. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 664–669; Mr. Cox, 669; Sir E. Sassoon, 671; Mr. Lloyd-George, 681–685.
Public Income and Expenditure (1893–1908) Return Presented, *July 27*, 810.

Revenue and Expenditure—*cont.*
Revenue raised by Taxes.
Qs. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 28*, 1193.
Statistics for 1907–8.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 27*, 847.
Welsh Purposes, Expenditure on.
Q. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 22*, 89.

Reynall v. Taafe
Decision as to.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 106.

Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill.
c. Rep. July 23*, 296.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 27*, 807.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 28*, 1069.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Ribble River.
Fishery Board.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Aug. 1*, 2085.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
Army Territorial Force Uniform Contracts, *July 28*, 1189.
Brecon, Meeting on 12th ult., Disturbance at, *July 28*, 1190.
Customs and Excise Reorganisation Scheme, *July 30*, 1766.
Lunatic Asylums, Cost of, *July 31*, 1955.
Navy
Deptford Victualling Yard.
Overtime, *July 30*, 1742.
Storehouse Staff, Pay of, *July 30*, 1743.
Ordnance Department — Storehouse Clerks' Petition, *July 30*, 1742.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Act—Clause 2, *July 23*, 302.
War Office Uniform Contracts, *July 30*, 1702.

Richardson Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 353.

Richmond
Royal Houses, Use for.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 27*, 846.

Ridley, Viscount
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1099, 1138–1141, 1144.
University of Durham Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 739.

Ridsdale, Mr. E. A. [Brighton]
Egypt—Cairo Drainage Scheme, *July 24,* 507.

Rifle Clubs
War Office Assistance to.
Q. Captain Morrison - Bell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29,* 1457.

Ripon, Marquess of—*Lord Privy Seal*
Irish Universities Bill, *Com. July 30,* 1651, 1671–1673.

River Wandle Protection Bill
c. 2R.* *July 27,* 807.
Rep. July 28,* 1167.
3R.* *July 29,* 1447.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2078.

Roads Boat Slip
Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29,* 1470.

Roberts, Mr. C. [Lincoln]
Licensing Bill—Clause 1, Interpretation of, *July 29,* 1512.
Police, Cost of, *July 31,* 1957.
Poor Law Relief, Annual Cost of, *July 31,* 1958.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
Edenbridge—Case of D. Nicholls, *July 28,* 1183.

Roberts, Sir J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30,* 1823–1826.
Education in Wales
Correspondence between Schools and Education Board, *July 30,* 1825, 1826.
Dual Inspection, Grievances as to, *July 30,* 1825.
Intermediate Education—Recognition of Central Board in Code, proposed, *July 30,* 1825.
India
Administrative Policy, *July 22,* 190–193.
Calcutta Liquor Licences, *July 28,* 1215.
Excise Administration Statement, *July 28,* 1214.
Liquor Traffic, Increased Revenue derived from, *July 22,* 189.
Sheep Dipping, Order as to, *July 28,* 1183.

Robertson, Lord
Irish Universities Bill, *Com. July 30,* 1658–1661.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland Tyneside]
Books—Import Regulations, *July 27,* 816.
British Indians in the Colonies
Position of, *July 22,* 85.
Transvaal Arrests, etc., *July 30,* 1750.
Criminal Appeal Act—Shorthand Writers, *July 27,* 816.
Egypt
Cairo Khedivial School Attendance, etc., *July 23,* 332.
Education System, *July 30,* 1751.
Mortgage Bank Proposal, *July 23,* 332.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con. July 24,* 551.

Robertson, Sir G. S. [Bradford, Central]
India
Administrative Policy, *July 22,* 205–208.
Condition of, *July 22,* 203, 204.
Education—Reform of Present System, proposed, *July 22,* 202, 203, 206.

Robson, Sir W. S.—*Attorney-General* [South Shields]
Provincial Homes Investment Company, Operations of, *July 23,* 346, 347; *July 29,* 1500.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31,* 1990.
Registration Bill, 3R. *July 23,* 494.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Com. July 28,* 1356, 1358.
Spitalfields Market
Proceedings, Delay in, *July 25,* 610.
Sale of, *July 29,* 1467.

Roche, Mr. A. [Cork]
Cork Post Office
Overseer, Examination for, *July 29,* 1453.
Surveyors, Allowances to, *July 28,* 1192.
Telegraphic Delays, *July 29,* 1454.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
Eyrecourt—Case of Hynes, *July 27,* 832.
Land Purchase Stock—Returns as to Issues, *July 22,* 112.
Lynam, Edward, Case of, *July 23,* 347.

Rochester Bridge Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2077.

Rome
Scots College Case.
Q. Mr. Sutherland. *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 28,* 1230.

Ronaldshay, Lord [Middlesex, Hornsey]
China—Foreign Trade in 1907, *July 23,* 311.

Roscommon
Clerk to Board of Guardians.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell; *July 24*, 511.
Condition of.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell; *July 22*, 110.

Rosebery, Earl of
Cavalry for Scotland, *July 27*, 724.
Deputy-Lieutenants — Qualifications required on Appointment, *July 27*, 725, 727.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1073–1077, 1083.

Rosyth Naval Base
See under Navy.

Rowlands, Mr. J. [Kent, Dartford]
Dartford Open-air Meetings, *July 30*, 1697.
Erith Unemployed Relief Works, *July 30*, 1761.
London and District Electricity Supply Bill., 2R., *July 30*, 1858–1861.
Police, Metropolitan
Annual Holiday, *July 27*, 813.
Exceptional Duties, Recognition of, *July 30*, 1758.

Royal Warrants
Conditions of Granting.
Q. Mr. Hay. *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 336.

Runciman, Rt. Hon. W.—*President, Board of Education* [Dewsbury]
Aberdare School Teachers, Dismissal of, *July 28*, 1176.
Bermondsey—Monnon Road School, *July 29*, 1497.
Building Grants, Administration of, *July 30*, 1830, 1832, 1833.
Code
Article 14, *July 28*, 1175.
Article 43, Interpretation of, *July 30*, 1727.
Date of Issue, *July 23*, 298.
Compulsory Attendance Committee, *July 22*, 91, 92.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1826–1833.
Denominational Schools, Improvement of, *Aug. 1*, 2081.
Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill, 2R. *July 28*, 1362, 1363; *Com.*, *July 29*, 1629, 1630.
Garforth School Dispute, *July 29*, 1498.
Grants in aid of Denominational Schools, *July 29*, 1456.
Half-Timers Committee, Scope of, *July 29*, 1495; *July 30*, 1829.

Runciman, Rt. Hon. W.—*cont.*
Hoxton—Use of Douglas Hall, *July 29*, 1496.
Llangollen School Dispute, *July 29*, 1498.
Lift in New Buildings, *July 24*, 507.
Open-air Schools, *Aug. 1*, 2080.
Penmachno School Site, *July 29*, 1498, 1499.
Registration Council Staff—Position on Abolition of Office, *July 27*, 826.
Teachers—Footnote to Article 10 of Code of 1906, *July 28*, 1177.
Training Colleges
List of, *July 28*, 1183.
Regulations for, *Aug. 1*, 2081.
Welsh Education
Code, *Aug. 1*, 2080.
Correspondence between Schools and Education Board, *July 30*, 1828.
Dual Inspection, Grievances as to, *July 30*, 1827.
Grants, Distribution of, *July 30*, 1827.
Intermediate—Recognition of Central Board in Code, proposed, *July 30*, 1829.
West Square School Accommodation, *July 29*, 1498.
Willesden
Case of W. Barnard, *July 27*, 825.
Education Committee Area Scheme, *July 28*, 1182.

Rushden
Postmen, pay of.
Q. Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Buxton. *July 29*, 1494.

Russell, Earl
Desertion, Practice in Scotland with regard to, *July 30*, 1686.
Matrimonial Causes Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 4–10.
Motors
Accidents due to—Statistics, *July 29* 1389.
Dust Nuisance, *July 29*, 1391.
Horns, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 29*, 1389.
Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1389–1391.
Police Commission Report, *July 30*, 1682.
Women Suffragists
Political Offenders, Treatment as, proposed, *July 29*, 1431.
Prosecution of—Act applying to Cases, *July 20*, 1428–1430.

Russell, Rt. Hn. T. W.—*Vice-President of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department* [Tyrone, S.]
Ballintoy Pier Repair, *July 24*, 506.

[*cont.*

Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.—*cont.*
Castlequin Model Farm Scheme, *July 29*, 1464.
Grand Jury (Ireland) Act (1836) Amendment Bill, *Com. July 22*, 229, 230, 233, 234, 237, 238; *Con. July 23*, 496.
Kenmare Train Service, *July 22*, 93, 94.
Kerry, Cattle Breeding in, *July 29*, 1456.
Londonderry—Flax Seed Supplied, *July 22*, 94.
Rathlin Island Pier, *July 24*, 507.
Wheat and Flour—Lemstrom Electrification System, *July 23*, 315.

Russia
Czar's Visit to England.
Q. Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 28*, 1230.
Loan—Issue in Great Britain.
Qs. Mr. Lynch, Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 331.
Luxenburg, Mr., Case of.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 613.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 27*, 877.
Tchaikovsky, Mr., Case of.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 1754.
Trade Report Presented, *July 22*, 3; *July 30*, 1635.

Russo-Japanese War
British Shipping Claims.
Qs. Mr. McArthur; *As.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 27*, 876.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 28*, 1230.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
British Indians in the Colonies, Position of, *July 22*, 85, 86.
Egypt
Education System, Necessity for Reform of, *July 27*, 982, 983.
Self-Government for, proposed, *July 27*, 982–985.
Germany, British Relations with, *July 27*, 982.
India—Case of Mr. Tilak, *July 28*, 1216.
Macedonian Bands, Suppression of, *July 23*, 332.
Natal Indemnity Bill, Terms of, *July 27*, 871.

Rutherford, Mr. W. H. [Liverpool, West Derby]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1059.
Companies Bill, *Com. July 27*, 995–1000.
Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 1631.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com. July 27*, 989–991, 993,

Rutherford, Mr. W. H.—*cont.*
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1046.
Naval Marriages Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1056, 1058.
Navy and Army Estimates—Application of Surpluses to Meet Deficiencies, *July 27*, 1063, 1068.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1003–1010.
Unemployed Workmen's Act — Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1046.

St. Aldwyn, Viscount
Coal Tax Repeal, Effects of, *July 29*, 1400, 1401.
Consols, Price of, *July 29*, 1404.
Finance Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 1398–1409, 1424.
Income Tax—Maintaining at 1s. in the £ in Time of Peace, *July 29*, 1407, 1408.
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Com. July 23*, 260.
National Debt
Redemption of, *July 29*, 1405, 1406.
Sinking Fund, Allegations as to Raids on by Salisbury Government, *July 29*, 1403, 1404.
Naval Base at Rosyth, Expenditure on, *July 29*, 1399.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1097, 1099, 1104–1106, 1110, 1115, 1118–1121, 1131–1135, 1140, 1154; *Rep.*, *July 29*, 1439, 1440; Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts., *July 31*, 1926, 1931, 1937.
Funds, Provision of, *July 29*, 1400, 1402, 1407.
Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 29*, 1401, 1408.
Supply—Growth of Various Votes, *July 29*, 1398.

St. Davids, Lord
Consols, Price of, *July 29*, 1411.
Finance Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 1409–1413.
Income Tax—Maintaining at 1s. in the £ in time of Peace, *July 29*, 1412.
Old-Age Pensions Bill—Provision of Funds, *July 29*, 1412.
Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 29*, 1410.
Supply—Growth of Various Votes, *July 29*, 1409.

St. Lucia.
Property Tax Bill.
Q. Sir H. Kimber; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 30*, 1748.

St. Vincent.
Carib Canal.
Os. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, *July 28*, 1312–1314; Colonel Seely, 1326.
Qs. Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. Lamont, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1121, 1222.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1223.
Relief Fund—Distribution of Balance.
Os. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, *July 28*, 1312, 1315, 1327; Colonel Seely, 1326.
Q. Mr. Lamont; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1221.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. Fell; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1223.
Revenue.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 28*, 1223.

Salisbury, Marquess of
Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill, Standing Order XXXIX., Suspension of, etc., *July 31*, 1907.
Merchant Service—Officers' Training, *July 27*, 721.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1107, 1116, 1129, 1135, 1137, 1142, 1143; Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts., *July 31*, 1922–1924, 1930.

Saltcoats
Postmen, Pay of.
Q. Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 22*, 65.

Salter, Mr. A. C. [Hants, Basingstoke.]
Sandhurst Royal Military College Cadetships, *July 27*, 837.

Saltown, Lord
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1130.

Samuel, Mr. H. L., *Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Ambergate Reservoir Works—Wages paid, *July 27*, 879.
Brecon Open Air Meetings, Police Attendance at, *July 29*, 1487, 1488.
Cabs, Taximeter—Overcrowding, *July 29*, 1490.
Corporal Punishment—Procedure in Imposing Sentence, *July 29*, 1490.
Heraldry—*Status* of Lyon King at Arms, *July 29*, 1487.
Kettering—Cases of Bowler *v.* Foskett, *July 29*, 1488.
Merthyr Tydvil Police Pension Rights, *July 27*, 880.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*cont.*
Prisons
Books Supplied to Prisoners, *July 29*, 1489.
Convict—Women Directors, *July 27*, 879.
Spitalfields Market, Sale of, *July 29*, 1467.
Waste Paper—Disposal of Prison Registers, *July 27*, 880.

Sanderson, Lord
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 28*, 1142.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
Bruni
British Authority, *July 28*, 1225.
Trade Statistics, *July 28*, 1226.
Canadian Tariff Treaty with France, *July 28*, 1229.
Coal Tax, Abolition of, *July 25*, 671.
Expenditure, Additional, Proposals for meeting, *July 25*, 671.
Finance Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 670–676, 685, 689.
India—Bombay Factory Disturbances, *July 28*, 1218.
Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 25*, 670, 671, 685.
Taxation—New Sources, Necessity for providing, *July 25*, 675, 676.
Tea Duty, Reduction of, *July 25*, 670, 672.
Training Colleges
List of, *July 28*, 1182.
Regulations for, *Aug. 1*, 2080.

Saye and Sele, Lord
Army Territorial Force, Organisation of *July 22*, 28.

Scotland
Secretary—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
Solicitor-General—Mr. A. Ure.
[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]
Church Property Allocation.
Q. Mr. Sutherland; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 30*, 1726.
Crofters, Arrears in Payment of Instalments by, etc.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 22*, 32–38, 46; Lord Herschell, 38–40, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 40–43; Lord Loreburn, 43–45; Marquess of Lansdowne, 45.
Estimates, *see under* Supply.
Land Question—Legislative Proposals.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 29*, 1466, 1477; *July 30*, 1721.
Qs. Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 30*, 1773.
Parish Council Elections—Return Presented *July 22*, 62.

[*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*
- Registration of Titles—Report of Royal Commission.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 28*, 1191.
- Sheriffs, etc., Qualifications required of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *July 28*, 1184.

Scott, Mr. A. H. [Ashton-under-Lyne]
- Provincial Homes Investment Company, Ltd., Judgment against, *July 22*, 65.

Scott, Sir S. E. [Marylebone, W.]
- Cabs—Railway Station Service, *July 27*, 814.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1021, 1023.
- Militia Ballot Act, Position of, *July 27*, 1023, 1024.
- Public Works Loans Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 251.

Sea Fisheries Regulation Act
- Report Presented, *Aug. 1*, 2073, 2079.

Seaham Harbour Dock Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Sears, Mr. J. E. [Cheltenham]
- Customs House (London)—Accommodation, *July 23*, 315.
- Customs and Excise
  - Amalgamation Scheme, *July 23*, 320, 321.
  - Stock-taking System, *July 30*, 1737.
- Inland Revenue, Returns, etc., required by, *July 23*, 320.
- Natural History Museum—Directorship Vacancy, *July 24*, 506.

Secretary of State for the Colonies—*Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.*

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—*Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.*

Secretary of State for the Home Department—*Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.*

Secretary of State for India—*Rt. Hon. Viscount Morley.*

Secretary of State for Scotland—*Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.*

Secretary of State for War—*Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.*

Seddon, Mr. J. R. [Lancashire, S.W., Newton]
- Building Societies, Fraudulent, Protection against, *July 30*, 1759.
- Dock Regulations, Enforcement of, proposed, *July 30*, 2059–2061.
- Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 469; *July 24*, 550.

Seddon, Mr. J. R.—*cont.*
- Man, Isle of—Deputation to Home Secretary, *July 31*, 2058, 2059.

Seed Potatoes and Seed Oats Supply (Ireland) Bill
- *l.* 2R. *July 27*, 728.
- *Com.* and *Rep.** *July 28*, 1164.
- 3R.* *July 29*, 1444.
- Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Seely, Colonel.—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Liverpool, Abercromby]
- Africa — Liquor Traffic among Native Races, *July 28*, 1329–1331.
- Africa, East
  - Labour
    - Employment Report, Date of Presenting, *July 22*, 67.
    - Rules, *July 27*, 868.
  - Land Tenure Legislation, *July 27*, 868.
  - Ordinances—Placing in Library, *July 22*, 67.
  - Portuguese Native Labour Recruitment Regulations, *July 23*, 328, 329; *July 27*, 869.
  - Railway Construction, Grants for, *July 27*, 838.
  - Rules in Cd. 4122, *July 22*, 67.
  - Steamship Communication with, *July 29*, 1458.
  - Africa, South, Administrative Policy, *July 28*, 1267–1269, 1273.
  - Compensation Fund, Administration of, *July 27*, 869; *July 28*, 1224.
  - Manhood Suffrage, Results of Lowering, *July 28*, 1268.
  - Native Education Report, *July 27*, 839.
- Basutoland—Special Report, *July 27*, 839.
- Bechuanaland—Special Report, *July 27*, 839.
- British Indians in the Colonies
  - Conference proposed, *July 28*, 1332.
  - Inter-Colonial and Imperial Agreement as to, proposed, *July 31*, 2028–2034.
  - Position of, *July 22*, 85, 86.
  - Report of Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, *July 31*, 2029, 2031.
  - Shapurji, Mr., Case of, *July 28*, 1222.
  - Transvaal Arrests, etc., *July 30*, 1750.
- Bruni
  - British Authority, *July 28*, 1225.
  - Trade Statistics, *July 28*, 1226.
- Ceylon
  - Pearl Fisheries, Leasing of, to Private Company, *July 28*, 1261.
  - Public Works — Employment of Natives *July 27*, 838, 839.

[*cont.*

Seely, Colonel—*cont.*
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R. *Aug. 1*, 2100.
- Criticisms on late Under Colonial Secretary, *July 28*, 1268, 1269.
- Crown Colony Inhabitants Stranded in England, *July 28*, 1224.
- Dominica Railway Construction, *July 28*, 1228.
- Exchequer and Audit Department—Travelling Expenses of Civil Officers, *July 30*, 1716.
- Federated Malay States
  - Children in Gaming and Opium Dens, *July 22*, 83.
  - Gambling Licence System, *July 22*, 83, 84.
  - Revenue Statistics, *July 22*, 82, 83.
- Gilbert Islands
  - Administration, Complaints as to, *July 28*, 1328, 1329.
  - Charges against Resident Commissioner, *July 30*, 1751.
- Imperial Conference—Duties of Secretariat, *July 29*, 1484, 1485.
- India—Jasdan Succession, *July 31*, 1949.
- Jamaica
  - Banana Trade, *July 28*, 1226, 1227.
  - Coolies—Rate of Pay, *July 28*, 1328.
  - King's House, Repair of, *July 28*, 1224.
  - Kingston Wharves and Railway Scheme, *July 28*, 1224.
  - Relief Fund, Distribution of, *July 30*, 1717.
- Natal
  - Dinizulu, Trial of—Charges and Procedure, *July 22*, 81, 82, 87, 88; *July 27*, 839, 870, 872, 873, 874, 875; *July 28*, 1264–1267, 1325, 1331; *July 30*, 1749; *July 31*, 2036; *Aug. 1*, 2095.
  - Indemnity Bill, Terms of, *July 27*, 871, 875; *July 28*, 1266, 1267, 1331, 1332; *July 29*, 1485; *Aug. 1*, 2093, 2094, 2100.
- Nigeria
  - Southern
    - Import Statistics, *July 22*, 85.
    - Liquor Traffic Inquiry, *July 22*, 82.
  - Spirit Import Inquiry, *July 30*, 1716.
  - Taxation System, *Aug. 1*, 2093.
- Opium Policy—Effect on Hong Kong, *July 27*, 867; *July 28*, 1260, 1261, 1325.
- Recognition of Services in Colonies, *July 23*, 310.
- St. Lucia, Property Tax Bill, *July 30*, 1749.

Seely, Colonel—*cont.*
- St. Vincent
  - Carib Canal, *July 28*, 1221, 1222, 1223; *July 28*, 1326.
  - Relief Fund, *July 28*, 1221, 1223, 1326.
  - Revenue, *July 28*, 1223.
- Suez Canal Dues, Dissatisfaction with, *July 23*, 327.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour Question, *July 28*, 1269, 1274.
    - Repatriations, *July 22*, 66.
  - Civil Service Retrenchments, *July 28*, 1271–1273, 1332.
  - Return as to, *July 30*, 1750.
  - Compensation Fund, Loss in, *July 23*, 327.
  - Loan of £5,000,000—Imperial Guarantee, *July 28*, 1274.
  - Native Labour Wages, *July 23*, 328.
  - White Labour, Particulars of, *July 30*, 1750.
- Trinidad Dock and Engineering Company, Director of, *July 22*, 81.
- West Indies
  - Administration, Cost of, *July 28*, 1328.
  - Cable Communication with, *July 28*, 1327.
- Zululand
  - Legal *status* of Zulus, *July 27*, 876.
  - Native Land Reservation, *July 27*, 875.

Severn
- Foreshore, Ownership of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. D. White; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 28*, 1238.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
- Bonar Bridge—Case of J. Murray, *July 30*, 1732.
- Probation of Offenders Act—Scottish Interpretation, *July 27*, 828.
- Sheriffs, etc., Qualifications Required of, *July 28*, 1184.
- Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill—Memorandum proposed, *July 27*, 829.
- Truck Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *July 23*, 348.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork County, Mid.]
- Colthurst Estate Sale Proposals, *July 28*, 1200.
- Cork Process Servers, Protection of, *July 27*, 835.
- Smith Estate—Case of J. D. McAuliffe, *July 29*, 1475.
- White Estate—Case of Mrs. M. Callaghan, *July 29*, 1475.

Sheep
Dipping order.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 28*, 1183.

Shetland
Cable Breakdown, Cause of.
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 27*, 839.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Buxton *July 28*, 1181.

Shoeburyness
Foreshore, Ownership of.
Qs. Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Mr. Haldane *July 22*, 78.
Q. Mr. J D. White; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 28*, 1189.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 28*, 1238.
Fishery Rights on War Office Ground.
Q. Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 1735.

Shop Hours Act
Closing Orders under—Return proposed.
Os. Lord Avebury, *July 22*, 13, 14; Earl Beauchamp, 13.
Orders made under, Presented, *Jvly 31*, 1909, 1943.

Shoreditch [Haggerston]
New Writ Issued, *July 27*, 890.

Siam
New Agreement with.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Carlile; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 612.

Silcock, Mr. T. B. [Somersetshire, Wells]
Ancient Monuments in England and Wales—Scope of Commission, *July 24*, 505.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
Church Property Allocation, *July 30*, 1727.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1901–1903.
Creich Crofters' Houses, Burning of, *July 25*, 613; *July 29*, 1500, 1501; *Aug. 1*, 2096, 2097.
Education Grants—Deduction System, *July 24*, 508.
Fisheries
Line and Trawl-Caught Fish Landed in Scotland, (1898–1907), *July 23*, 314.
Scottish Cruisers, *July 23*, 348; *July 31*, 1948.
Trawling Prosecutions, *July 22*, 69.
Glasgow Unemployed—Work of Distress Committee, etc., *July 31*, 2067–2069.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Land Question—Legislative Proposals, *July 29*, 1466, 1477; *July 30*, 1721.
Lewis, Island of
Fish Landed in 1898 and 1907, *Aug. 1*, 2085.
Fisheries, *July 27*, 811.
Houses, Proposals for Rebuilding, *July 29*, 1467.
Lochs Schools, Cleansing of, *July 31*, 1959.
Migration Scheme, *July 23*, 313.
Rating *impasse*, *July 28*, 1192; *July 29*, 1466.
Sanitary Condition, *July 27*, 824.
Skigersta Boat Shelter and Sea Wall, *July 23*, 314.
Registration of Titles—Report of Royal Commission, *July 28*, 1191.
Syre Settlers, Decision of, *July 28*, 1192.
Thurso, Steamboat Service with, *July 29*, 1500.
Tobacco—Scottish Cultivation, *Aug. 1*, 2097.
Vatersay and Barra, Situation on, *July 27*, 824; *July 30*, 1902.

Sligo
Condition of.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 96.
Post Office Night Duty.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 28*, 1179.

Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 27*, 704.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 28*, 1167.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Ballinorley School, Closing of, *July 30*, 1770, 1771.
Belfast Police Transfer Cases, *July 23*, 305, 307.
Constabulary
Canteen Fund, *Aug. 1*, 2090.
Cosgrove, J., Case of, *July 25*, 611.
Legislative Proposals, *July 31*, 1965.
Phœnix Park Depot, Baths at, *Aug. 1*, 2089.
Recruits—Messing Arrangements, *Aug.* 2089.
Education
Grants, Additional, Conditions of Giving, *July 23*, 306.
Inspectors, Complaints against, *July 28*, 1201.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 595.
Oatquarter School Teacher's Salary, *July 23*, 306.
Old-Age Pensions Bill—Position of Pensioners in Workhouses, *July 30*, 1733.

Small Holdings
Applications in Yorkshire.
Q. Mr. H. Greenwood; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 29*, 1463.

Small Holdings and Allotments Act
Administration of.
Os. Mr. Morrell, *July 31*, 2050–2053; Mr. Montagu, 2053–2055; Sir E. Strachey, 2055–2058.
Interim Report Presented, *July 29*, 1373, 1450.

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill
c. 2R.* *July 25*, 700.
Com. July 28, 1355.
Con. and 3R.* *July 29*, 1628.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* *July 31*, 1910.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
Gilbert Islands—Charges Against Resident Commissioner, *July 30*, 1751.
Indian Administrative Reform Proposals, *July 30*, 1746, 1747.
Scottish Land Question—Legislative Proposals, *July 30*, 1773.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster]
Income-Tax—Definition of Earned Income, *July 23*, 320.

Smith Estate
Case of J. D. M'Auliffe.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1475.

Smyth, Mr. T. F. [Leitrim, S.]
Croften Estate—Case of J. Reynolds, *July 30*, 1707.
Harlech Estate—Case of Mrs. A. Reilly, *July 30*, 1706.
Marsham Estate—Case of M. Dunne, *July 30*, 1706.
Mohill, Seed Loan—Period for Repayment, *July 30*, 1705.

Sneem
Postal Facilities in District.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29*, 1459.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]
Inland Revenue Chemical Officers, Petition of, *July 30*, 1733.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devonshire, Barnstaple]
Territorial Force, Quartermaster Sergeants, Position of, *July 22*, 74.

Solicitor-General
Sir S. T. Evans.

Solicitor-General for Ireland
Mr. R. Barry.

Solicitor-General for Scotland
Mr. A. Ure.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Southwell District Gas Bill
l Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

South-West Suburban Water Bill
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* *July 27*, 806.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Speaker and Deputy-Speaker—Rulings
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill Constitution of Standing Committee C., *July 27*, 888.
"Count" could not be Moved for Between Hours of 8.15 and 9.15 p.m., *July 22*, 191.
Irish Universities Bill
Amendments out of Order, *July 24*, 555.
Constituent or Affiliated Colleges, Discussion as to, *July 23*, 405.
Whole Bill could not be Discussed on an Amendment, *July 23*, 423, 429.
Irrelevant Matter, *July 30*, 1845.
Isle of Man—Jurisdiction of Home Secretary, *July 31*, 2058, 2059.
Natal Administration, Discussion of, *July 28*, 1243.
Old-Age Pensions Bill
Consequential Amendments could be Made to any Lords' Amendt., Agreed to, *July 31*, 1979.
Lords Amendt. not Involving Breach of Privilege could be Accepted by the House, *July 31*, 1985.
"Privilege" Amendments, *July 31*, 1970, 1974, 1980, 1995.
Privilege, Waiving in Certain Cases, *July 31*, 1982.
Questions, *see that title*
Speeches Made in Another Place could not be Answered in the House of Commons, *July 22*, 214.

Spirits
Duties Paid in 1907–8.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 1468.

Spitalfields Market
Market Carts in Vicinity.
Q. Mr. B. S. Straus; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 1696.
Proceedings, Delay in.
Q. Mr. W. Pearce; *A.* Sir W. Robson, *July 25*, 610.
Sale of.
Q. Mr. S. Samuel; *A.* Sir W. Robson, *July 29*, 1467.

[*cont.*

Standing Orders
Amendment of Certain Orders, *July 27*, 808.
 Os. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *July 29*, 1370.
Nos. XXI. and XXXIX,. Suspension of—*Motions, July 30*, 1633.
 Os. Earl of Crewe, *July 30*, 1633.

Stanley, Mr. Arthur [Lancashire, S.W., Ormskirk]
Naval Shipbuilding Programme—Comparison with Germany, *July 29*, 1478.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
Commons Regulation (Towyn Trewan) Provisional Order Bill, Standing Order XXXIX., Suspension of, etc., *July 31*, 1908.
Irish Universities Bill, *Com., July 30*, 1653.

Starkey, Mr. J. R. [Nottinghamshire, Newark]
Fourth Notts and Derby Regiment, Headquarters of, *July 29*, 1482, 1483.

Statistical Abstract
Copy Presented, *July 30*, 1635, 1690.
Foreign Countries—Copy Presented, *July 31*, 1944; *Aug. 1*, 2073.

Statute Law Revision Bill
Joint Committee Report, *July 23*, 255, 368.

Staveley-Hill, Mr. H. [Staffordshire, Kingswinford]
Admiralty—System of giving Information to the Press, *July 27*, 822.
Africa, East—Portuguese Native Labour Recruitment Regulations, *July 23*, 328, 329; *July 27*, 869.
Africa, South—Compensation Fund, *July 27*, 869.
Merchant Shipping—Protection in War Time, *July 28*, 1207.
Navy
 Manœuvres, Report on, *July 30*, 1739.
 Torpedo-boat Destroyers — German Programme, *July 28*, 1209.
Transvaal Native Labour Wages, *July 23*, 328.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. [Finsbury, Central]
Tramways—Men Employed, *July 23*, 311; *July 31*, 1945.

Stockport Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Strachey, Sir E.—*Treasurer of the Household* [Somersetshire, S.]
Agricultural Credit Banks—Foreign Systems, *July 29*, 1463.

Strachey, Sir E.—*cont.*
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 2R. *July 22*, 244; *Com. July 27*, 1059.
Butter, Nut, Regulations as to, *July 29*, 1460.
Cattle Diseases
 America — Issue of Leaflet, proposed, *July 28*, 1195.
 Canadian *July 23*, 346.
 Contagious, Notification of, *July 30*, 1729.
Cayo Rent Collection, *July 27*, 827.
Cran Measures Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1367.
Dogs—Inquiry into Distemper, *July 30*, 1701.
Duleek Survey Operations, *July 27*, 842.
Edenbridge—Case of D. Nicholls, *July 28*, 1184.
Fisheries Board, Proposals for, *July 30*, 1701.
Hop Industry—Acreage in England under Hops, *July 30*, 1728.
Horse Breeding Scheme, *July 28*, 1184.
Liverpool—Appeal in Cleave's Case, *July 31*, 1959; *Aug. 1*, 2096.
Milk Supply—Condensed Milk Company Case, *Aug. 1*, 2085.
Ordnance Survey Field Superintendents, *July 27*, 842.
Redenham Village Green, *July 30*, 1700.
Ribble River Fishery Board, *Aug. 1*, 2085.
Sheep Dipping Order, *July 28*, 1183.
Small Holdings—Applications in Yorkshire, *July 29*, 1463.
Small Holdings Act, Administration of, *July 31*, 2055–2058.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1355.

Stradbroke, Earl of
Married Women's Property Bill, 2R. *July 27*, 736, 737; *July 28*, 1165.

Straffan Stud Farms
Military Manœuvres in Vicinity.
 Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 325.

Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway, etc., Bill
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 22*, 2.
 Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

"Strathyne"
Chinese Crew.
 Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 1452.

Straus, Mr. B. S. [Tower Hamlets, Mile End]
Mile End Road, Motor Omnibus Accidents, *July 22*, 65.
Port of London Bill—Alterations suggested, *July 23*, 342, 343.
Spitalfields Market—Carts in Vicinity, *July 30*, 1696.

Strikes and Lock-outs
Report Presented, *July 30*, 1635, 1689.

Suez Canal
British Government Voting Power on Company.
Q. Mr. Molteno; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 329.
Dues, Dissatisfaction with.
Q. Mr. Molteno; *A.* Col. Seely, *July 23*, 326.
Qs. Mr. Molteno, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 330.
Shipping and Tonnage—Returns Presented, *July 28*, 1071, 1169.

Sugar Duty
Reduction of.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 667; Sir E. Sassoon, 670, 671, 685; Mr. Lloyd-George, 685; Mr. Harmood-Banner, 699; Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29*, 1401, 1408; Lord St. Davids, 1410; Earl Cromer, 1413; Lord Faber, 1416; Earl of Crewe, 1424.

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill
l. *Rep.* July 22*, 58.
3R.* *July 23*, 272.
c. Lords Amendt., *Con.*, *July 29*, 1632.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill
Memorandum proposed.
Q. Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *July 27*, 828.
Table of Comparison Presented, *July 30*, 1636, 1691.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
Dominica—Case of Mr. W. Davis, *July 28*, 1320.
Gilbert Islands Administration, *July 28*, 1320, 1329.
Greenwich Park Night Watchmen's Hours, *July 30*, 1729.
Hollesley Bay Experiment, *July 29*, 1533, 1536.
Jamaican Coolies—Rate of Pay, *July 28*, 1319, 1328.
Milk Supply—Legislative Proposals, *July 29*, 1531.
Motors
Dust Nuisance, *July 29*, 1530.
Legislation, Necessity for, *July 29*, 1530.

Summerbell, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Trinidad
Dock and Engineering Company, Director of, *July 22*, 81.
Municipal Council, Re-establishment of, proposed, *July 28*, 1319.
Unemployment—Urgency of the Question, *July 29*, 1531–1533.
West Indies Administration, Cost of, *July 28*, 1318.

Superannuation
Lynam, Edward, Case of.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse. *July 23*, 347.

Superannuation Act, 1887
Civil Employment of Naval and Military Officers—Return Presented, *July 27*, 707, 810.

Supply
Curtailment of Discussion by Closure, Practice as to.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour. *July 30*, 1782, 1784; Mr. Asquith, 1794; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1814, 1815.
Grant out of Consolidated Fund towards making good—£69,157,274; *Com.* July 28*, 1354; *Rep.* July 29*, 1627.
Growth of Various Votes.
Os. Viscount St. Aldwyn, *July 29*, 1398; Lord St. Davids, 1409; Earl Cromer, 1414.
Irish Estimates, Procedure as to.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 30*, 1786, 1790; Mr. Asquith, 1795.
Scottish Votes, Inadequate Time Allowed for Discussion.
Os. Mr. Morton, *July 31*, 2105, 2106.

Sutherland, Mr. J. E. [Elgin Burghs]
Moray Firth Trawling Negotiations, *July 28*, 1241.
Rome—Scots College case, *July 28*, 1230.
Scottish Church Property Allocation, *July 30*, 1726.

Sweated Industries Bill
c. Report from Select Committee, *July 22*, 112.

Swinton and Mexbrough Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Syre
Settlers, Decision of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 28*, 1192.

Taff Vale Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]
Irish Universities Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 2006.
Wireless Telegraphy—Admiralty Staff, *July 27*, 823.

Tanderagee
Labourers' Cottages Scheme.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 854.

Tarbert, Loch Fyne
Pier Lease.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 1725.

"Taurus"
Arrest by German Torpedo Boat.
Q. Sir G. Doughty; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 1754.

Tawe Valley Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Taxation
Broadening Basis of.
Os. Lord Faber, *July 29*, 1417, 1418.
Duties, Taxes and Imports Collected by Imperial Officers—Return Presented, *July 31*, 1943.
Local
Account (1907–8)—Return Ordered, *July 22*, 63; Presented, *July 28*, 1168.
Licences Transferred to Local Authorities.
Os. Earl of Crewe, *July 29*, 1420.
Return (1907–8) Ordered, *July 22*, 63; Presented, *July 28*, 1169; *Aug. 1*, 2079.
Scottish Accounts—Return Presented, *July 29*, 1373, 1450.
New Sources, Necessity for Providing.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 666–669, 691; Sir E. Sassoon, 675, 676; Mr. Lloyd-George, 690–692; Sir G. Parker, 694; Mr. Harmood-Banner, 697–699.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 417, 419.

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, S.E. Radcliffe]
Opium—Suppression of Traffic, *July 28*, 1320–1323.

Taylor Estate
Fishery Rights.
Qs. Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 360.

Tea
Consumption—Copy of Memorandum. Ordered, *July 30*, 1693.
Duty, Reduction of.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 667; Sir E. Sassoon, 670, 672; Mr. Joynson-Hicks, 676.

Telegraph (Construction) Bill
l. 2R. *July 23*, 261.
Com. July 27, 733.
Rep. July 28*, 1072.
3R.* *July 30*, 1676.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *July 31*, 2013
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Telegraph Service
Porterage Paid to Outsiders.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 27*, 841.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Home Office Vote—Inadequate Time Allowed for Discussion, *July 29*, 1609.
Imperial Conference, Secretariat, Duties of *July 29*, 1484, 1485.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Act
Clause 2—Application to Athletic Clubs.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 302.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
l. 2R. *July 23*, 265.

Thames River Steamboat Service Act (1904) Amendment Bill
c. Con. and 3R. *July 27*, 807; *July 29*, 1447.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.*,* *July 29*, 1369.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
Admiralty Contracts—Wages Paid by Messrs. Rolf, *July 27*, 820.
Plymouth Post Office—Wages of Bricklayers, *July 28*, 1171.
Russia—Czar's Visit to England, *July 28*, 1230.
Territorial Force
Appeals by Commanding Officers of Volunteers, etc., for Support to Scheme, *July 27*, 856.
Civil Power, Aid to, *July 27*, 856.

Thurso
Steamboat Service with.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 29*, 1500.

Tobacco
Expenditure by Working Classes.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 70.
Scottish Cultivation.
Qs. Mr. Morton; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 1*, 2097.

Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill
l. Report from Standing Committee, *July 23*, 255.
3R.* *July 27*, 740.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Tollemache Estate Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2078.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Bury, Lancashire]
Inebriate Homes, Cost of, *July 31*, 1954.

Trade, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. W. S. Churchill.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. H. E. Kearley.
Labour Gazette Articles, Responsibility for
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 90.

Trade Reports
Annual Series Presented, *July 22*, 3, 61; *July 25*, 598; *July 27*, 706; *July 30*, 1635, 1691; *July 31*, 1909, 1944.

Trade and Commerce
British Possessions and Foreign Countries—Abstract Presented, *July 31*, 1944, *Aug. 1*, 2073.
State of, in Great Britain and the United States.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 25*, 686-689; Sir G. Parker, 686, 687, 695–697.

Tramways
Men Employed.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 311.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 31*, 1945.
Speed of Cars in London.
Qs. Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. Myer, Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 28*, 1233.

Tramways Act
Report Presented, *July 29*, 1373, 1449.

Tramways and Light Railways (Street and Road.)
Return Presented, *July 29*, 1449.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
c. Con. July 22*, 60.
3R.* *July 23*, 295.
*l.** Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Transfer of Goods Bill
c. 1R.* *July 30*, 1774.

Transvaal
Asiatic Policy—Circular to Trade Councils.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, 880.
British Indians, *see that title.*
Chinese Labour Question.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1252, 1253; Colonel Seely, 1269, 1274; Mr. S. Wortley, 1274; Sir G. Parker, 1284.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour Question—*cont.*
Repatriations.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 66.
Civil Service Retrenchment, etc.
Grievances as to
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1253–1257, 1259; Colonel Seely, 1271–1273, 1332; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1276; Sir G. Parker, 1287–1290; Earl Winterton, 1303–1306; Mr. Boulton, 1324.
Return as to.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 30*, 1749.
Compensation Fund, Loss on.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 23*, 327.
Loan of £5,000,000 — Circumstances of Imperial Guarantee.
Os. Mr. S. Wortley, *July 28*, 1274; Colonel Seely, 1274; Sir G. Parker, 1284, 1292; Mr. Boulton, 1323.
Mines—Labour Statistics.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. J. H. Lewis, *July 25*, 612.
Native Labour—Wages.
Q. Mr. Staveley - Hill; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 23*, 328.
Portuguese Native Labour—Conditions of Employment.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 28*, 1251.
White Labour, Particulars of.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 30*, 1750.

Trawling
See under Fisheries, *also title* Moray Firth.

Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill
c. 1R.* *July 30*, 1774.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.
Financial Secretary—Mr. C. E. Hobhouse

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Elland]
Weir Charity Scheme, Objections to, *July 30*, 1731.

Trinidad
Dock and Engineering Company, Director of.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 22*, 81.
Municipal Council, Re-establishment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 28*, 1319.

Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2075.

Truck
Committee Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *July 23,* 348.
Necessity for Dealing with.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 29,* 1585.
Potteries, Practice in.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23,* 337.

Trustee Savings Banks
Returns (1906–7) Ordered, *July 22,* 62; Presented, *July 28,* 1169.

Tuberculosis
Commission, Value of Work of and Necessity for Continuing Investgations.
Os. Mr. W. Long, *July 29,* 1524–1528; Sir F. Channing, 1542, 1543; Sir P. Magnus, 1545–1547; Mr. Burns, 1564.
Notification of.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23,* 315.

Tulrahan Farm
Price of.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23,* 364.

Turkey
British Subjects Captured by Brigands, Circular as to.
Q. Mr. H. P. Pease; *A.* Sir E Grey, *July 30,* 1752.
Customs Duties, Increase in—Condition of British Sanction to.
Os. Mr. Lynch, *July 27,* 951.
Trade Report Presented, *July 22,* 3; *July 30,* 1635.

Tyne Improvement Bill
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* July 24,* 497.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2077.

Uganda
Railway Accounts — Discontinuance of Annual Return, *July 23,* 254, 297.

Unemployed Workmen's Act
Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 27,* 1037–1042, 1050; Mr. Maddison, 1042; Mr. Burns, 1043–1045, 1049; Mr. K. Hardie, 1045; Mr. W. Rutherford, 1046; Mr. J. Ward 1047–1050.

Unemployment
Administration of Act.
Os. Mr. Burns, *July 29,* 1567-1575.
Distress Committees, Work of.
Os. Mr. Burns, *July 29,* 1567, 1568.

Unemployment—*cont.*
Grant, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 22,* 89.
Grant for Ireland.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23,* 319.
Increase in.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 25,* 694.
Scottish Distress Committees, Grant to.
Os. Mr. Cleland, *July 31,* 2063-2066; Mr. Morton, 2104.
Statistics in *Labour Gazette.*
Q. Earl Winterton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30,* 1760.
Urgency of and Suggestions for dealing with, the Question.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 29,* 1531–1533; Sir F. Channing, 1541; Mr. Curran, 1547–1552; Mr. A. S. Wilson, 1552; Mr. Dobson, 1553; Mr. G. A. Hardy, 1560; Mr. Burns, 1567, 1569, 1570; Mr. Crooks, *July 31,* 2101, 2102, Mr. Pickersgill, 2102; Mr. Burns 2103; Mr. Jowett, 2023; Mr. J. D. White, 2066.
Women's Work Department of Central Body, Reports on.
Os. Mr. Curran, *July 29,* 1551; Mr. Burns, 1572, 1573.

United States
Treaty (Persons in Custody and Wrecking and Salvage Rights) Presented, *July 31,* 1909, 1944.

University of Durham Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *July 24,* 596.
l. 1R.* *July 25,* 597.
2R. *July 27,* 739.
3R.* *July 29,* 1446.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2075.

Upton Town Hall Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2076.

Usk Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill
l. Rep. July 28,* 1069.
Com. and *Rep.* July 29,* 1369.
3R.* *July 30,* 1634.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1,* 2076.

Vaccination
Cooper, Mr., Case of.
Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 27,* 819.
Deaths as a Result of.
Os. Mr. Lupton, *July 29,* 1537, 1538.
Exemption Certificates received in 1907.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23,* 344.
Gallimore, J., Case of.
Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 22,* 91.

Valentia, Rt. Hon. Lord [Oxford]
Territorial Force—Inns of Court Volunteers. *July 27*, 863, 864.

Vatersay
Crofters—Date of Settling Dispute.
Qs. Mr. Weir, *July 30*, 1896, 1897; Mr. Sinclair, 1902.
Situation on.
Q. Sir J. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 27*, 824.

Venezuela
Concessions Cancelled.
Q. Mr. H. Gooch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 28*, 1228.

Vermin
Legislative Measures for Suppressing in Ireland.
Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 613.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Buckinghamshire, N.]
Army Foreign Service—Officers' Houses, *July 27*, 858.
Factories—Employment of Young Persons, *July 31*, 1956.
Irish Universities Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 422; Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 2011

Vivisection
Commission Report, Date of Issuing.
Qs. Mr. A. Douglas, *July 29*, 1602; Mr. Gladstone, 1602.

Volunteers
Long-Service Medal.
Q. Mr. Fiennes; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 1703.

Wages and Hours of Labour
Report Presented, *July 30*, 1635, 1689.

Wakefield
Post Office Extension.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 27*, 840.

Wallace Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. C. MacVeigh; *A.* Mr. Birrell. *July 22*, 72.

Walsall
Excise Offences—Fines (1898–1907).
Qs. Mr. H. C. Lea; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 1485.

Walsh, Mr. S. [Lancashire, S.W., Ince]
International Securities Corporation, Case of, *July 30*, 1758.
Irish Universities Bill, Lords Amendts. *Con.*, *July 31*, 2010.
Provincial Homes Investment Company. Operations of, *July 30*, 1756.

War Office *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. H. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Lord Lucas.
Financial Secretary—Mr. F. D. Acland.
Accounting Officer, Name of.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 31*, 1959.
Ministers other than Secretary of State for War attending at.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 365.
Uniform Contracts.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 1702.
Webber, Mr., Case of.
Qs. Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Acland, *Aug. 1*, 2092.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
Ambergate Reservoir Works—Wages paid, *July 27*, 878, 879.
Army Estimates—Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiencies, *July 27*, 1067.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1047–1050; 3R., 1055.
London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1880.
Naval Base at Rosyth—Expenditure on, *July 27*, 1064.
Redenham Village Green, *July 30*, 1700.
Unemployed Workmen Act—Omission from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, *July 27*, 1047–50.

Warden Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 1946.

Wardle, Mr. G. J. [Stockport]
Fenchurch Street Railway Point Cleaner, Case of, *July 23*, 340.
Weights and Measures—Stamping Fees, *July 27*, 882.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Staffordshire, Lichfield]
Army
  Officers—Recruiting from Universities and Public Schools, *July 27*, 908.
  Special Reserve
    Officers, Conditions of Service for, *July 27*, 908.
    Organisation of, *July 27*, 906.
    Recruiting Returns, *July 27*, 907.
    Rifles, New, Date of Supplying *July 27*, 907.
    Training Arrangements, *July 27*, 907.

Warrenpoint
- Excursion Fatality.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 1508.

Wason, Rt. Hon. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
- Indian Churches, Use of by Presbyterians, *July 22*, 222.

Wason, J. C. Orkney and Shetland]
- Cattle
  - Diseases in America—Issue of Leaflet, proposed, *July 28*, 1195.
  - Importation Restrictions
    - Foreign Representations, *July 28*, 1228.
    - Legislative Proposals, *July 28*, 1242.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com.* *July 27*, 1027, 1036.
- Motors
  - Competitions on Public Highways, *July 28*, 1239.
  - Law as to, Necessity for Strengthening, *July 27*, 1027, 1036, 1037.
  - Police Traps, *July 30*, 1761.
- Naval Shipbuilding Programme—Comparison with Germany, *July 29*, 1479.
- St. Vincent—Carib Canal, *July 28*, 1221.
- Tramways—Speed of Cars in London, *July 28*, 1233.
- Women's Suffrage Movement—Prison Treatment, *July 28*, 1231.

Waste Paper
- Disposal of Prison Registers.
  - *Q.* Mr. Carr-Gomm; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 27*, 880.

Waterville
- Postal Delays.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 31*, 1951.

Waterworks
- Sinking Fund on—Action of Local Government Board as to Period of Repayment.
  - *Os.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, *July 29*, 1557.

Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill
- *c.* *Con.* and 3R.* *July 27*, 807.
- *l.* Commons Amendments *Con.** *July 28*, 1069.
  - Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow, College]
- Lords-Lieutenant—Scottish Appointments, *July 29*, 1465.
- Meat Supply, Inquiry, *July 28*, 1236.
- Navy—Coal Supply, *July 28*, 1195.

Watt, Mr. H. A.—*cont.*
- Post Office Contracts placed in Scotland, *July 31*, 1947.
- Revenue and Expenditure—Statistics for 1907–8, *July 27*, 847.
- Richmond Royal Houses, Use for, *July 27*, 846.
- St. Vincent Revenue, *July 28*, 1223.
- Scottish Sheriffs, etc., Qualifications Required of, *July 28*, 1184.
- Spirits—Duties paid in 1907–8, *July 29*, 1468.
- Tarbert (Loch Fyne) Pier Lease, *July 30*, 1725.
- Tramways—Speed of Cars in London, *July 28*, 1234.

Weardale, Lord
- Dover Graving Docks Bill—Sessional Order as to Second Reading, *July 27*, 703.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyme]
- Admiralty China and Earthenware Contracts, *July 22*, 74.
- Africa, South, Compensation Fund, Administration of, *July 28*, 1223.
- Bermuda Engineer Stores, *July 28*, 1190.
- Gravesend Torpedo Slipway, *July 23*, 322
- Irish Universities Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 659.
- Land Valuation Bill, Proposals as to, *July 22*, 112.
- Newcastle-under-Lyme Post Office Classification, *July 27*, 887.
- Nigerian Taxation System, *Aug. 1*, 2093.
- Shoeburyness Foreshore, Ownership of, *July 22*, 78, 79.
- Transvaal Compensation Fund, Loss on, *July 23*, 327.

Weights and Measures
- Stamping Fees.
  - *Q.* Mr. Wardle; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 27*, 882.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
- Bonar Bridge—Case of J. Murray, *July 30*, 1731.
- Canadian Immigration Regulations for Consumptive Persons, *July 30*, 1721.
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1896.
- Fisheries
  - Line and Trawl Caught Fish Landed in Scotland (1898–1907), *July 23*, 312.
  - Scottish Cruisers, *July 23*, 348.
  - Trawling Prosecutions, *July 22*, 69.
- Invergordon Naval Base Scheme, *July 29*, 1468.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Lewis, Island of
Fish Landed in 1898 and 1907, *Aug. 1*, 2085.
Fisheries, *July 27*, 811.
Houses, Proposals for Re-building, *July 29*, 1466.
Loch's Schools, Cleansing of, *July 31*, 1959.
Migration Scheme, *July 23*, 313.
Rating *impasse*, *July 28*, 1191; *July 29*, 1466.
Sanitary Condition, *July 27*, 823.
Skigersta Boat Shelter and Sea Wall, *July 23*, 313.
Railways, Electric—Precaution against Fire, *July 22*, 70.
Scottish Land Question—Legislative Proposals, *July 29*, 1466, 1477; *July 30*, 1721, 1773.
Syre Settlers, Decision of, *July 28*, 1192.
Vatersay Crofters—Date of Settling Dispute, *July 30*, 1896, 1897.

Weir Charity
See under Charities.

Welsh Church
Commission Report.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 31*, 1966.

Wemyss, Earl of
Compulsory Military Service, Possibility of Establishing on National Service League Plan, *July 22*, 15–18.
Defence of the Empire—Adequacy of Present Arrangements, *July 22*, 14, 15.

West Estate
Case of Peter D. Kelly.
Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 27*, 849.

West Indies
[*For Particular Islands, see their Names, as* Barbados, Jamaica.]
Administration, Cost of.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 28*, 1318; Colonel Seely, 1328.
Cable Communication with.
Os. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, *July 28*, 1316, 1317; Colonel Seely, 1327.
Clergy—Return Presented, *July 27*, 708, 810.

West Square
School Accommodation.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 1497.

Westmeath
Condition of.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 110.

Westmeath—*cont.*
Revaluation Expenses.
Q. Sir W. Nugent; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 29*, 1453.

Wexford
Labourers' Cottages Schemes.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 1709.

Whale Fisheries (Ireland) Bill.
l. 2R. *July 27*, 728.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 28*, 1164.
3R. *July 29*, 1445.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 2014.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2075.

Wheat and Flour
Lemstrom Electrification System, Value of.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Russell, *July 23*, 314.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
Aerial Navigation—War Office Expenditure (1903–8), *July 29*, 1481.
Agricultural Labourers' Wages, Hours of Work, etc., *July 24*, 505.
Bills—Form of Presenting and Printing, *July 29*, 1476; *July 30*, 1736.
Butter, Nut, Regulations as to, *July 29*, 1459.
Education Grants—Deduction System, *July 24*, 507.
Income-Tax Reduction Claims, Date for making, *July 28*, 1197.
Indian Churches, Use of, by Troops, *July 22*, 227; *July 27*, 829.
Severn Foreshore, Ownership of, *July 28*, 1238.
Shoeburyness—Foreshore acquired by War Office, *July 28*, 1189, 1238.
Unemployment—Urgency of the Question, *July 31*, 2066.

White, Mr. P. [Meath, N.]
Dublin, Metropolitan Police—Case of Staff-Sergeant Scully, *July 31*, 1963.

White, Sir G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
Congo Free State
Annexation Proposals, *July 30*, 1838–1840.
Belgian Administration — Responsibility of Great Britain, *July 30*, 1836–1842.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1836–1842.
Irish Universities Bill, 3R. *July, 25*, 628–631.

White Estate
Case of Mrs. M. Callaghan.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1475.

White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition Bill
c. 1R.* *July 30*, 1774.

Whitehead, Mr. R. [Essex, S.E.]
Birth Certificates—Cost of Copy, *July 30*, 1705.
Shoeburyness—Fishery Rights on War Office Ground, *July 30*, 1735.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
Granton—Steamship Communication with Burntisland, *July 31*, 2070.

Widnes Corporation Bill
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* July 24*, 497.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Wild Birds Bill
l. Com. and *Rep.* July 23*, 265.
3R.* *July 27*, 740.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2074.

Wiles, Mr. T. [Islington, S.]
McGhee, F., and Wife, Sentence on, *July 23* 337.
Three Counties Asylum, Beer brewed at, *July 30*, 1758.

Willesden
Case of W. Barnard.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 27*, 825.
Education Committee Area Scheme.
Q. Mr. Macpherson; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 28*, 1182.

Williams, Colonel R. [Dorset, W.]
Director of Army Finance, Office of, *July 30*, 1736.

Williams, Mr. J. [Glamorgan, W.]
Port Talbot Postmen's Duties, *July 31* 1948.

Williams, Mr. W. L. [Carmarthen, District]
Cayo Rent Collection, *July 27*, 826.

Williamson, Mr. A. [Elgin and Nairn]
Fisheries Board, Proposals for, *July 30*, 1701.

Willoughby de Broke, Lord
Motors
Accidents due to—Statistics, *July 29*, 1376.
Dust Nuisance, *July 29*, 1374, 1376–1378.
Horns, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 29*, 1377.
Legislation, Necessity for, *July 29*, 1374–1380.
Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1378, 1379.

Wilson, Mr. A. S. [Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness]
Africa, South—Garrison Reduction, *July 22*, 66.
Motor, Speed Restrictions, *July 29*, 1552.
Unemployment—Urgency of, Suggestions for dealing with the Question, *July 29*, 1552.

Wilson, Mr. G. S. [Hull, W.]
Army Territorial Force Quartermaster-Sergeants, Position of, *July 30*, 1702.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorks, W.R. Holmfirth]
Natal—Dinizulu Case, *July 27*, 839.

Wilson, Mr. J. H. [Middlesbrough]
"Clam"—Chinese Crew, *July 22*, 70.
"Strathyre"—Chinese Crew, *July 29*, 1452.

Wilson, Mr. W. T. [Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughton]
Admiralty, Rough Carpentry, Men employed on, *July 31*, 1950.
Birmingham Post Office Staff Pay, *Aug. 1*, 2086.
Bolton Post Office Staff, *July 31*, 1951.
Bristol Post Office Erection—Notices posted by Contractor, *July 27*, 840.
Building Trade, State of, *July 30*, 1729.
Manchester Post Office Staff, *July 31*, 1951.
Navy
Dockyards—Wages of Joiners, *July 27*, 845.
"Rohilla" Contract—Wages of Workmen, *July 28*, 1172.
West India Dock Stores, Wages at, *July 27*, 844.
Telegraph Service—Porterage paid to Outsiders, *July 27*, 841.

Wiltshire
Charities—Return Presented, *July 29*, 1450.

Windsor
Motorists, Prosecution of.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 27*, 818.

Winn Estate
Interest on Purchase Money.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 351.

Winterton, Earl [Sussex, Horsham]
Admiralty Statements to the Press, Authorship of, *July 30*, 1890–1892.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1890–1892.
"General"—Arrest by German Gunboat, *July 30*, 1753.
Motor Omnibus Breakdowns, *July 28*, 1234.
Natal—Trial of Dinizulu, *July 28*, 1302.

[*cont.*

Winterton, Earl—*cont.*
Navy—Press Communications by Officers, *July 30*, 1744, 1745.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 1981.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1355.
Transvaal Civil Servants' Grievances, *July 28*, 1303–1306.
Unemployment Statistics in *Labour Gazette*, *July 30*, 1760

Wireless Telegraphy
Admiralty Staff.
Q. Lord E. Talbot; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 27*, 823.
Control of.
Qs. Colonel Lockwood; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 855.

Wishaw Burgh Electricity, etc., Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Wolverhampton, Viscount
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1091–1094, 1096, 1099, 1101, 1103–1108, 1110, 1113, 1115, 1117, 1120–1124, 1131, 1134, 1135, 1141, 1142, 1145, 1147, 1150, 1163; *Rep. July 29*, 1438–1444; 3R. *July 30*, 1637; Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts., *July 31*, 1913, 1925, 1927, 1929.
Third Reading in House of Lords, Procedure as to, *July 29*, 1444.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2077.

Women's Suffrage Movement
Prison Treatment.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 22*, 71.
Qs. Mr. Brodie, Mr. Byles, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Healy; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 338, 339.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 28*, 1231.
Political Offenders, Treatment as, proposed.
Os. Earl Russell, *July 29*, 1431; Earl Beauchamp, 1432; Mr. S. MacNeill, *July 30*, 1844, 1885–1888, 1900; Mr. Gladstone, 1900, 1901.
Prosecution of—Act applying to Cases.
Os. Earl Russell, *July 29*, 1428–1430; Earl Beauchamp, 1430.

Wood, Mr. T. McK.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
London and District Electricity Supply Bill, 2R. *July 30*, 1853–1858.

Woolwich Arsenal
Stores available.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 1703.

Woolwich Common
War Office Rights over.
Qs. Mr. Crooks, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 77.
Qs. Mr. Crooks, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 864.

Workhouses
[*For particular Workhouses see Names of Places, as* Gateshead.]
Irish Teachers, Position of.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 1474.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield Hallam]
Bills, Private—Suspension of Standing Order 8, *July 30*, 1776.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 1822.
Crime—Comparison between Great Britain and Ireland, *July 30*, 1822.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Question, *July 28*, 1274.
Loan of £5,000,000—Imperial Guarantee, *July 28*, 1274.

Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill
l. Rep. July 28*, 1069.
Com. and *Rep.* July 29*, 1369.
3R.* *July 30*, 1634.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 2076.

Yeomanry
Fife and Forfar Regiment—Case of Private Rennie.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 27*, 856.

Young, Mr. S. [Cavan, E.]
Education Inspectors, Complaints against, *July 31*, 1964.
Irish Universities Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 658.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]
Admiralty Shipbuilding Contractors and Foreign Contracts, *July 28*, 1205.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com. July 27*, 1021.
Indian Public Works Department—Pay of Engineers, *July 29*, 1484.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
Aberdare School Teachers, Dismissal of *July 28*, 1176.

[*cont.*

Yoxall, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*
- Education
  - Code
    - Article 14, *July 28*, 1175.
    - Article 43, Interpretation of, *July 30*, 1727.
  - Grants in Aid of Denominational Schools, *July 29*, 1456.
  - Open-air Schools, *Aug. 1*, 2080.
  - Teachers—Footnote to Article 10 of Code of 1906, *July 28*, 1176.
  - Welsh Code, *Aug. 1*, 2080.

Zouche of Haryngworth, Lord
- Army Territorial Force, Organisation of, *July 22*, 24, 29.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 28*, 1114.

Zululand
- Legal *Status* of Zulus.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 876.
- Native Land Reservation.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 27*, 875.